

“Unfold your self”: Kenneth J. Fielding and Carlyle Studies,

David R. Sorensen
St. Joseph's University

In *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History* (1841), Carlyle speaks of the benefit to be derived from the company of a distinguished man: “He is the living light-fountain, which is good and pleasant to be near” (3). Kenneth J. Fielding’s “light” is everywhere apparent in Carlyle studies, serving both as an inspiration and a stimulus to those who continue to explore the legacy of Thomas and Jane. It is a mark of Fielding’s intellectual fortitude and curiosity that seventeen years after being honored in an issue of *Prose Studies* on the occasion of his retirement from the Department of English Literature at the University of Edinburgh, he continues to pursue fresh inquiries and to initiate new research. From the start of his association in 1966 with the Duke-Edinburgh edition of *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle* (1970–), he has stressed the importance of understanding the Carlyles in relation to their remarkably broad range of friendships. Patiently and tenaciously, he has mined what he fondly calls “the rockface” of manuscript evidence, much of it ignored or overlooked by modern scholars and biographers. It is also worth pointing out that the bibliography that accompanies this essay is confined to the period from 1987 and leaves out an earlier period of nearly twenty

years of influential and enduring work on Carlyle, Dickens, and other Victorian writers.

Without fuss or fanfare Fielding has quietly exposed the often threadbare quality of the biographical and critical assumptions that have surrounded the Carlyles since the publication of James Anthony Froude's four-volume life of Carlyle in 1882 and 1884. In an important article in 1990, he charted a course for future research that proved remarkably fertile, both in relation to the *Collected Letters* and their impact on the study of Victorian literature and history. What he sketched was an approach that would take readers far beyond the boundaries of Froude and his followers:

As the Carlyles' range of friends and acquaintances increased, it extended into regions which both give a context for the *Works* and yet lie outside them. By identifying these major and minor figures we may be able to see what the letters are about, what social and intellectual relationships they touch on, the practical reasons for such correspondence, or how they relate to all that the Carlyles stood for. ("Editing" 5)

Fortunately, Fielding was prepared to act on his own advice. In introductions, notes, and separate essays he illuminated previously unknown connections between the Carlyles and a host of "major and minor figures," including Lady Harriet Ashburton, Louisa, Lady Ashburton, Delia Bacon, Amalie Bólte, Godefroy Cavaignac, Thomas Chalmers, Charlotte Cushman, Erasmus Darwin, David Davidson, George Dawson, Gavan Duffy, John Forster, Margaret Fuller, Elizabeth Gaskell, William Hazlitt, Alexander Herzen, Anna Jameson, Geraldine Jewsbury, Martha Lamont, William Lecky, Vernon Lushington, Giuseppe Mazzini, James and Harriet Martineau, Frederick Denison Maurice, John Mitchel, Richard Monckton Milnes, Émile Montégut, Caroline Norton, Margaret Oliphant, Theodore Parker, Elizabeth Paulet, Theresa Revis, the Saint-Simonians, Thomas and James Spedding, John Sterling, Robert Tait, William M. Thackeray, Ellen Twisleton, John Tyndall, and many others.

Fielding's work has quietly produced a major shift in knowledge about the Carlyles and their world, though many commentators continue to disregard his discoveries. In an age of theory and cultural studies, the close study of the Carlyles' biographical and intellectual environment may seem outdated to those in search of more ambitious and fashionable topics. Yet, as Fielding has repeatedly insisted, critical generalizations carry little force unless they are rooted in a sound knowledge of the Carlyles' world. Following Froude, critics have tended to segment Thomas Carlyle's life, giving a disproportionate emphasis to *Sartor Resartus* (1833–34), *The French Revolution* (1837), and *Past and Present* (1843), while distancing themselves from the “reactionary” period that followed 1848. The contrasts are never as sharp as these divisions suggest. As Fielding noted in the introduction to volume nineteen of the *Collected Letters*, this tendency overlooks the crucial part that paradox plays in Carlyle's outlook: “Especially since his method often lay in conflict and confrontation, Carlyle often seems inconsistent when different phases of his career are brought together without distinction, but through seeking the truth in extremes and the clash of opposites, he challenged his readers.” Carlyle is elusive because he thrives on contradiction: “[T]hough it is easy to construct intricate schemes of what [he] taught and meant, his letters often should force us to realize that he was a man of inconsistency, variety, and unexpectedness, an ironist consistent mainly in his challenging sincerity” (x). Always alert to the “unexpected,” Fielding has revealed how little is known about Carlyle's impact on politics, religion, philosophy, art, and society, particularly in the period after 1848.

