Abbreviations

The following abbreviations are used for Carlyle’s collected and uncollected writings and selected frequently cited texts. Full bibliographical information may be found in Works Cited.

CL    Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle. Ed. C. R. Sanders et al.
CME   Critical and Miscellaneous Essays (five volumes).
EL    James A. Froude. Thomas Carlyle: A History of the First Forty Years of His Life.
FG    The History of Frederick the Great. 8 vols.
FR    The French Revolution. 3 vols.
HGL   Carlyle’s Unfinished History of German Literature. Ed. Hill Shine.
HHW   On Heroes and Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History.
Kaplan Fred Kaplan. Thomas Carlyle: A Biography.
LDP   Latter-Day Pamphlets.
LJS   The Life of John Sterling.
LS    The Life of Schiller.
OCLS  Oliver Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches. 5 vols.
PP    Past and Present.
### Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RIJ</td>
<td><em>Reminiscences of My Irish Journey in 1849.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RWE</td>
<td><em>The Correspondence of Emerson and Carlyle.</em> Ed. Joseph Slater.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spedd</td>
<td>&quot;Thomas Carlyle and Thomas Spedding: Their Friendship and Correspondence.&quot; Ed. Alexander Carlyle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR</td>
<td><em>Sartor Resartus.</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TR</td>
<td><em>Two Reminiscences of Thomas Carlyle.</em> Ed. John Clubbe.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WR</td>
<td>Wotton Reinfred.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preface

1. The importance of the work done on the early writings of Carlyle in the past thirty years should not be underestimated, and this study would not have been possible without it, yet it is nonetheless the case that the number of studies focused on *Sartor Resartus* continues to equal, or nearly equal, studies of all the other works combined. As G. B. Tennyson has written in his bibliographical essay on Carlyle, "What is now needed is for some of the serious and capable critical attention directed to *Sartor* and some of the techniques developed in modern *Sartor* and general Carlyle criticism—as in the works of Holloway, Tennyson, Levine, LaValley, and others—to be directed to other Carlyle works" ("Thomas Carlyle," 99–100). The tendency to focus on Carlyle’s development up to the time of writing his masterwork, *Sartor Resartus*, has been present from the beginnings of modern Carlyle studies and has continued in recent years. Studies in this category include much of the best criticism of Carlyle, for example, C. F. Harrold’s *Carlyle and German Thought*, Hill Shine’s *Carlyle’s Fusion of Poetry, History, and Religion by 1834*, G. B. Tennyson’s *Sartor Called Resartus*, and Jacques Cabau’s *Le Prométhée Enchainé*. This tendency is most marked in otherwise sound and important studies that focus on the development of Carlyle’s thought on particular issues rather than on particular works, but which nonetheless do not pursue the development of these ideas beyond the midpoint of his career, studies like Philip Rosenberg’s *The Seventh Hero* and Ruth apRoberts’s *Ancient Dialect*. Rosenberg stops his discussion with *Past and Present* (1843) because, he argues, Carlyle did not develop any “new insight, even a deplorable one” after that date. Rosenberg concludes that “these writings seem . . . scarcely worth reading and even less worth writing about” (p. x). One cannot help but notice that the later Carlyle does not accord very well with the very attractive Carlyle whom Rosenberg portrays in his book. It is only fair to add that there have been some excellent studies that do examine Carlyle’s entire career, most notably George Levine’s *The Boundaries of Fiction* as well as his “Use and Abuse of Carlylese,” and Albert J. LaValley’s *Carlyle and the Idea of the Modern*.

Chapter 1

1. Concomitant with these shifts in the authority of religious discourse were attacks on the hierarchical principle through which the institution of the
church was governed, the Reformation substituting less hierarchical or anti-hierarchical schemes like episcopacy, presbyterianism, and congregationalism for the Roman hierarchy (see Bendix, 293). In the nineteenth century, dissenters and utilitarians alike successfully challenged the union of church and state and the privileged position of the Anglican hierarchy.

2. I distinguish the rise of an explicit, written doctrine of patriarchy from the origins of patriarchy in Western culture. On the former, see Schochet, who argues that it does not become a full-fledged doctrine of political obligation until 1603 (16, 98); on the latter, see Lerner.

3. In addition, contemporary historians could point to changes in the English constitution—the former existence of feudalism, for example—as proof that government changes and that, therefore, it is not passed along genetically in unchanging form (see Pocock).

4. The word *literature* itself only came to designate artistic texts in the course of the nineteenth century (see Todorov; Williams, *Keywords*, 183–88; Kernan, 7, 259–64; and Parrinder, 20–21). René Wellek adds a corrective by insisting that there are important precedents for the modern usage, but his argument ultimately demonstrates that the word *literature* did not come to designate a body of imaginative texts until the late eighteenth century (“What Is Literature?” 16–23). In Gissing’s *New Grub Street* (1891), Alfred Yule notes the evolution of the term: “And apropos of that, when was the word ‘literature’ first used in our modern sense to signify a body of writing? In Johnson’s day it was pretty much the equivalent of our ‘culture’. . . . His dictionary, I believe, defines the word as ‘learning, skill in letters’—nothing else” (434).

5. Although Coleridge’s *Constitution of Church and State* did not appear until after Carlyle’s ideas were fairly well formed, it had been in progress for a long time and many of its ideas had appeared in Coleridge’s earlier works.

6. Carlyle’s knowledge of economic theory should not be underestimated. In the early 1820s, he translated the article on “Political Economy” by Simonde de Sismondi—one of the earliest critics of industrial capitalism—for Brewster’s *Edinburgh Encyclopedia*. Carlyle’s critique of laissez-faire appeared as early as 1831 when he wrote: “the principle of Laissez-faire is fast verging . . . to a consummation. Let people go on, each without guidance, each striving only to gain advantage for himself, the result will be this: Each, endeavouring by ‘competition’ to outstrip the others, will endeavour by all arts to manufacture an article (not better) only cheaper and showier than his neighbour” (TNB, 206; see also WR, 24; SR, 159; HGL, 5; CL, 5:183–84).

7. In so characterizing Carlyle, I am looking forward to his renewed interest in the civil wars in the late 1830s; but his sympathy with the Puritans and the Scottish rebels, whom he considered his own ancestors, was lifelong (see CME, 4:178).

8. Jacques Lacan’s imaginary and symbolic realms have contributed to my
understanding of the dialectic described in this paragraph; it will be further explored in chapter 2.

Chapter 2

1. On the literary career in the nineteenth century, see Said, 236–75; Arac, Commissioned Spirits, 23.

2. The edition cited is a revision of an edition published in 1833. For a discussion of the representation of the family as a preindustrial idyll, see Davidoff et al. There is a similar relationship between family and pastoral in Dickens (see Marcus, chaps. 4 and 5; Welsh, chap. 9).

3. Carlyle represents the long course of ill health that began in 1790 and continued until his early death (at age forty-five) in 1805 as a correlative of Schiller’s endless wanderings. Just as Schiller wandered in search of rest from wandering, so his “unceasing toil” in quest of emotional health produced illness (105). The relationship between Carlyle’s own dyspepsia and his quest for psychic health will be discussed in chapter 3.

4. Tennyson dates the poem before 1825, and David Masson dates it before 1821 (Tennyson, 62, n. 45). Tarr and McClelland agree that, although the poem could have been composed as late as 1830, the early 1820s seems the most likely date (135–36).

5. He had finished translating the second part of Wilhelm Meister just before beginning these attempts at fiction, and its influence is clear. Apart from its opening, Wotton Reinfred has much more in common with Meister than with Werter. Like Meister, Reinfred sets out on a journey after losing his beloved to another man. The House in the Wold, where freethinkers engage in highly philosophical conversations, resembles Lothario’s castle, where Wilhelm discovers a secret society of men dedicated to higher knowledge. Wotton discovers his rival in the House in the Wold, just as Meister encounters the husband of the countess he had nearly fallen in love with in Lothario’s castle. Finally, Wotton Reinfred owes a great deal to the style and narrative methods of Wilhelm Meister.

6. “Illudo Chartis” also records the father’s death, which apparently occurs sometime after he sends Stephen to the university. No mention is made of the death of the mother in either narrative. The stern father motif also occurs in other narratives, especially the lives of Burns and Goethe (CME, 1:293; WM, 1:13).

7. That it is truly an ideal society and an Elysium is also questionable. Although the inhabitants discuss transcendentalism, it is not certain that they live transcendentally. Carlyle’s semiparodic representation of the Coleridgean figure Dalbrook will be discussed below in chapter 3.

8. In addition to Schiller and Goethe, Carlyle most frequently draws on
his depiction of Richter in producing his representation of Teufelsdröckh. The title of the chapter under discussion echoes his description of Richter's childhood as "idyllic" (CME, 2:109-10).

9. In addition to the biographical and fictional narratives Carlyle used as resources for his construction of Teufelsdröckh's career, he undoubtedly drew on Wilhelm Meister, in which the father/son relationship anticipates Sartor Resartus in a number of ways. Wilhelm comes into conflict with his father over his career, Wilhelm wishing to study art instead of going into commerce like his father. Wilhelm's father had sold off his own father's collection of art, including a painting of a king's son dying of love for the father's bride. (Similarly, Schiller's Don Carlos—a play concerned with monarchical authority—involves a father who condemns his son to death and marries his son's beloved, turning his Garden of Eden into a desert of despair [LS, 64]). While on his journey, Wilhelm is introduced to the works of Shakespeare, who becomes his substitute father, and inevitably becomes obsessed with the play that revolves around the relationship of father and son, Hamlet (1:244). Finally, the death of Wilhelm's father frees him to commit himself to art and the search for knowledge, and Wilhelm reaches an important stage when he recognizes in himself the father of Felix and adopts Mignon as his daughter.

10. The early death of the father may also be found in the biographies of Richter and Werner. Werner, like Teufelsdröckh, subsequently becomes a "Wandering Jew" (CME, 1:131).

11. Carlyle was also drawing on Wilhelm Meister's Travels, subtitled The Renunciants (CME, 2:15; SR, 191; see also 186, n. 4).

12. Not long thereafter, according to another late report, Carlyle admitted to his friend Irving that he had lost his faith in Christianity (Rem., 225). Note, however, that David Masson reports the episode as the end of a process rather than a critical event in itself, claiming that it was "from that first well-remembered reading of Gibbon in twelve days, at the rate of a volume a day, that he dated the extirpation from his mind of the last remnant that had been left in it of the orthodox belief in miracles" (263-64). What counts here is the imaginative reconstitution of events, not their "reality." There is no precise date at which one can fix Carlyle's loss of faith; we know only from the letters that the sufferings of disbelief intensified around 1819 (see EL, 1:64-68; Kaplan, 48-59; Allingham, Diary, 232, 253, 268; Wilson, 1:78, 132-33, 145-47).

13. He seems to have begun learning German both to study mineralogy and to read the authors he had learned of through Mme. de Staël (CL, 5:136; see Campbell and Tarr). While Carlyle might have found the idea of literature as replacement for religion in Coleridge, he always attributed it to the Germans. Although it seems likely that he had read Coleridge's criticism, I can find no references to it in Carlyle's writings before 1823 (TNB, 46-47; Shine, Carlyle's Early Reading, 69, no. 455).
14. See *CME*, 3:16, 58, 119; *LS*, 46; *WM*, 1:113. His second major review article, "The State of German Literature" (1827), summed up his view of German literature as a new religious creed, the article’s conclusion equating religion and literature (*CME*, 3:85). Correlatively, writers, like Jeffrey, about whom Carlyle had reservations were excluded from the priesthood of literature (*TNB*, 175).

15. The linkage between poetry and revelation, prophecy, and inspiration appears frequently in Carlyle’s early writings (see *TNB*, 211; *LS*, 201; *CME*, 2:94–95; *HGL*, 5; *SR*, 224).

16. The comparison of poet and king, ruler, lawmaker appears repeatedly in his writings. He claimed that the “writer of the first Book in a language . . . must be ranked by the nation he writes for, infinitely higher than any conqueror or lawgiver” (*HGL*, 28). In comparing the institution of literature to the church, he had also called it “our Senate, our whole Social Constitution” (*CME*, 2:369). He compared Burns to a legislator and argued that Johnson’s true calling was not for literature but for the more active political arena, “as Statesman (in the higher, now obsolete sense), Lawgiver, Ruler” (*CME*, 1:287, 3:92; see also *SR*, 45; *TNB*, 139; *HGL*, 28; *CME*, 1:287, 2:369, 3:92).

17. See also *CME*, 2:372, 398. Shakespeare is also implicitly a king, since he “knew (kenned, which in those days still partially meant can-ned) innumerable things” (*CME*, 3:142–43).

18. This description appeared in a letter to Goethe describing his projected (and never completed) history of German literature. In this letter, Goethe’s era explicitly succeeds an era of skepticism. A similar pattern and attitude may be seen as late as 1832 (*CL*, 6:123; see *CME*, 3:178).

19. One must take into account the circumstance that Carlyle was a young author seeking to ingratiate himself with the master. He certainly had reservations about Goethe, but in a letter to a friend he did claim, in spite of these reservations, that he “could sometimes fall down and worship” this adopted father (*CL*, 2:437; see Ikeler, 27–29, 73–77).


21. Carlyle also implicitly compares his father’s building to texts in two later statements in the reminiscence discussed below (7, 33). Linda Peterson’s reading of *Sartor Resartus* as a text that employs the hermeneutic technique of biblical interpretation is equally appropriate to the “Reminiscence of James Carlyle,” which could be regarded as an interpretation of the meaning of his father’s life for him (chap. 2).

22. As C. F. Harrold notes, Carlyle alludes to the etymological derivation of pontiff from the Latin “pons + facere, bridge builder, originally applied to Roman Magistrates whose sacred function it was to superintend the building
and demolition of bridges." The word was later "applied to priests at Rome, then to the Pope" (SR, 79, n. 5). The theme of the bridge as medium connecting the natural and supernatural worlds also occurs in Tieck's "The Elves," a work Carlyle translated for German Romance (see Cabau, 120–21, 168–73).

23. Kaplan notes, significantly, that Margaret Carlyle actively opposed the separation decided upon by James (24). Carlyle does attempt to argue that his education did not separate him from his father and family. His father, he says, had disregarded the warning that if he educated his son, he would "grow up to despise his ignorant parents" and had later assured him that the prophecy had not been fulfilled (Rem., 12). But the fact that Carlyle needs assurance in itself betrays his anxiety that education has separated them, and the metaphorical resonances are clear when he writes that, after going to school at age ten, he "was never habitually beside" his father again (28).

24. Froude describes Carlyle's "real passion" for his mother, their mutual "passionate attachment of a quite peculiar kind," and asserts that the "strongest personal passion" that Carlyle "experienced through all his life was his affection for his mother" (EL, 1:35, 47, 239). He also argues that the attachment persisted even after Carlyle's marriage, depicting Carlyle and his mother driving about in a gig, "smoking their pipes together, like a pair of lovers—as indeed they were" (LL, 1:178). Kaplan concurs and expands Froude's reading (e.g., 24; see also Cabau, 193–235).

25. In formulating this discussion, I have in mind Lacan's discussions of the imaginary and symbolic realms, his associated oedipal theory of the nom du père, and his critique of ego psychology. Of course, Lacan's critique of ego psychology means that a writer's works cannot be traced to any origin in the individual; the notion that the self is constituted socially suggests, rather, a dialectic that undermines the opposition of self and society (see also Jameson, Lemaire, and Ragland-Sullivan).

Chapter 3

1. Although Carlyle was living in relative isolation in southwestern Scotland, he followed these events closely in the newspapers (see CL, 5:130, 161, 216). In late August, he would have seen Mill's letters on the revolution, which appeared anonymously in the Examiner (Mill, Earlier Letters, 12:59–67).

2. See TNB, 160, 163, on the relationship between judge and criminal (SR, 60) and the vision of the clothes flying off the court (SR, 61). See also TNB, 164–66, and CL, 5:153; in the latter, a letter of August 30, Carlyle makes reference to "natural Supernaturalism." The first notebook passage occurs just after Carlyle notes that he had received writings from the St. Simonian Gustave d'Eichthal four weeks earlier. Since he received the packet around July 23 (see CL, 5:133), this would date the entry as about August 20. Both this letter
(which mentions the July revolution) and the notebooks juxtapose mention of the St. Simonians and the use of the clothing metaphor. In his response to the St. Simonians, Carlyle employed, perhaps for the first time, the "tone and Phraseology of Teufelsdrockh" (CL, 5:136, n. 3). Although much of the material that Carlyle would include in Sartor Resartus had been gathering for nearly a decade (for example, in Wotton Reinfrd), passages written before this date do not employ the clothing metaphor. In Sartor Resartus, for example, the passage on the figurativeness of language is expressed in terms of the clothing metaphor; but the earlier version of the passage, written in the latter half of 1829, does not use it (SR, 73; TNB, 141-42).

3. Carlyle informed his brother on September 18 that he was planning to "write something of [his] own," and, on October 10, he spoke of actually being at work on it (CL, 5:164, 171).

4. Other details indicate Teufelsdrockh’s sympathy with the revolution. The Editor suggests he may be headed for London, where the reform agitation was under way; Teufelsdrockh responds to news of the July revolution with a German version of the revolutionary song, Ca ira: and we are also told that he has been communicating with the revolutionary St. Simonians. On the relationship between what Carlyle himself said of the St. Simonians and this passage, see CL, 5:136, and TNB, 158-59.

5. Carlyle sympathized with the "poor wretches" who threatened to strike and riot in Glasgow in late 1819 and early 1820 (CL, 1:242; see also 212, 218, 224-25, 252-53, 254: Rem., 212-13, 222). He may even have had firsthand experience of these riots, since one occurred in Edinburgh in August 1812, a summer that he spent mostly there (Logue, 33, 41; Kaplan, 32).

6. It also elaborates the familiar notion of the “fabric” of society (see SR, 62). On the general notion of the tissue of society and social interconnectedness, see the chapter “Organic Filaments” and 52, 53, 60, 70, 71, 89, 95, 132, 245.

7. “Custom,” Teufelsdrockh writes, persuades us that “the Miraculous, by simple repetition, ceases to be Miraculous . . . thus let but a Rising of the Sun, let but a Creation of the World happen twice, and it ceases to be marvellous, to be noteworthy, or noticeable” (259, 57). Puns on habit and costume appear throughout Sartor (35, 59, 72-73, 171, 223, 260-61, 266; see also the chapter on symbols, esp. 218).

8. In The French Revolution, Carlyle will represent this as the sansculottic tendency toward cannibalism, and already in Sartor Resartus he is concerned with the Malthusian anxiety that we will end up “universally eating one another” (SR, 227). He also frequently complains that the utilitarian “Profit-and-Loss Philosophy” replaces the soul with the stomach (e.g., 232).

9. From “The State of German Literature” (1827) forward, Carlyle depicts as mere hodmen authors who do not treat literature as religion (CME, 1:59;
see CL, 4:271, 5:152–53, 6:329; TNB, 144). He also contrasts those who build (e.g., Goethe) with those who burn or destroy (e.g., Voltaire; see WM, 1:28). The masonry metaphor can be found throughout Sartor Resartus (see esp. 54, 250, 263).

10. About 1830, his insistence that literature will be the new liturgy receives an ironic twist when he begins saying that "journalism," which he always despised, rather than "literature," is the new religion. Teufelsdröckh writes, for example, that "Journalists are now the true Kings and Clergy," for the liturgy of journalism is an ironic one that destroys "ancient idols" rather than producing a new belief (SR, 45, 252; see CME, 2:77; TNB, 263; HGL, 5).

11. Since the hero's authority derives from God, not the people, Teufelsdröckh rejects representational government that assumes popular authority. "Not that we want no Aristocracy," Carlyle wrote in his notebook at this time, "but that we want a true one" (TNB, 179). Here Carlyle departs from Mill in "Spirit of the Age," who argues that authority has shifted from governors, who had been the only ones with sufficient knowledge to govern, to representatives of the people now sufficiently knowledgeable to choose their own governors (Newspaper Writings, 253–58).

12. Whether or not he might have found a publisher under other circumstances, Carlyle became convinced that nothing could be done while the English had their minds on the reform bill (CL, 5:376, 436, 6:14, 16, 24, 64).

13. Several years earlier, DeQuincey had made almost identical objections to Carlyle's translation of Wilhelm Meister, complaining of its "lawless innovation," "licentious coinages," and "neoteric slang" (192–97). Anticipating the defense of Sartor's style discussed below, Carlyle inscribed this episode in Sartor Resartus (Vanden Bossche, "Polite Conversation"). It is an index of Carlyle's own accommodation to English culture that he later conceded that DeQuincey had been right to admonish him (Shepherd, 2:276).

14. For example, Teufelsdröckh's wanderings enact the Editor's statement that his birth is an exodus; his "watch-tower" home becomes the "watch-tower" of German philosophy (20, 6); he sees a clock and jail on his way to his first school and then becomes a prisoner of time (127); as a child, he "sew[s]" books into a "volume" and as an adult writes a "Clothes-Volume" (102, 79).

15. These techniques are described in Cabau, 140; Caserio, 31–32; Edwards, 99; Gilbert, 433–36; Leicester, 11, 15; M. Roberts, 404; and Haney, 319ff. This is not to deny that Sartor Resartus draws on a long tradition of religious and literary symbolism and figuration, but it can be argued that even the extravagance of Sartor's allusions to biblical, classical, and German texts, as well as contemporary thought and events, does not provide any real external reference (i.e., to a tradition that precedes and grounds the text), since it makes use of them apart from the system of meanings to which they were formerly attached. Along these lines, Linda Peterson has recently argued that
Carlyle employs a Straussian hermeneutics of intertextuality that finds meaning through the relation between texts rather than, as in traditional theories of revelation, through appeal to the single divine author (54–57).