In a landmark essay in 1992, Fielding explored the links between Carlyle and the leaders of the Young Ireland movement. He identified the anonymous author of a review of the *Letters and Speeches of Oliver Cromwell* (i.e., *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches* [1845]) in the republican journal *Nation* as the Irish revolutionary John Mitchel, who was later tried for sedition and transported to Tasmania, from which he eventually escaped to the United States, where he fought and proselytized for the South in the American Civil War. In the twentieth century, Mitchel entered the Valhalla of Irish Republican Army heroes.

Fielding astutely used Mitchel's remarks in the Cromwell review to illustrate the complex affinities between Carlyle and Young Ireland: "Perhaps, the most remarkable thing about Carlyle's writings is their power of suggesting thoughts that the writer never contemplated . . . so that amongst his most ardent admirers . . . there are, probably, few who agree in his peculiar views" (qtd. in "Ireland" 134). The Young Irelanders were drawn to Carlyle as a source of inspiration. Fielding insisted that "[w]e need to see that [Mitchel] sought Carlyle as the commanding authority on revolutionary action in the cause of justice and national independence" (135). *The French Revolution* in particular appealed to Irish republicans, both at a conscious and an unconscious level:

It was a handbook for revolutionaries. Be one a moderate (like Duffy) or an extremist (like Mitchel) it presented various revolutionary directions. Then, though it deplored violence, it powerfully conveyed its attraction. It showed a new rhetoric, a disdain for immediate consequences, a rejection of church conservatism, and appreciation of the influence of literature and the press, and a profound concern for the people's suffering. (136)

If Carlyle became a rallying point for Young Ireland, Young Ireland itself affected Carlyle's views. As Fielding explained, *Latter-Day Pamphlets* (1850) owed much to Carlyle's involvement with Young Ireland: "It is . . . clear that Mitchel's militancy and failure to compel events in 1848, crucially affected Carlyle's response to that revolutionary year, as well as his understanding of what could be done in Ireland" (137). Unlike many other Victorian commentators interested in Ireland, Carlyle was not content to comment from a distance. His two visits to the country—the first for six days in September 1846, and the second for two months in the summer of 1849—sharpened his distaste for democratic institutions, liberalism, and "laissez-faire." Yet as Fielding argued, the fierce invective of *Latter-Day Pamphlets* does not tell the whole story. Following his conviction for sedition in May 1848, Mitchel was transported to Van Dieman's Land, now Tasmania. Moved by the plight of a man who had

been thwarted in his attempt to ignite a revolution, Carlyle wrote on his behalf to the Viceroy, the Earl of Clarendon, and appealed for clemency (Clarendon Papers). Fielding's further discovery of two other letters in the National Library of Scotland—Clarendon's response to Carlyle's appeal, and Mitchel's touching letter of appreciation to Carlyle in 1866—threw light on what Carlyle himself once described as the “dark, untenanted places of the Past” (*Historical* 6). Fielding was characteristically modest about the significance of these revelations, yet his comments deserve to be repeated:

In itself the commentary on the influence of literature on politics, and the inter-relation between Anglo-Scottish, Irish and French culture. My only deviation is to remark that such letters may help to convey that biography and editing call for imagination in discovery and research as well as invention. (139)

His diligence led him to other surprising Carlylean political connections. In his introduction to volume twenty-seven of the *Collected Letters*, he noted the remarkable friendship between Carlyle and the Russian radical, Alexander Herzen:

There are no letters between them in 1852. Yet here is a man at the centre of political thought and action in Europe who was an intense admirer of Carlyle's *The French Revolution* and other writings, who had sent him some of his works, and whose respect was returned. Almost as soon as he landed in England he called at Cheyne Row and joined in vigorous discussion.

Added Fielding, “Yet Carlylean biography has known nothing about [Herzen]; and though there is the record of two letters mentioning him . . . less is said of their connection than of problems with the builders or Nero the dog” (xii). He speculated fruitfully about the causes of such oversights. Focused too narrowly on *Sartor Resartus* and its place in English literature, Anglo-American scholarship had tended to ignore Carlyle's reception in Europe, where he had always been regarded

as a serious and important writer. Herzen's desire to engage Carlyle was typical of many European intellectuals. As Fielding asserted, their "mutual interest lay in their scorn for the falsities they saw in the status quo and their wish to expose them as pungently as possible" (xiii). French reviewers such as Émile Montégut and Joseph Milsand had already written intelligently about Carlyle in *Revue des Deux Mondes*. Like Herzen and many other Europeans, they found him refreshingly sceptical about Anglo-American ideals of "individualism," "democracy," "freedom," and "progress." He was prepared to contest these orthodoxies and to speak scathingly of the hypocritical use to which they were often put. At the same time he detested socialist schemes for the reform of human nature and ridiculed the "formulas" of revolutionary ideology. In Fielding's words, European exiles, radicals, revolutionaries, and intellectuals "reached beyond the barrier of Carlyle's vehement style to the substance of what he was saying about government" (xiii). What they discovered was often surprisingly relevant to their own experience.