16. When *Sartor* finally appeared in Fraser’s, the reactions were almost entirely unfavorable (*EL*, 2:461). It should be noted that all of the responses to *Sartor Resartus* discussed here came after the 1834 publication, but they indicate attitudes that were surely apparent earlier, as Carlyle’s statements about his feeling of isolation, discussed below, indicate. I am concerned with how his contemporaries responded to the rhetoric of *Sartor Resartus*; for detailed analyses of this rhetoric, see Holloway, chap. 2; Tennyson, *Sartor*; Levine, *Boundaries of Fiction* and “The Use and Abuse of Carlylese”; Brookes; and Landow, *Elegant Jeremiahs*.

17. Mill complained, among other things, that Carlyle’s phraseology “fails to bring home [his] meaning to the comprehension of most readers” (*Earlier Letters*, 12:176). When he later published Carlyle’s “Mirabeau,” Mill first attempted to smooth out some of its “quaint” usages and then defended its style to his friends (see 202, 307, 334).

18. In another letter, he described a visit during which Irving gave him an article by one Thomas Carlyle (!) that he claimed was “‘given him’ by the spirit!” Carlyle found it “to be simply the insanest Babble, without top bottom or centre, that ever was emitted even from Bedlam itself” (*CL*, 6:132; see also *Rem.*, 298ff.; Skabarnicki, “Annandale Evangelist”).

19. Carlyle’s phrasing—“At some Hotel of the Sun, Hotel of the Angel, Gold Lion, or Green Goose, or whatever hotel it is, in whatever world-famous capital City, his chariot-wheels have rested”—makes it clear that Green Goose is meant to be a typical name for the kind of inn Cagliostro stopped at, not an actual place (*CME*, 3:279).

20. It is worth emphasizing in the context of the preceding discussion that, while Carlyle employs something like Romantic irony in *Sartor Resartus*, he does not intend to destabilize meaning completely. In this respect, I concur with those critics who insist that Carlyle intends his irony to be limited by his insistence on an ultimate ground of meaning (e.g., Fleishman 128; McGowan, 60–69). A number of recent studies have treated Carlyle as a Romantic ironist (see Dale, “*Sartor Resartus*,” 293–312; Haney, 307–33; Jay, 92–108; Mellor, chap. 4; and Morris, 201–12).

21. Later, Carlyle associated contemporary English literature with industrial mechanization as well as urban capitalism. “Literature, too,” he wrote in “Signs of the Times,” “has its Paternoster-row mechanism, its Trade dinners, its Editorial conclaves, and huge subterranean, puffing bellows; so that books are not only printed, but, in a great measure, written and sold, by machinery” (*CME*, 2:62). Mechanization, he claimed elsewhere, was helping to make literature a commodity, just another “species of Brewing or Cookery”
Through such comments, Carlyle attempts to sustain a distinction between literature and the mere products of print (see TNB, 170).

22. He never tired of repeating the story of society’s neglect of Burns as proof that, when judged by the laws of supply and demand, poets will never be considered valuable (CME, 1:258; see also 42–43).

23. The metaphor of hunger in this sentence connects novel writing both with the Cagliostric quackery that eats and destroys rather than creates, and with the important theme of cannibalism in The French Revolution, which will be discussed below (see also CL, 6:396). Carlyle frequently complained in his letters of the 1830s that hunger might drive him from the profession of literature. One could argue, of course, that hunger forced him to stay with it.

24. There have been a number of discussions of Carlyle’s use of epic devices and the influence of Homer on his writings, but little on his conception of epic until Mark Cumming’s A Disimprisoned Epic. I would suggest that Carlyle did not so much attempt to make the The French Revolution epic because he read Homer, but read Homer because he wanted to make his next work epic (see LaValley, 139–52; Farrell, 215–31; Clubbe, “Carlyle as Epic Historian” and “Epic Heroes”; J. Rosenberg, 39–48; Cumming, “Disimprisonment of Epic”).

25. In the early nineteenth century, there were nearly as many definitions of epic as there were critics and no consensus on what constituted the epic canon. Thus, while Carlyle drew on recent scholarship, he had considerable freedom in how to define epic (Foerster, 31–34; see also Jenkyns, chap. 9; Turner, chap. 4). Mark Cumming’s study confirms and provides considerable evidence beyond that presented here that Carlyle was reshaping epic to suit his own literary ends. Cumming demonstrates how Carlyle combines romance, satire, elegy, farce, tragedy, emblem, fragment, allegory, phantasmagory, and so on to create a heterogeneous form. However, I would note that Cumming tends to discuss these genres as opposed pairs, pitting a univocal against a multivocal, or closed versus open, form (emblem versus fragment, for example, or allegory versus phantasmagory). Cumming suggests that multivocality undermines univocality, whereas I find that the desire for univocality and closure persists in tension with multivocality.

26. The shift in Homeric criticism paralleled the shift from Percy’s minstrel theory to Ritson’s “productions of obscure or anonymous authors” (Hustvedt, 265). These two areas of study come together with biblical criticism in Herder’s comparison of Homer, early Hebrew poets, and German folk songs (Myres, 75, 81).

27. The phrase “songs and rhapsodies” was used to describe the Iliad by Richard Bentley in 1713 and became a commonplace in later Homeric studies (cited in Myres, 49; see also Dale, Victorian Critic, 81–82, esp. n. 36). Henry Hart Milman, citing Henry Nelson Coleridge’s comparison between the Robin
Hood legends and the Homeric poems, complained that Homer's epics were being turned into a "minstrelsy of the Grecian border" (124-25). Carlyle read Ritson's *Fairy Tales* and *Ancient Songs and Ballads* in 1831 (*TNB*, 213).

28. As Turner notes, Carlyle was an exception among early Victorians in his acceptance of Wolf's hypothesis. Carlyle may have accepted it in part because Goethe had hailed it (see Myres, 86; Grafton et al., 27).

29. Wolf's *Prolegomena to Homer* (1795) accordingly was largely modeled on Eichhorn's analysis of the Bible (Grafton et al., 18-26). Carlyle himself frequently compared Homer to the Bible (e.g., *TNB*, 188; *CME*, 3:176; *CL*, 7:135, 138).

30. This conception of epic as a totalizing worldview—"how the World and Nature painted themselves to the mind in those old ages"—appears early in Carlyle's writings (*CME*, 1:351; see 3:161; *TNB*, 187). It also was something of a commonplace (Turner, 136; Myres, 63).

31. We see here the term "epic" taking over the role played by "myth" in Carlyle's earlier writings. In 1828, he had written that the Faust legend was a "Christian mythus," an "embodiment of a highly remarkable belief," which in this sense "may still be considered true," and, of course, he had used the term "Mythus" in *Sartor Resartus* to denote a cultural belief (CME, 1:154-55). Epic takes the place of myth, enabling Carlyle to emphasize a text's factual and historical basis rather than its transcendental and imaginative qualities.

32. A letter to his brother, for example, distinguishes Gibbon's *Decline and Fall* from "general literature" (*CL*, 2:467-68).

33. Carlyle accepted Wolf's hypothesis that Homer could not write (see *HL*, 17). He also associated the invention of writing, especially of printing, with the onset of the modern era (see *SR*, 40, 246; *HGL*, 5).

34. Still one of the best discussions of Carlyle's use of history, especially its antihistorical strain, is René Wellek's "Carlyle and the Philosophy of History." On Carlyle as historian and historical writer, see J. Rosenberg; Dale, Victorian Critic; Jann, chap. 2; and Culler, chap. 3. Dale's discussion, like Wellek's, emphasizes the caution with which one must discuss Carlyle's historicism (7-8, 55-58).

35. While, as Carlyle quickly saw, Mill had been influenced by the St. Simonians, Carlyle traced this cyclical model of history to the Germans. Indeed, he wrote to the St. Simonian Gustave d'Eichthal that the idea that revelation may be found in the "acted History of Man" is the "Religion of all Thinkers ... for the last half century: of Goethe ... Schiller, of Lessing, Jacobi, Herder" (*CL*, 5:278-79). On the origins of this concept in Carlyle's writings, see Wellek, "Carlyle and the Philosophy of History," and Shine, *Carlyle and the Saint-Simonians*.

36. On the pervasive desire to escape history in Victorian culture, see Welsh, chap. 13. Carlyle's use of tripartite structures in *Sartor Resartus*, *The
French Revolution, Past and Present, and elsewhere is also related to this tripartite historical model. The cyclical pattern of creation and destruction is most fully elaborated in the (organic) image of the phoenix that is reborn from its own ashes and in the organic cycle of growth and decay (SR, 244; see 40, 47, 56, 122, 177, 200, 216, 244).

37. He began it by February 16, 1832, a month after his father's death (CL, 6:124). In the reminiscence, he had compared his father to Samuel Johnson, and later in life he noted that his feelings about his father were "traceable" in the essay on Johnson (Rem., 7; CL, 6:105).

38. The letters mention only the first four books, but Clubbe reasonably suggests that Carlyle read as far as book 6 ("Carlyle as Epic Historian," 126). The commentaries mentioned here are the ones he requested in a letter to Henry Inglis (CL, 7:92, 137–38; see 132). He may have read others from his own library or from other sources. It is certain, for example, that he had read Wolf by the time he lectured on the history of literature in 1838, for he refers to him there, and it seems most likely that he read him in 1834 during his period of concentrated Homer study (HL, 16–19).

39. It is worth recalling that in "Illudo Chartis" Stephen Corry's father decides to send him to the University of Edinburgh "in the ever memorable year of 1795," an event that the narrator compares to "a second birth" (King, 167).

40. Holloway briefly discusses Carlyle's "dramatization of discussion" through the use of fictional personae in Sartor Resartus, Past and Present, the introduction to Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches, and Latter-Day Pamphlets, but he does not connect it to the dramatization of discussions by historical personae in The French Revolution (27).

41. This mode of historical narrative is so prevalent that Emile Benveniste designates it simply histoire (208–9; see White, intro.). Conventional historians have long objected to Carlyle's historical style. Recently, for example, Hugh Trevor-Roper complained of the "over-dramatization . . . highly personal judgments . . . rhetorical interruptions . . . [and] grotesque egotism" of Carlyle's histories (732).

42. I cite the edition of 1839, but this volume appeared in 1833. I choose Alison because his history represents contemporary practice and Carlyle had some acquaintance with it (see CL, 6:373).

43. C. F. Harrold has estimated that such commentaries constitute nearly a third of The French Revolution ("Carlyle's General Method," 1150).

44. One effect of this practice is Carlyle's even-handed sympathy for virtually every historical figure in spite of his personal judgments of them. Although he admires Mirabeau and Danton more than Robespierre and Louis XVI, he endeavors to see why they acted in the way they did and how historical circumstances shaped them (e.g., 3:106–7, 285–86). See especially the deaths of Mirabeau, Marat, Marie Antoinette, Philippe d'Orléans, and Mme. Roland (2:146, 3:169–70, 194–95, 207–11).
45. For further discussion of the antinarrative quality of *The French Revolution*, see Caserio, 30–43; Leicester, 8; J. Rosenberg, 58ff.; Vanden Bossche, "Prophetic Closure," 212.

46. Carlyle’s error about the distance to Varennes, the topic of much controversy among historians, is discussed in Ben-Israel, 142–43 (see also J. Rosenberg, 71). The point here is that Carlyle’s error reveals only that he was more concerned with the symbolic import of the event—that the inability of the monarchy to move swiftly in flight indicated its inability to govern—rather than literal facts.

47. Carlyle’s use of mock epic has been previously noted by La Valley (139–52, 146, 159) and J. Rosenberg (64–66). Both Rosenberg and La Valley provide an important corrective to those who do not take the mock-epic element into account in their discussions of Carlyle’s use of epic form, but I think Rosenberg is mistaken when he argues that Carlyle is "boast[ing]" that "speech is more useful than song" (52–53). As the theme of speech in *The French Revolution* makes clear, Carlyle “speaks” only because singing has become impossible (see also La Valley, 147). Cumming, in turn, by deemphasizing epic devices and concentrating on Carlyle’s reshaping of epic, provides a corrective to Rosenberg and La Valley.

48. Once again, Carlyle echoes Burke, who had written “let them not break prison to burst like a Levanter, to sweep the earth with their hurricane and to break up the fountains of the great deep to overwhelm us” (*Reflections*, 66–67). Unlike Carlyle, however, Burke does not equate the building of the state with the Bastille, nor does he regard it as having become a prison.

49. On the importance of the metaphor of fire in the works preceding *The French Revolution*, see Cabau, 12ff., and passim.

50. Note that the earliest meaning of the word *fabric* is an edifice or building, yet *fabric* also evokes Carlyle’s clothing metaphor and its connotations of an organic network of human relations (see also *Reflections*, 24).

51. Carlyle’s analysis deviates from Burke’s, however. Burke refers repeatedly to the *assignat*, the paper money issued by the revolutionary government, as a sign of its moral bankruptcy (*Reflections*, 44, 60, 62, 273–75). Carlyle also treats the *assignat* as an example of the insubstantiality of the acts of the revolutionary government, but he regards the problem of producing worthless banknotes as the product of the old regime that bankrupted the government and was the first to substitute paper for gold, a point that Burke glosses over in his analysis (*FR*, 2:8).

52. Allusions to Babel appear throughout the history: e.g., a “confusion of tongues” (1:41); a “jargon as of Babel” (1:100); “as many dialects as when the first great Babel was to be built” (2:27).

53. Carlyle here follows Burke (and Coleridge, who states the case more obliquely) in arguing that it is virtually impossible to base a constitution on abstract political principles (*Reflections*, 35–38 et al.).
54. The difference between Carlyle and Goethe can be discerned in Carlyle's essay on "Goethe's Works" (1832), written about a year after he completed *Sartor Resartus*. In this essay, Carlyle adapts the three phases of religion of *Wilhelm Meister* and the three stages in Teufelsdröckh's conversion to describe Goethe's own career. The three phases in *Wilhelm Meister* are the Ethnic, the Philosophical, and the Christian (*WM*, 2:267). In Carlyle's narrative of Goethe's life, the first phase, the period dominated by the "pestilential fever of Scepticism" manifested in *Werter*, precedes the three phases of religion and corresponds to Teufelsdröckh's Everlasting No. The third phase, in which Goethe rises from the "ashes" of "Denial" into "Reverence" and the "deep all-pervading Faith" of *Wilhelm Meister's Travels*, corresponds to the Christian phase of religion and Teufelsdröckh's Everlasting Yea (*CME*, 2:431–32). To describe the intervening period, which clearly corresponds to the Centre of Indifference, Carlyle combines the first two phases of religion, the Pagan and Ethnic. Whereas the phases described in *Wilhelm Meister* are progressive stages of religious development, Carlyle disregards this when he combines the first two, presumably as erroneous delusions, in favor of the last. Similarly, his Teufelsdröckh does not really progress from No to Centre to Yea, but suddenly discovers the Everlasting Yea. This is how Carlyle dealt with the problem of closure raised by Wotton Reinfred. There, closure was premature, Wotton almost immediately discovering the House in the Wold, the Eden of German transcendentalism, rather than reaching it through progressive self-understanding. In *Sartor Resartus*, all apparent moments of closure prior to the Everlasting Yea turn out to be illusions. The House in the Wold of *Wotton Reinfred* becomes the Waldschloss (castle in the wood) where Teufelsdröckh falls in love with Blumine and believes he has discovered, or returned to, Eden. Teufelsdröckh himself undermines this moment of closure, by describing his vision of paradise ironically as a mere "Calenture... whereby the Youth saw green Paradise-groves in the waste Ocean-waters" (147–48).

55. Teufelsdröckh concludes with the maxim often repeated in *Sartor Resartus*: "Doubt of any sort cannot be removed except by Action" (196). Closely related is his transformation of "Know thyself" into "Know what thou canst work at" (163). In "Characteristics," Carlyle laments that "Opinion and Action" have been "disunited," and longs for the time when the "former could still produce the latter" (*CME*, 3:15).

56. Closely related is the association between speculation, wandering, and illness that Carlyle had already established in *The Life of Schiller* (see 105). In "Characteristics," Carlyle's dyspepsia becomes the "dyspepsia of Society," and he seeks to recover the period of life before pain makes us aware of our bodies, the idyllic childhood when "the body had not yet become the prison-house of the soul" (*CME*, 3:20, 2). On Carlyle's dyspepsia, see Kaplan, 59, 63–64, 87, 120.
57. This last passage draws almost word for word on one of Carlyle's descriptions of Coleridge (CL, 3:90–91; see 6:233, 261). Before he had met him, Carlyle had already put him down as “mystical,” placing him in the same category as Fox and Böhme (CL, 2:468). His famous description of Coleridge in *The Life of John Sterling* draws heavily on the reports in these letters (LJS, 52–62).

58. The aristocracy, Carlyle writes, has “nearly ceased either to guide or misguide” (1:12). On Louis's incapacity for action and decision, see 2:137, 180, 223–24, 264, 286.

59. For a cogent summary of these problems, see Brantlinger, 67, 76–77. Brantlinger also argues, as I do below, that the revolution is endless, because the political process provides no solutions to the social problems that produced it (chap. 3, passim).

60. Carlyle borrowed the speech from his essay “The Diamond Necklace” (see Leicester, 15–17).

Chapter 4

1. The first in English, that is; I except the German translation of *The Life of Schiller* that appeared with Carlyle's name in 1830.

2. My argument finds support in Patrick Brantlinger's assertion that Carlyle dispassionately criticizes all parties in *The French Revolution* and that he identifies the French aristocracy, Girondins, and Jacobins with the English Tories, Whigs, and Radicals (chap. 3 passim). My argument is that, in spite of his distrust of partisan politics, Carlyle at this point hoped to intervene in them to forward his own proposals for reform.

3. The tensions between Carlyle and the radicals are evident in Mill's maneuvers after he received Carlyle's first contribution, “Mirabeau,” in which Carlyle had sought controversy by criticizing Etienne Dumont, a French follower of Bentham. Mill made deletions and added a note advising readers that the author's opinion did not reflect that of the editors. Carlyle objected to the deletions and restored the passages when the essay was published in his collected essays. Carlyle contributed to the *London and Westminster* for only a short period, in 1837–38, when he was still in need of the income that review articles brought. By the time he became serious about the Chartism project in 1839, it appeared that the *London and Westminster* was about to fold. When Mill offered to publish “Chartism” there as a “final shout,” he decided that “the thing [was] too good for that purpose” and turned down the offer (CL, 11:221; see 19, 45, 206).

4. Carlyle wrote to Lockhart on May 20, when the bed chamber crisis of May 7–13, 1839, seemed certain to bring in a Tory ministry, but the crisis was resolved and the Whigs stayed in power until 1841. In discussing Carlyle's
relationship to the political parties and their literary vehicles I do not intend to exclude Fraser's Magazine, a Tory journal in which Carlyle published more frequently than anywhere else. But Carlyle never considered it a vehicle for his social criticism because, unlike the major reviews which examined books from the perspective of party ideology, Fraser's was a literary magazine, more committed to jeux d'esprit than party politics (see D. Roberts, 79; Houghton, Wellesley Index, 2:303ff.).

5. See also Morgan (Seigel, 28) and the review "Chartism" in the Monthly Chronicle (101–2). Carlyle's desire to be accounted a Tory may have shaped his reading of the Morning Chronicle (December 31, 1839) review which asserts, more equivocally than Carlyle's letter implies, that he is "no friend to the present Ministry, or to either the Whig or the Radical section of the Liberal party" but also insists that his views are opposed to the Tory line of the Quarterly Review. The Spectator lavished praise on Chartism and quoted several passages from it ("Topics of the Day," 9–11).

6. This is an inference from Carlyle's reply; Mill's letter is lost. Carlyle's critique dates from the passage of the New Poor Law in 1834, when he complained that the law assumed "that the condition of the Poor people is—improving! . . . 'Well gentlemen,' I answered once, 'the Poor I think will get up some day, and tell you how improved their condition is'" (CL, 8:117).

7. See Tait's Edinburgh Review in Seigel, Critical Heritage, 166–67; Lady Sydney Morgan, 27; "Chartism," Monthly Chronicle, 98, 104; and Herman Merivale in Seigel, Critical Heritage, 280. Several reviewers were quick to point out that the emigration proposal was not new. Both proposals were part of his program to radicalize the Tory party, since one faction of the radical party did support emigration and it was the Tory party, as he argued in Chartism, that was holding up the establishing of a national system of education.

8. The first two lecture series, on the histories of German literature and European literature, looked to his past as a literary critic, which by this time was nearly over (the essays on Walter Scott and Varnhargen von Ense published in 1838 were to be his last written on literary figures). The third series, on modern revolutions, also drew heavily on his previous writings and researches. As the Times reported, "the reader of Mr. Carlyle's works will have seen these sentiments many times before" ("Mr. Carlyle's Lectures," 5). To a certain extent, of course, On Heroes and Hero-Worship also drew upon previous work. When he finished the third lecture, he wrote that the lectures were not "a new story" to him, but that the "world seemed greatly astonished at it" (CL, 12:192).

9. Carlyle had decided on the topic of heroes by February (CL, 12:58, 64). Since his plan to give six lectures remained consistent throughout, it would seem to indicate that the alteration of his plan did not mean adding a lecture but simply reversing the order of the last two. This may explain the chrono-
logical anomaly of his returning to Cromwell and the seventeenth century in
the final lecture, following the lecture on eighteenth- and nineteenth-century
men of letters.

10. On the general notion of the Carlylean hero, see Lehman; Grierson;
DeLaura; P. Rosenberg, 188–203; and LaValley, 236–52.

11. Martin Bidney has demonstrated that the successive heroes are “dimin­
ishing” reincarnations of the first hero, Odin. LaValley rightly argues that the
man of letters is the weakest of the heroes, but mistakenly assumes that the
form of On Heroes was meant to be linear and progressive (250–51; see also
Donovan).