In the same introduction Fielding sharply disposed of the myth of Carlyle the Germanic hero-worshiper, whose *Frederick the Great* (1858–65) Goebbels read to Hitler in the Berlin bunker. Without dismissing Carlyle's reactionary side—"he was often ready to play up to being a caricature of prejudice" (ix)—Fielding carefully distinguished the author of *Frederick the Great* from Nazi ideologues. The Führer would have found little consolation in the pages of Carlyle's great Prussian biography. As Fielding observed, Carlyle "made little of the unified nationalist Germany that was just beginning to stir" (xv). Instead, he was seeking to develop the leads that he had found in the writings of Goethe and Schiller and to explore the life of an embattled leader who detested the corruption of eighteenth-century aristocratic political life. Carlyle was also determined to repudiate the conclusions of his rival Macaulay, "disagreeing with what he saw as his sentimental contrast between the Machiavellian king and the virtuous empress Maria Theresa" (xvi). For Carlyle, Frederick was another Cromwell, and his biography was less a pæan to a despotism and "drill" than a dramatic representation of an iconoclast who prepared the way for the French Revolution.

Carlyle went to extraordinary lengths to achieve accuracy, and Fielding rightly emphasized the heroic aspect of his labour: “[He] was gripped by the fascination of looking at a different kind of world or society, or in correcting older versions of history” (xv).

Carlyle’s religion may be as widely misunderstood as his politics, though, again, Fielding incisively challenged the accepted version of Froude’s “Calvinist without the Theology” (2:2). As he trenchantly remarked in the introduction to volume twenty-six of the *Collected Letters*, “the Calvinistic prophet of a lame tradition . . . is still so desperately hard to dispose of” (xii). Part of the difficulty lay in the Anglo-American critical consensus that had developed in the first half of the twentieth century. The numerous and elaborate explanations of the “German” and “Calvinist” elements in *Sartor Resartus* overlooked a basic truth—that it was not primarily concerned with either German philosophy or Puritan fundamentalism. In an article on “The Sceptical Carlyles and the Unitarian Mrs Gaskell” published in 1992, Fielding urged readers to consider *Sartor* in relation to its times:

Admiration for Carlyle, shared by some English and Americans, arose not only from their respect for his personal independence, and the understanding that he stood outside the dominant religious, social and political order but also from their understanding that *Sartor* questions a merely literal reading of the Bible. It is, after all, with its patchwork of documents, almost a parody of the written revelation. (54)

The preoccupation with the “German” and “Calvinist” elements ignored Carlyle’s central purpose: “We need to think about the early reception of *Sartor* more closely; to see that it was addressed to the experience of contemporary British and American readers, forget its ‘Calvinism’ and appreciate the Germanic fantasy as a diversionary distraction” (55).

Few commentators heeded this warning. Relying on Froude’s outdated formula, they continued to underestimate the richness and the topicality of Carlyle’s spiritual outlook. As Fielding pointed out in his

essay on Thackeray and Carlyle's *The Life of John Sterling* (1851) in 1999, even such distinguished biographers as Gordon N. Ray and Charles R. Sanders had erroneously assumed that Thackeray had written a savagely hypocritical and stupid review of Carlyle's *The Life of John Sterling* in the *Times* in 1851. Appealing to the evidence of an unpublished letter that he found in the Ashburton papers at the National Library of Scotland, Fielding proved that Thackeray had reviewed Carlyle's biography—in the pages of George Henry Lewes's radical journal, the *Leader*. The *Times* review, written by Samuel Phillips, was an unpleasant expression of mid-Victorian religious bigotry and malice directed against liberal rationalists such as Sterling, Francis Newman, Arthur Hugh Clough, Froude, and of course Carlyle. Fielding revised the standard version of events to create a new context for appreciating Carlyle's biography. It had been Sterling's brother Anthony who had persuaded the reluctant Carlyle to undertake the biography:

The usual story is that this was because they disliked the biography written by the Archdeacon Julius Charles Hare, whose curate John had been for a short time at Herstmonceaux, and that Hare had falsely overstressed his orthodox piety. Yet this is only half true. It was evidently just as much in answer to sharp attacks from both the fundamentalists and high church believers on Hare, John Sterling, and everyone associated with them. ("Thackeray" 313)

Once again, Fielding had punctured inflated platitudes.