12. If Lehman is correct that Fichte’s man of letters—as a man who mani­
fests the divine in history—underlies Carlyle’s conception of the hero (75
et al.), then there is a special irony in this lecture, for in it Carlyle transfers
the authority originally conceived as the privileged realm of the poet to the
divinity / king and portrays the man of letters as incapable of achieving it. In
this sense, Lehman’s argument that the hero theory was complete by 1832
must be modified (88).

13. Not only had Carlyle published several essays on Goethe, but he had
also concluded his first two series of lectures with Goethe. Since it is safe to
assume that many members of his audience had attended the earlier lectures,
it seems all the more surprising that he would imply that they knew Rousseau,
Odin, or Mahomet better than Goethe.

14. Donovan notes that DeLaura inconsistently makes “Hero as Man of
Letters” rather than “Hero as King” the climax of On Heroes and Hero-Worship
(Donovan, n. 18; DeLaura, 719; see also Bidney, 60).

15. In 1833, when Carlyle was still deciding whether or not to write on the
French Revolution, he regarded Knox rather than Cromwell as the kind of
reformer that England needed (CL, 6:303; see 260–61). But by 1840, when
he lectured on heroes, Knox had been replaced by Cromwell, and Knox was
treated only briefly in the “Hero as Priest.”

16. We know the earlier lectures only from newspaper reports, but these
reports make clear that Carlyle was already attempting to rebut the prevailing
view of Cromwell. Although it approved of most of the lectures, the Examiner
censured the discussion of Cromwell in terms that suggest Carlyle was trying
to rehabilitate his reputation (“The Lectures of Mr. Carlyle,” 294).

portions of this manuscript have been published in “A Preface by Carlyle” in
Fielding and Tarr, which I will cite when appropriate.

18. Similar statements may be found throughout his manuscripts and let­
ters. One is a “conservative,” he wrote, “who brings back the Past vitally visible
into the Present living Time” (Fielding and Tarr, 18). His struggles to find a
proper form for his history persistently emphasize that he is striving to write
more than history, that "the epic of the Present is the thing always to write; the epic of the Present not of the past and dead" (Fielding and Tarr, 16). He frequently portrays his inability to make progress on Cromwell as a failure to make the past live: "By Heaven's blessing, we belong not to the 17 centy; we are alive here, and have the honour of belonging to the nineteenth!" (Forster, fol. 52; see also fol. 54). He also wrote in January 1840 that he had been reading about Cromwell, but he did "not see how the subject can be presented still alive. A subject dead is not worth presenting" (CL, 12:16).

19. His complaints that a book on Cromwell was "impossible," which began in mid-1842, have an especially despairing resonance, since in Chartism he had derided the utilitarians for deeming social reform "impossible" (an admonition he would repeat in Past and Present). Carlyle always complained about the difficulty of writing, but his complaints about Cromwell in his letters and journals were unusually frequent (e.g., LL, 1:215, 238–39, 300, 339; CL, 13:129, 263, 14:199, 204, 210–11, 214, 239; NL, 1:302, 304). The Forster manuscripts are also sprinkled with expressions of frustration about his inability to "get begun" (see fols. 23, 52, 53 v., 60 v., 61, 65, 66 v., 69, 87, 92 v., 93, 94, 97, 98, 98 v., 99, 102, 104, 111 v., 112 v., 170 v.).

20. At one point in the Forster manuscripts following a passage that he apparently felt failed to revive the past, he admonishes himself: "But in fact thou shalt know what is dead and not seek to revive it, but leave the dead to bury their dead" (fol. 65).

21. D. J. Trella has argued, against Kaplan, J. Rosenberg, and LaValley, that Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches was not a "failure" (Cromwell in Context, 5 et al.). But, as Kaplan demonstrates, Carlyle himself regarded the project as a failure, at the very least because he had originally intended to write a history or biography but had to settle for an edition of historical papers (310).

22. Forster, fol. 93, begins: "Gazing with inexpressible trembling curiosity into those old magic tombs of our Fathers [ . . . ] I can see a city in considerable emotion." The verses, written in Scots dialect, are transcribed in Tarr and McClelland (63–64; see also 65). The dramatic scenario is discussed below. In addition to the list of "Moments" in the Forster manuscript, the Historical Sketches contains a page labeled "Moments, again" that outlines the book as a series of "scenes" (fol. 206).

23. The manuscript is published in Fielding, "Unpublished Manuscripts—II." I will cite page numbers from this text. Although the scenario is dramatic, Carlyle does not abandon his epic intention. In the introductory notes, he discusses biography as "epic," and the twelve acts suggest the model of classical epic in twelve books. In another passage in the manuscripts, Carlyle tries to create some drama by imagining a dialogue between Cromwell and his doctor (Forster, fol. 101).

24. Although he considered it only a short-term measure, he had become
a firm supporter of repeal (see CL, 13:143, 216, 14:225). At this point, he was torn between hoping for a Whig majority sufficient to repeal the Corn Laws and a Tory leader willing to do so. His faith in the Tories was slight enough that he could still hope for the election of his Whig friend Edward John Stanley in the 1842 elections (CL, 13:181–82, 186). In letters to his Tory friend Richard Monckton Milnes, he chastised the Tories for supporting the Corn Laws and predicted that Peel would surprise everyone by supporting repeal (CL, 13:152, 194, 311).

25. The circumstantial evidence seems conclusive. The Manchester Insurrection was a seminal topic of Past and Present, the subject of the opening chapters and the title of book 1, chapter 3. The letters to Jane Carlyle link his new writing with the Manchester Insurrection, and at this time he was having difficulty writing on Cromwell. Nine days after writing to Jane, he hinted to Emerson that he was working on a book other than the one on Cromwell (RWE, 328). Carlyle’s comment, in the letter to Jane, that he does not know what he is working at, is to the point; he knew he was not working on Cromwell, and only later would this new writing take shape as Past and Present. See Kaplan, 293, 579, n. 62.

26. The details of this episode have been discussed elsewhere. See Richard Altick’s introduction to Past and Present, xii–xiii et al.; Kaplan, 294–95; LL, 1:296–308.

27. Carlyle was attacking the Whigs, much to Sewell’s satisfaction, but his views were hardly orthodox enough to satisfy the Anglican divine, who began his review by asserting that Carlyle’s works “contain many grave errors: they exhibit vagueness, and misconception, and apparently total ignorance in points of the utmost importance.” Although Sewell found Carlyle’s criticism of society “forcible, acute, true, and in many respects wise,” he complained that Carlyle wanted to discard old institutions instead of revitalizing them (446, 461).

28. For the passage Carlyle refers to, see Seigel, Critical Heritage, 81–82. Although Merivale was explicitly reviewing The French Revolution, his review may well have been prompted by Chartism and the political infighting among the parties it prompted. After Sewell’s review appeared in September, for example, several newspapers commented on it, each taking up the cry of one or the other party (see CL, 12:284, n. 3). The evidence for the influence of Chartism is that Merivale reviewed the second edition of The French Revolution that appeared some three years after the history was first published yet just some six months after Chartism had attacked the Whig government. Although the review does not explicitly mention Chartism, it specifically alludes to Carlyle’s proposals for emigration and education (Seigel, Critical Heritage, 82). Carlyle saw it as a Whig response, readily believing early reports that its author was Macaulay (then a member of the Whig cabinet).
29. The Quaker appears in Past and Present as "Friend Prudence" (276). Carlyle's letter of February 1, 1843, to Marshall, written as he was completing Past and Present and advising Marshall to "be a real king, and guide, and just Law-ward (antique for 'Lord') or Preserver of God's Law among your people," continues to focus on the need for a "real Aristocracy, in place of a false imaginary Aristocracy" (Hilles Box 25, Beinecke Library, New Haven, 2–3).

30. Later that year he read a history of the Carlyle family and bemusedly suggested that he might have been a duke (CL, 14:174).

31. These are joined by an astonishing number of speakers represented as more generalized figures: personifications—working Mammonism, Unworking Dilettantism, Enlightened Philosophies, Captains of Industry, Humanity of England, Millocracy; typical individuals—the idle reader of newspapers, the parents who killed their child in the Stockport cellar, the pope, the king, a royal subject, a man in a horsehair wig, he of the shovel-hat, a drill sergeant, a Hapless Fraction, an Industrial Law-ward, and the Irish widow; typical groups—the poor at St. Ives, millions of workers, interrogative philosophers, the moneyed class, the English, the Community, aristocrats, "vested interests," Spinners, future men, Lancashire Weavers, Upholsterers and French Cooks, Transcendental friends, Socinian Preachers; historical groups and individuals—the workers massacred at Peterloo, the French at the Bar of the Convention, William the Norman bastard, Howel Davies the buccaneer, King Redbeard; and institutions—Parliament, the Legislature, and the Anti-Slavery Convention.

32. Landow discusses the prophetic aspects of the two introductory paragraphs but does not note the differences discussed here (Elegant Jeremiah, 41–43).

33. As in his representation of the French nation in The French Revolution, he portrays the working class as inarticulate, requiring a leader to voice their needs; he thus subsumes these voices to his own in the debate with his nonworking-class audience. Unable to imagine anything but a hierarchical social order, Carlyle dismisses all thought of the working class fending for itself. Although the title of Chartism seems to indicate that it is about the working-class social movement, Carlyle sees Chartism only as a sign of the times—a symptom, not a solution. Because workers are isolated from one another by laissez-faire economy—"each [is] unknown to his neighbour," he had argued in Chartism—they are not able to "take a resolution, and act on it, very readily" (CME, 4:201).

34. Although the "past" of Past and Present refers to the twelfth century, the title of one chapter, "Two Centuries," refers us to the seventeenth, and the present is measured as often against Cromwell's era as against Samson's (see 24–25, 221–23, 251–52, 257, 265). Furthermore, it is the settlement of 1660,
rather than the Reformation, that opens up the gulf between the lost paradise of the past and present-day chaos (167).

35. Although Philip Rosenberg provides one of the most cogent analyses of the limitations of Carlyle's social critiques, I think he is mistaken to suggest that Carlyle might somehow have produced a critique like Marx's (e.g., 166–67). The alternative that Rosenberg wishes Carlyle had discovered was precluded by Carlyle's refusal of a rigorous historicism and his insistence on the necessity for transcendental authority.

36. Carlyle's interest in land reclamation preceded his interest in emigration. In 1829, he had written in his notebook that the political economists had erred in their comparison of manufacture to improving wastelands: "the improved land remains an addition to the Earth forever" (TNB, 143). In the 1830s, his concerns for the laboring population led him to favor emigration as a solution, and it may, in fact, have been his effort to describe the situation of Scottish peasants driven to emigration by hardhearted landlords that led him to write Chartism (CL, 11:203–4). Although he had counseled against emigration in the 1820s, by the early 1830s he was talking about emigrating himself and eventually did help his brother Alexander emigrate to Canada (CL, 1:156, 2:30, 54, 84, 6:355–56, 353, 360, 386, 8:146, 9:162–64). Carlyle preferred government-supported to individual emigration, because the schemes for the former offered the opportunity for a heroic leader to create a new society. In 1835, he grew so enthusiastic about the man he thought was to lead a colony in South Australia that he said he wanted to go himself when he had finished writing The French Revolution (CL, 8:10–11). Emigration was also one area where Carlyle still agreed with his friends among the philosophic radicals. Both the Mills and Charles Buller were among a faction of the radicals that supported Edward Gibbon Wakefield's plan for government-sponsored emigration and colonization, although they supported it on the principle that it would produce ordered colonies rather than that it would reduce the supply of labor in England (Shepperson, 15–19; see Carrothers, 91–93). On Carlyle's personal interest in emigrating, see CL, 12:202, and Fielding, "Carlyle Considers New Zealand."