He returned to the subject in 2001, in his poignant and powerful essay, "A Carlylean Elegy in Auchtertool Kirkyard." With Carlylean fidelity to the importance of "locality," Fielding used a visit to the Kirkyard to reflect on the Carlyles' religion. He speculated that "we might almost agree with Nietzsche that Carlyle was in fact an 'atheist' without being willing, or with the courage, to admit it." Yet in this ambiguity—or self-deception—lay the source of his influence:

He was able to reconcile the wish to believe in the divine while rejecting what was plainly incredible; and, by the mid-century, he

came to it without sheltering in the fantasy of *Sartor* or a certain double talk in other works. At the same time, he rightly reckoned himself a man of piety. (39)

Another unfamiliar source, the William Lecky papers in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, offered a glimpse of Carlyle as a doubter who admired strong belief. Illustrating his view that “there are various aspects to Carlyle, to be found at different times, in other places, and in different moods,” Fielding recalled Lecky’s perspective:

[He] himself found this as well as he talked his way on walks round London with his friend; and while he could persuade Carlyle in old age to read the Old Testament he could not get him to look at the New, though “a religious mind, life, or character he valued beyond all others.”

As Fielding noted, “Men and women sought Carlyle out because they saw his sincerity and felt his unexpectedness” (37–38).

Religion was a peculiarly private matter to both Carlyle and Jane. Their frequently skeptical, even blasphemous declarations have to be judged alongside their private observances, as Fielding observed: “For, whatever else they professed, they . . . showed that their religion was rooted in place, family, and familiar ways, and so almost necessarily connected with their final resting-places and their church and its rituals in birth, marriage, and particularly death” (48). The elegiac spirit may not normally be associated with Carlyle, yet his friendship with liberal Scottish theologians such as Thomas Erskine and Dr. John McCleod Campbell—both critics of Calvinism—demonstrates what Fielding referred to as his “tender compassion, by no means to be characterised solely by his vehemence and worship of power” (49). Froude’s description of Carlyle as a “Calvinist without the Theology” was far more relevant to himself than to his friend. If Carlyle had an interest in the subject, it was in the part it played as a symbol of Scottish national identity. The doctrine itself, so grotesquely interpreted by his friend Edward Irving, held little interest for him. As Fielding noted,

It may be truer to think of Carlyle as having helped to release his own generation from an over-literal acceptance of past teaching; and who yet found himself in a state of tension as his life extended and his beliefs were stretched with it. . . . He was a remarkable mixture of liberalism and illiberalism.

This emphasis, as always, was grounded in sympathetic observation of the world the Carlyles “wrote about, and the actual beliefs they professed, challenged, and evaded” (51). In these and other circumstances, mere generalization is of limited use.

In two different settings Fielding wrote about Carlyle’s links to artists and art. Visitors to Chelsea will be familiar with Robert Tait’s *Chelsea Interior*, which was first exhibited at the Royal Academy in 1858 and was recently acquired by the National Trust as part of the permanent collection at the Carlyle House in Cheyne Row. In an essay on Tait Fielding carefully explained the process by which Tait combined photography and painting in the composition. It is partly

revealed by looking into the cabinet seen at the back of the innermost recess of the painting. This now includes a photograph by Tait from which he certainly painted Jane’s portrait in the picture. Every detail of the expression, pose, and setting is the same.

The painting contained a second surviving photographic fragment: “This is a photograph of Jane’s pet Nero, snipped from the smaller print, and set in a brooch, that once belonged to her maid, Charlotte” (“Robert” 114). Fielding not only highlighted nineteenth-century artistic methods—the Pre-Raphaelites too used photographs—but he also revealed the darker psychological qualities inherent in this purportedly ideal Victorian domestic scene: “[I]n reality Jane Carlyle is shown at an intensely unhappy stage of her life, rightly pictured as if she were feeling that there was nothing for her to do but sit in the background, comforted by her pet dog who, as she said, is by no means an insignificant figure.” Bringing a knowledge of Carlyle’s habits to the study of the painting, Fielding reminded his readers that “Carlyle is said to have sometimes lain down on the floor so that his offensive pipe-

smoke should be sent up the chimney.” Such spontaneous gestures were unwelcome in the chilly atmosphere of the house in 1858. The result was “something more than an authentic representation of the Cheyne Row drawing-room” (115). As Browning had suggested in “My Last Duchess,” art can often tell the truth, relentlessly and uncomfortably.