37. One problem that arises in Latter-Day Pamphlets is that Carlyle's reliance on the commercially minded middle class ends up justifying the very commercial spirit he had condemned in Past and Present, but this contradiction emerges already in the earlier text when he praises the colonizers for turning the "desert-shrubs of the Tropical swamps" into "Cotton-trees" (PP, 170).

38. Jeremiah, 6:14, 8:11. It is cited in the context of criticism of political economy by Coleridge (Lay Sermons, 141) and Carlyle (PP, 245; see also SR, 232). It is also echoed by the narrator of Tennyson's Maud (part 1, ll. 21–28).

39. Indeed, Carlyle's opinion of literature continued to decline in these years. He persisted in advising against the profession of literature (CL, 14:26)
and in advising poets to write prose (CL, 13:155, 14:22; NL, 1:283; RWE, 353). He even came to feel that German literature, since the death of Goethe, was worthless (CL, 14:3).

40. In the lectures on modern revolutions, Carlyle had depicted the Puritan revolution as the beginning of the era of modern revolutions, although he had also attempted to differentiate it from later revolutions. The dramatic scenario for Cromwell depicts the end of Cromwell's era as holding "France and Revoln in germ," an idea suggested on the last page of the Letters and Speeches as well (Fielding, "Unpublished Manuscripts—II," 10; OCLS, 4:207–8).

41. The dramatic scenario mentions the "various speech" of a group of Scots gathered around Jenny Geddes; groups discussing what the people and nobility think of the trial of Strafford; "troopers' dialogues" about Oliver; and an interchange involving "an astrologer, hunger, steeple, women in the trenches" (Fielding, "Unpublished Manuscripts—II," 8–10).

42. For example, 1:165, 178, 305, 394, 2:148, 179, 243, 260, 3:196, 4:77. On occasion, he also uses the first-person technique to represent Parliament, the political instrument of the Puritans (e.g., 1:256, 4:17). There are, of course, a very few exceptions (e.g., 1:120–22, 2:208, 246). In the latter half of the text, where the speeches dominate, the technique is hardly used at all.

43. The typographical conventions discussed here are those of the first, and as far as I can determine, all subsequent editions until the Centenary Edition, which breaks with the previous practice. The Centenary prints the narrative in the same size type as the letters and puts the letters in italics. The conventions for printing the speeches are unchanged.

44. Conventional modern historians, of course, consider these interpolations "Carlyle's greatest fault as an editor" rather than a means of enlivening historical documents (Frith, I:xxxviii).

45. The major manuscript versions of the episode are the passage in the Historical Sketches manuscript (HS, 299–310), the Forster manuscript (fol. 105), and the dramatic scenario (in which the Geddes anecdote is the most detailed episode). The latter concludes with the remark, "Could nothing be made of this?" (Fielding, "Unpublished Manuscripts—II," 9).

46. Carlyle's care in establishing the date manifests how seriously he pursued the subject. His letter of 1839 is already seeking information about the historical basis of the anecdote. He again sought information in 1840 and 1841, at which time David Laing informed him that Jenny Geddes was probably not historical (CL, 12:300, 13:74–78; see esp. 75–76, n. 7). Carlyle traced the appearance of the Geddes myth to the successive editions of Richard Baker's Chronicle of the Kings of England. In his copy of the Chronicle, now at the Carlyle House, Chelsea, he has noted in the margin alongside the passage on Gaddis: "This is not in the Edit" of 1665 (the 4th), and it is as here in the 6th of 1674: the 5th I have not seen, nor yet ascertained the year of" (458). In the Letters
and Speeches, he remarks that the passage makes its first appearance in the fifth edition of 1670 and that it had been anticipated by a pamphlet of 1661 (1:96–97, n. 3).

47. “The Nigger Question” is the title of the 1853 and all subsequent versions of Carlyle’s essay, originally published in 1849 as “The Negro Question.” Whenever possible, I will specify the version to which I am referring by the appropriate title. “Negro/Nigger Question” will refer nonspecifically to both editions.

48. Carlyle complained on several occasions about the slowness with which Parliament acted once it finally committed itself to repeal (Marrs, 629, 631, 634–35). Furthermore, he regarded repeal of the Corn Laws—which he thought more likely to benefit the middle class than the poor—only the first act toward major reform (RWE, 391).

49. Carlyle was at first inclined to treat the Irish Question, like the English one, as a problem of an irresponsible aristocracy, and, as late as 1848, he was satirizing the “Rakes of Mallow” (i.e., the Irish aristocracy) for presuming that ownership of a piece of “sheepskin” gave them a right to turn “the hard-won potato they [i.e., Irish peasants] have earned in hard travail from the bosom of their mother Earth” into “claret and champagne, into horse-furniture, house furniture, incidental expenses and the delicacies of the season” for their own pleasure (“Rakes of Mallow,” MS 1213, Beinecke Library, New Haven, fol. 1 v.; see 2 v.). Dating of the manuscript is difficult, since it is a transcription of various notes prepared by his secretary, Joseph Neuberg, when he began writing Latter-Day Pamphlets. Although internal evidence dates parts of the manuscript to 1848, other portions could have been written as early as 1846.

50. Letter to John Grey, April 17, 1847, Hilles box 24, Beinecke Library, New Haven f. 2 v.

51. The following discussion seeks to add further evidence to the persuasive case made by Kaplan that Carlyle began by intending to write about Ireland (341). In addition to the argument put forward here, there is further evidence of Carlyle’s preparation to write such a book in the reading he did in anticipation of the 1849 journey to Ireland. This reading included Jocelyn’s and the Bollandists’ lives of Saint Patrick as well as the saint’s own Confessio (Duffy, 136–39; Allingham, Diary, 129–30, 137). Carlyle’s brief manuscript on the Bollandists’ Acta Sanctorum, however, does not deal with Saint Patrick or Ireland (Bowdoin, 1878, Brunswick, Me.). His further reading is indicated by material in his library at the Carlyle House, Chelsea, which includes James Fraser’s Hand Book for Travellers in Ireland and a collection of tracts by Jasper W. Rogers, including Facts for the Kind-Hearted of England! as to the Wretchedness of the Irish Peasantry, and the Means for Their Regeneration. The “Rakes of Mallow” manuscript, which focuses on the vicissitudes of laissez-faire (see above, n. 49), provides the only other indication of where his writings on Ireland were tend-
ing. A related manuscript is “Leave It Alone; Time Will Mend It,” which uses the same language concerning laissez-faire as the “Rakes” manuscript (see Kaplan, 352; “Rakes,” fols. 12—14).


53. In addition to the two articles mentioned above, Carlyle published “Legislation for Ireland” and “Irish Regiments of the New Era” in the Examiner and Spectator, respectively, on May 13, 1848; both are reprinted in Shepherd.

54. In an unpublished manuscript, Carlyle defended the argument that it was the “destiny” of England to rule Ireland while insisting that he did not mean to say that England was superior to Ireland (Harnick, 31). In a passage not published by Harnick (it is written on a small sheet that accompanies the manuscript), his metaphor of the body politic, suggesting that England as the head must not cut off its legs simply because it cannot clothe them properly, implies a natural subordination of Ireland to England (“The English Talent for Governing,” Beinecke Library, New Haven).

55. By this time, he felt that religion had been degraded into sentimentality (LL, 2:20, and “Model Prisons”) and literature had become “Phallus-Worship” (Kaplan, 332—33, and “Phallus-Worship,” 22).

56. On May 11—he was at work on the sixth pamphlet in late April and finished the seventh by the end of May—he wrote to his mother that he might stop at eight or ten pamphlets, and he did not make the decision to stop at eight until June 27 (Kaplan, 354). Carlyle always seems to have the epic model before him and, as Seigel points out, the Aeneid and Paradise Lost have twelve books (“Latter-Day Pamphlets,” 159, 162—63).

57. Elsewhere he wrote that he did not have “the slightest thought of quitting” until he had “fired twelve cannon-salvoes (red-hot balls occasionally) thro' the infinite Dung heap which the English Universe seem[ed] to [him] to consist of at present” (Gray, 285).

58. All the elements of the framing device were added in 1853 except for Carlyle’s introduction describing the setting and one description of indignant auditors leaving the room (CME, 4:354). The seven additions of 1853 dramatize the progressive audience reaction. At first there are mere shows of emotion (351, 354), then the first departures (354, 357). After this point, those still present become increasingly enthusiastic, “increase” their attention (357), laugh at the speaker’s humor (359, 383), become silent (367), and, finally, “assent” (379). Both August and Levine comment on the artistry of the frame and how it invites the reader to identify with the represented audience. What
I would stress is that the strategy is intended to test the audience, to drive away nonbelievers rather than make us into believers. Note that, apart from August's introduction and notes, I do not cite his edition (see note on texts).

59. Michael Goldberg notes that this seems hyperbolic in light of the fact that Carlyle was published, as he admits in the same letter, that year in the *Spectator* and the *Examiner*. However, Carlyle is probably making reference to the fact that the article was cut by Forster, and he was forced to divide it between newspapers because of editorial objections to length and content ("Prospects of the French Republic," 22).

60. Carlyle blamed Russell for failing to deal with the principal problem facing England, the Irish Question (see Spedding, 755). During his journey to Ireland in 1849, he kept his distance from Russell's government by traveling in the company of the nationalist Gavan Duffy and turning down an invitation from Lord Clarendon, the chief British administrator in Ireland (see Kaplan, 342; *RIJ*, 49).

61. Carlyle's attacks on sentimental opposition to capital punishment in the *Pamphlets* may also be traced to this discussion of the massacres (see *OCLS*, 2:51–52; *LDP*, 73–79). Elsewhere he suggests that the good governor will lay on the "whip" (*RIJ*, 74; *CME*, 4:376).

62. The evolution of Carlyle's conception of the industrial regiments stretches back to the discussion of work in *Past and Present*. In 1844, he compared his labor in writing *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* to the labor of the "170,000 men [who] had to die . . . draining the Neva Bog" in order to build St. Petersburg (Faulkner, 158). He first proposed that unemployed Irish be organized in regiments to drain the Bog of Allen and perform other public works projects that would make the land fertile in his 1848 article, "Irish Regiments of the New Era." Later that year, he read and inquired about a report in the *Times* of just such a project in France (*NL*, 2:61; Spedding, 750–51). During his tour of Ireland, he found most hope in projects that involved draining bogs and improving farming techniques; at one stop, he asked the proprietor of a model farm if he would like to have "2000 labourers already fed and clothed to your hand (such as sit in the Killarney workhouse idle at this moment)?" (*RIJ*, 133; see 53–54, 129–31, 205ff.; Duffy, 431). All of this suggests that Wilson is in error to argue that the idea came from Andrew Fletcher, a seventeenth-century political writer that Carlyle was reading about 1850; if anything, Carlyle was seeking further support for his ideas in Fletcher (Wilson, 4:252–53; see Goldberg and Seigel, *Latter-Day Pamphlets*, 531, n. 63).

63. Although Gallagher does not discuss "The Negro Question," this and the following paragraph are much indebted to her *Industrial Reformation of English Fiction* (chap. 1, esp. 6–21). On Carlyle's specific knowledge of this debate, see Campbell, "Carlyle and the Negro Question Again," and Christianson, "Writing of the 'Occasional Discourse.'"

64. Carlyle continued to use the horse metaphor in the later pamphlets
Notes to Pages 135–137

(see 96–97, 101–2, 152, 237–38, 244). These passages allude directly to the issues of "The Negro Question" by making reference throughout to the colonies and the freed slaves; at one point, for example, Hodge's horse is referred to as "Black Dobbin." In the 1853 "Nigger Question," Carlyle attempted to soften the effect of the analogy by arguing that Farmer Hodge should be compelled by law to "treat his horses justly" (CME, 4:370).

65. Mill anticipates many of the questions discussed here, including the point that slaveowners were motivated by "love of gold" rather than high ideals, and that Carlyle equates the noble task called for by the gods with the production of spices. Mill responds by asking whether the gods judge that "pepper is noble, freedom . . . contemptible" (Essays on Equality, 88, 91).

66. Carlyle was again running counter to a tide of popular sentiment. He must have had in mind the exposés of the sweating garment trade that had recently appeared in the Morning Chronicle, and the plight of seamstresses had been a cause célèbre since Mary Furley, a homeless and desperate seamstress, attempted suicide and inspired Thomas Hood's "Bridge of Sighs" earlier in the decade. Hood's poem had, in turn, inspired numerous popular paintings and prints. The dilemma of the seamstress was the subject of other contemporary social commentary, including Hood's "Song of the Shirt" (1843), Elizabeth Gaskell's Mary Barton (1848), and Richard Redgrave's painting "The Seamstress" (1844, 1846).

67. "The Nigger Question" is, if anything, more racist than "The Negro Question." Not only did Carlyle alter the title from "Negro" to the more offensive "Nigger," but he repeated the idea that "the Black gentleman is born to be a servant," as well as the assertion that blacks and whites were created differently by God and blacks belong at the bottom of the social hierarchy (CME, 4:368, 371, 361). The 1853 version also provided further support for anti-abolitionists by suggesting that slavery could be made just (CME, 4:368–72). For a different point of view, see Tarr, "Emendation as Challenge." Although the Governor Eyre controversy will be discussed below, it is relevant here for the light it sheds on this debate. Gillian Workman has recently argued that Carlyle's "involvement in the Eyre controversy" was not a result of "racist views" and that "Carlyle's language in describing the Negro . . . was surely more a rhetorical device than an expression of racial disgust" (85). In light of Carlyle's overtly racist comments, it is hard to make sense of this distinction. Even if rhetoric can be separated from meaning, which is doubtful, Carlyle's belief in racial inequality is difficult to square with the idea that his writings are merely some kind of Swiftian satire. If he had not harbored racial prejudices, how else could he have responded to the Eyre furor in these words: "Nay (privately very!) if Eyre had shot the whole Nigger population, and flung them into the sea, would it probably have been much harm even to them, not to speak of us?" (Bliss, 388; see also Hall, esp. 177–82).
68. Carlyle’s racial prejudices were not limited to these groups. Already in *Past and Present*, he had portrayed medieval Jewish moneylenders as “insatiable . . . horseleech[es]” and approved of the use of torture to force them to abandon claims for payment of debt (64, 65, 182; see 96). Nor were his prejudices confined to medieval moneylenders. After Disraeli opposed Peel on Corn Law repeal, Carlyle rarely mentioned his name without adding an anti-Semitic slur, depicting him as Judas, the merchant of Venice, and a descendant of the impotent thief; this may have led him, in 1848, to oppose a bill that would allow Jews to sit in Parliament (*LDP*, 171; *NL*, 2:124, 125, 141, 143, 148; *LL*, 1:450–52; see also Gross, 30–31). Carlyle did, of course, befriend educated members of the Irish middle class and denied that he had any anti-Celtic prejudice in *Oliver Cromwell’s Letters and Speeches* (1:407). Yet other evidence suggests a strong prejudice, as does, for example, his tendency to classify the Irish by “types” (*RIJ*, 12, 19).

69. Hepworth Dixon, who may, of course, have read this reply to “The Negro Question” in *Fraser’s*, also noted, in the *Atheneum*, how often Carlyle invoked “‘the Immortal Gods,’ ‘the Immensities,’ ‘the Eternities,’ and such like personages” (126).

70. Asked by a young man from Manchester for advice on pursuing a career in literature, Carlyle replied that if he really intended to do “a man’s work in literature” and not merely entertain, he could not expect to make a living from the career (*LL*, 1:440). In his journal, Carlyle had recently written that he no longer believed in “Art” and now considered it “one of the deadliest cant[s]” (*LL*, 1:453; see also *RWE*, 395).

Chapter 5

1. Although the quotation appears in a passage in which Wilson cites a letter of 1847, the reference to *Pamphlets* suggests a later date, probably 1850. Wilson’s documentation is scanty, and it seems likely that he has run together quotations from two different letters here.

2. See also Wilson, 5:85; Reid, 1:494–95; Shepherd, 2:152; Kaplan, 397; and Fielding, “Carlyle’s Unpublished Comments on the Northcote-Trevelyan Report.”

3. See LaValley, 304, 308. Robert Keith Miller is misled by Carlyle’s preference for prose over poetry into concluding that Carlyle was opposed to Sterling’s choice of literature for a career, but the narrative represents Carlyle, notwithstanding his ambivalence toward literature, pushing Sterling toward that career in preference to the religious vocation (41).

4. Sterling had been attacked in 1848 by the high church *English Review* in an article entitled “On Tendencies towards the Subversion of Faith.” The cause was then taken up by the even more fervent Evangelical paper, *The
Record, which attacked him repeatedly in the spring of 1849. One of his worst offenses was that he “did not scruple to avow that he regard[ed] Carlyle as being a truly inspired Isaiah!” (Tuell, 364).

5. Tuell, 272–80, 292–300, 337–50; Harding, passim. Harding argues that, while Sterling differed with the church on certain questions, he was fundamentally orthodox. Tuell and Harding were not the first to note that Carlyle distorted Sterling’s religious career; it was already recognized by some of his contemporaries. See, for example, the review “Carlyle’s Life of Sterling,” in the Christian Observer.

6. Another instance of Carlyle’s shaping of Sterling’s biography is discussed by Anne Skabarnicki in “Too Hasty Souls.”

7. See the discussion of Coleridge above, chap. 3. Gerald Mulderig demonstrates how Carlyle set Sterling against Coleridge but does not note the similarities between them. My argument is that Carlyle’s literature did not turn out to be any more satisfactory than Coleridge’s religion. Although Sterling was active while Coleridge was inactive, Sterling’s activities had no more practical issue than did Coleridge’s endless talk.

8. Carlyle gave Sterling this advice repeatedly between 1837 and 1842, and he may well have given it both before and after those dates (CL, 10:128–29, 234–35, 12:187, 263, 321, 348, 13:132, 14:22, 23). A good example of his advice to aspiring poets may be found in his exchange of letters with W. C. Bennett. In 1847, Bennett sent Carlyle a sonnet, and Carlyle replied with his customary advice on seeking a better career than literature. When, in 1853, Bennett sent a pamphlet on educational reform, Carlyle replied enthusiastically that it was “much more melodiously ‘poetical’ . . . than the best written verses are” (Shepherd, 2:9, 135).

9. His acquiescence to Browning, after reading Men and Women (1855), is phrased in almost the same way: “I do not at this point any longer forbid you verse, as probably I once did. I perceive it has grown to be your dialect, it comes more naturally than prose. . . . Continue to write in verse, if you find it handler’" (LMSB, 299–300).

10. Other reviews noting the change in tone include Gilfillan, esp. 717; “The Life of John Sterling,” Examiner, esp. 659; “John Sterling and His Biographers,” Dublin University Magazine, esp. 185–86; George Eliot (in Seigel, Critical Heritage, 377); Francis Newman (in Seigel, Critical Heritage, 380); John Tulloch (in Seigel, Critical Heritage, 393). Of course, Carlyle was only half pleased that a book he considered “light” and unimportant received a better reception than his other recent works (Marrs, 685).

11. The North British Quarterly and George Gilfillan in the Eclectic Review charged him with “Nihilism” and “despair” (North British, 245; Gilfillan, 721, 720). Even the Spectator, which had published Carlyle’s articles on Ireland in 1848 and attributed “an attractive charm” to the new book, complained that
he "has no right . . . to weaken or destroy a faith which he cannot or will not replace with a loftier" (Brimley, 1024).

12. Prince Albert had proposed the pension, but Lord Aberdeen turned it down on the grounds of Carlyle's "Heterodoxy" (NL, 2:157). When Carlyle was nominated for the office of rector of the University of Glasgow, the Scottish papers attacked him for denying "that the revealed Word of God is 'the way, the truth, the life'" (Wilson, 5:131; see NL, 2:170–71).

13. This manuscript, written in November 1852, was printed by Froude in EL, 2:8–15. I cite the more accurate transcription of Murray Baumgarten in "Carlyle and 'Spiritual Optics.'" Other manuscripts produced during this period include "On the project of appointing to the civil service by merit alone" (Beinecke Library, New Haven), a manuscript on constitutional government (National Library of Scotland), and another arguing that the aristocracy only survived historically because they "were the beautifullest" (National Library of Scotland; reprinted in Trela, "Carlyle and the Beautiful People"). The letters of the early 1850s also abound with opinions on recent political and cultural events: Irish land reform (Duffy, 450, 454; NL, 2:121–22); education reform (Wilson, 5:19, 24; Shepherd, 2:135); the Great Exhibition of "Wind-ustry" (LMSB, 287; RWE, 468; NL, 1:106; LL, 2:84; Sadler, 286); Napoleon III's coup (Wilson, 5:25; NL, 2:119); changes in the English cabinet (Wilson, 5:25–26; NL, 1:124–25, 141; Sadler, 289); and the Crimean War (RWE, 506; LL, 2:163–64).

14. Concerned, like The Life of John Sterling, with the problem of Jesuitism, this manuscript records the attempt of the Catholic Guise family to repress the truth of the Reformation, a process that only brings back the repressed truth with greater violence in the French Revolution (27, 61; the same point is made in FG, 1:223). Comparisons with the French Revolution of 1789 appear throughout (e.g., 39, 45, 46).

15. Carlyle published a few very minor writings between the time he completed The Life of John Sterling and 1855, when he became immersed in Frederick the Great, and after 1855 there is little in the way even of manuscripts addressing current issues. Only "Ilias (Americana) in Nuce" (1863), which was only half a page long and was aimed primarily at America, not England, sought controversy.

16. In addition to the implicit comparison in Frederick the Great, Carlyle explicitly compared James Carlyle and Friedrich Wilhelm in the 1866 Reminiscences (333). The fact that he conceived the figure of Friedrich Wilhelm in terms of the figure of his own father explains how he could write so approvingly of a figure whom others find barbarous.

17. In referring to the first half of the history, I mean to indicate the structural rather than literal division of the work. Carlyle had planned four volumes, two covering the period up to the death of Friedrich Wilhelm and
two on the reign of Frederick the Great, but the second half grew on him as he wrote and became, in the first edition, four volumes in itself. Thus the completed edition totaled six volumes. Carlyle's original intention can still be discerned in the division of the work into books. The first two volumes have ten books and the last four have eleven (originally intended to be ten). To indicate this division of the work into two parts, I will refer to the first two volumes as the first half and the last four volumes as the second half of the history. Note, however, that citations are from the Centenary Edition, which has eight volumes, the "second half" beginning at 3:278.

18. Previous commentary has noted the oedipal conflict in the first two volumes but assumed that it is resolved when Frederick submits to Friedrich Wilhelm. J. Rosenberg, for example, argues that the last four volumes lack the coherence that this theme gives to the first two (163–65). My argument is that the father/son conflict persists in the last four volumes, which fail for formal rather than thematic reasons.

19. Carlyle is very insistent on this point, repeating it several times: "Not the Peaceable magnanimitles, but the Warlike, are the thing appointed Fried­rich . . . henceforth"; war is his "inexorable element," while "Peace and the Muses" are "denied him" (3:395, 4:363, 5:196). Carlyle shaped his represen­tation of Frederick's life to emphasize the victory of Bellona over the Muses. While 70 percent of the final four volumes (eight of the eleven books) rep­resent Frederick's wars, the period of the wars only occupied 27 percent of the historical time covered. Carlyle condenses the ten years' peace between the Silesian wars and the Seven Years' War, as well as the final twenty-three years of Frederick's life, each into one book.

20. Carlyle again shapes his narrative to deemphasize Frederick's interest in the arts. While he represents Voltaire as seeking trouble in the controversy, Nancy Mitford suggests that Frederick actually set Maupertius and Voltaire against one another (11–12). Mitford also points out that Carlyle never men­tions Frederick's interest in the rococo art of Watteau (3; see 12).

21. In another passage, Carlyle's phrasing similarly suggests that Voltaire is an inverted Dante. Just as The Divine Comedy "belongs to ten Christian cen­turies, only the finishing of it is Dante's," the "Theory of the Universe" of the eighteenth century is "not properly of Voltaire's creating, but only of his uttering and publishing" (HHW, 98; FG, 3:193).

22. Another example is an anecdotal "bit of modern chivalry" performed at the Battle of Fontenoy that has been "circulating round the world . . . for a century." Carlyle discovers a "small irrefragable Document" demonstrating that the truth is "quite the reverse" and concludes that the story, which does not belong to the folk but to the literary French, is a product of "French Mess-rooms" (5:98–100).

23. Carlyle began the actual writing of Frederick the Great in the spring of
1855, and already in the spring of 1856, and again that summer, he was writ-
ing that he hoped to send the “First half of [his] wretched Book” to press in the
autumn (NL, 2:178; RWE, 511). Yet it was two years later, in June 1858, before
he could report that he had only a sheet and a half of the first two volumes
to write, and even so there were further delays (NL, 2:192). At work on what
he initially thought of as the second pair of volumes, he again optimistically
reported early in 1859 that he planned to finish in a year (Duffy, 583). Yet,
in late 1860, he admitted that his work went “very slow[ly]” and he was still
not “yet quite done” with the second of the planned ten—it turned out to be
eleven—books (NL, 2:209). The process of delay continued until the autumn
of 1864, when he could finally say with confidence that the history would soon
be finished; even then he was still some six months away from finishing it (NL,
2:225, 226; see also 225; RWE, 534; Duffy, 588; Allingham, Letters, 135).

24. Phrases like “If I live to get out of this last Prussian Scrape” and “if I
live to finish” occur frequently in his letters (Spedding, 759; RWE, 496; Marrs,
719). He also compared writing Frederick the Great to being “choked,” “nearly
ended,” and “nearly killed” (RWE, 526; Marrs, 740–41; RWE, 551; see
LL, 2:188, 247–48; Duffy, 578; Spedding, 760).

25. Carlyle quotes his, or possibly Neuberg’s, faithful translation of Gustav
Freytag’s Neue Bilder aus dem Leben des deutschen Volkes (397–408).

26. A letter of 1856, in which Carlyle is concerned to argue that Fred­
erick’s tactics had still not been improved upon and that Napoleon had not
introduced any genuine innovations, suggests that Carlyle’s detailed accounts
of Frederick’s intricate military maneuvers and tactics may partially be ac­
counted for by his desire to see in them Frederick’s true artistic genius (Wilson,
5:208–9).

Chapter 6

1. Even in the early 1870s, Carlyle continued to produce occasional public
pronouncements. Nonetheless, for the last five years of his life, he was nearly
silent, and from 1879 to his death in early 1881, there is almost no recorded
writing. Since Froude is selective in his quotations, it is difficult to tell when
the journal ends, but there seem to be no entries after 1878, the year of his last
published piece of writing. The last letter of those published is a letter of Feb­
ruary 8, 1879, to his brother John, who died in September of that year
(NL, 2:341). Letters to most other correspondents stopped earlier, about 1875–76
(see RWE, 587; Cate, 208; Copeland, 248; Marrs, 788; Duffy, 606).

2. LaValley appropriately describes the Jane Carlyle of The Reminiscences
as a sun goddess (330). Carlyle describes her as sunny (51, 58), bright (155,
317), shining (69, 128), and luminous (128); he also praises her lambency (99),
brilliancy (99), and irradiation (123; see also 126, 133–34, 302). The epitaph
he wrote for her refers to her "bright existence" and "clearness of discernment" and describes her as "the light of his life" \(LM, 2:392; \) see also \(LL, 2:369\).

3. Examples abound. About midway through "Edward Irving," he writes that although the manuscript should probably be "burnt when done," he will continue with it because it calms and soothes him \(307\). After finishing "Lord Jeffrey," he writes "I must carefully endeavour to find out some new work for myself" \(341\). But the compulsion to narrate was so strong that after writing that he has "no wish or need to record" Jane Carlyle's death, he goes on to do so \(164\).

4. This perhaps needs to be qualified by the fact that the reminiscence has never been published in the form that Carlyle apparently envisioned, namely, alongside Jane Carlyle's diary of April 15–July 5, 1856, in which he discovered just how great her pain had been, that she had even feared she was dying (see \(NLM, 87–109\)). Nonetheless, Carlyle does insist that she was happy in spite of this and other evidence of her unhappiness. LaValley argues that he may have been prompted by "guilt" and a "need to delude himself about the central meaning of his life" to create a "loving and overpoweringly important Jane" \(329\).

5. He learned from her diary at this time that while he was boring her with his struggles to write the account of the battle of Mollwitz she "felt convinced she was dying" \(134\). His schedule while writing \(Frederick the Great\) allowed her only one half-hour a day of his time. He also realized that he was so obsessed with working that he refused to take the time to buy a carriage for her, a purchase that might have prevented the accident that he clearly felt hastened her death \(145\).

6. Some of the rhetoric is new, but Carlyle's most incisive criticisms owe more to his friend Ruskin than to his own insights. While the early Ruskin had been profoundly influenced by Carlyle, the influence was by this time running in the other direction. For example, he had not for a long while, if ever, been concerned, as he is in "Shooting Niagara," with the soot and squalor of industry and the pollution of streams, but these were major themes of Ruskin's criticism of industry (see \(CME, 5:31, 47\)). By this date, Carlyle had read the first volume of \(Stones of Venice\) \(Cate, 61\), the third and part of the fourth volumes of \(Modern Painters\) \(Cate, 72–73, 75\), \(Unto This Last\) \(Cate, 89\), the "Essays in Political Economy" \(Cate, 100, 103–4\), and \(Ethics of the Dust\) \(Cate, 113\).

7. The section in which this passage appears was not included in \(Macmillan's Magazine\) where the essay first appeared, but it did appear when the essay was reprinted as a pamphlet later that year.

8. This appeared in the passage that was not included in \(Macmillan's\). See previous note.

9. Semmel explains that "Martial law could only be legally employed when
used to suppress a revolt; when used to punish a crime, it was illegal" (146; see 128ff.).

10. Mill had sent a copy to Carlyle when the book was published (Wilson, 5:340). At the time, Carlyle found the reasoning powerful and praised it as “serious, ingenious, clear,” but he could not accept its fundamental argument and went on to register his “perfect and profound dissent for the basis it rests upon” (NL, 2:196; see Larkin, 74). The manuscript of the response Carlyle wrote in 1865 is transcribed in Trela, “A New (Old) Review.” Carlyle worked only two days, October 18–19, 1865, before abandoning the critique. Trela, who remarks that it is “surprising” Carlyle would return to On Liberty six years after reading it, seems not to have noticed that Mill had recently been elected to Parliament or that Carlyle began writing on the day of Palmerston’s death.

11. Carlyle’s defense of Eyre has sometimes been confused with his implicit proslavery arguments in “The Negro Question” and “Ilias in Nuce.” Those writings had used the argument that slavery constitutes a potentially superior form of relationship between employers and workers to industrial capitalism. But the Eyre controversy had to do with the relationship between governors and governed, not employers and employed. The merits of his earlier argument aside, Carlyle’s argument in this case has to do with sustaining social order—saving the ship—rather than creating just social relationships, and the charge against Eyre was not that he intervened paternalistically to make the Jamaicans work—the action Carlyle advocated in “The Negro Question”—but that he had treated them ruthlessly and unjustly.

12. Carlyle strongly identifies with, yet vehemently rejects, both positions. His narrative of Irving—the “uncommon man” who arrives in London to great acclaim, holds audiences captive with “Rhodmanthine expositions of duty and ideal,” but then has his “Prophecy” rejected as heresy—closely parallels his own career (232, 283, 278; see 254, 288ff.). Although he does not identify as closely with Jeffrey, he cannot help discovering affinities with the man he classes as the greatest literary critic of his time and a “Scotch Voltaire” (340, 341; see Skabarnicki, “Annandale Evangelist,” 27–28). The latter suggests an indirect link as well, since there are numerous affinities between Carlyle and the Voltaire of Frederick the Great who, like Carlyle, is a solitary Ishmael (3:187, 4:409, 5:237 et al.), considers giving up literature when condemned for his heterodoxy (4:453), writes on Mohammed, and becomes dyspeptic (5:333).