Fielding’s second investigation of Carlyle and art was an especially felicitous one for those who attended the Scottish actor Tom Fleming’s performance of “Scottish Historical Portraits: An Address by Thomas Carlyle, Written by K. J. Fielding” in April 2001 at the National Portrait Gallery of Scotland in Edinburgh. Fleming’s beautifully sensitive and measured portrayal of Carlyle and Fielding’s script each testified to the power of an engaged historical imagination, alive to what Carlyle called the “inward condition of Life” (*Historical* 5). It was appropriate that Carlyle should have “appeared” in the institution that he had played such a vital role in founding. As Fielding explained in a program note,

In May 1854, David Laing told a meeting of the Society of Antiquaries that he had lately called on Carlyle in London and told him how a proposal for an exhibition of Scottish portraits had once again failed, on which Carlyle said, “I never see anyone from Edinburgh without suggesting an Exhibition of that kind.” Laing proposed to revive the idea, and suggested that Carlyle might write “a letter expressing his views on the subject,” and putting it “in a definite form.” This was sent on 3 May 1854, and was read to the Society of Antiquaries. . . . A long while was to pass before it took its effect, when the Scottish National Portrait Gallery at last opened in July 1889. But that Carlyle and Laing gave the impetus is beyond doubt. (3)

Fielding’s script vividly conveyed a sense of Carlyle’s conviction, as well as his humor. His closing words resonated with an audience sitting in the presence of Whistler’s famous portrait of Carlyle:

You may well know how I was caught by Watts, and Millais, and then by one MacNeill Whistler, my near neighbour. . . . He had

asked for two or three sittings, but wanted many more. If I made a sign of changing my position, he screamed in agony, "For God's sake, don't move!" It was my coat he wanted to get just right—face went for a little—so I got a young man to wear the coat. (15)

Another side of Fielding's influence is evident in his deep interest in Jane Carlyle, which culminated recently in the publication of the Ashgate edition of *Jane Carlyle's Newly Selected Letters* (2004). His primary aim had been to separate the real woman from the mythical figure partly invented by Froude in his biography. In Fielding's view she was neither a martyr nor a victim, but a forceful yet tormented woman who was a strong, humorous, and occasionally unpleasant personality in her own right. In 1997, he produced with Ian Campbell "a new and complete edition" of Carlyle's *Reminiscences* (1881) that exposed Froude's unreliability both as an editor and a biographer. The history of Froude's inconsistencies in preparing the first edition of *Reminiscences* was scrupulously reviewed in the "Note on the Text" and do not need to be rehearsed here. What became evident to Fielding was that Froude's purposes were never as transparent as he represented them, particularly in relation to his account of the Carlyles' marital tensions. Froude's version of Jane Carlyle was at odds with the manuscript evidence of her letters, which he manicured to reinforce his very Victorian conception of her character. The situation was made no clearer by the subsequent intervention of Carlyle's nephew Alexander in his partisan edition of *New Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle* (1903). More recently, Froude's characterization of Jane has been absorbed and refined by those intent on advocating a feminist and psychoanalytical argument, which curiously confines Jane's character even as it seeks to enlist her in the opposition to Victorian patriarchy.

Typically, Fielding engaged in the controversy not by generalizing but by patiently appealing to primary manuscript evidence. In 2002 he and Campbell published "New Letters of Harriet Martineau to Jane Carlyle, 1842-44," which revealed the close friendship between "two of the most remarkable writing women of their time" (379). Did these letters also highlight Carlyle's own obtuseness as a husband? Fielding and Campbell wisely urged further investigation:

[The letters] break into, change, overlap and confirm what we al-

ready know of both women's lives and letters. They inform and raise questions which need to be pursued. They show the strong shared consciousness of the place of women in writing, public affairs, and the web of relationships they shared.

While Carlyle may have estimated Martineau's intellect accurately, it was also true that his preoccupation with Lady Harriet Ashburton blinded him to "a whole world of personal relationships" (392). Earlier, Fielding had edited (with Ian Campbell and Aileen Christianson) and introduced the manuscript of Jane Carlyle's *The Simple Story of My Own First Love*, written in 1852 and published in an imperfect and censored form by Froude and Alexander Carlyle. Yet the story was anything but simple, as Fielding explained in his introduction: "It will be seen that, as well as being a cautionary tale, it can be read as an attempt to define herself, and from its restored opening we can now see or infer how it may have arisen" (3).

He then described the web of allusions interwoven in the story itself. In the story Jane begins by responding to the rejection by Carlyle of ("the greatest Philosopher of our day") Thackeray's claim in his recently published novel, *Henry Esmond* (1852), that true love endures forever. The subject was very much on Thackeray's mind:

For what Thackeray has to say about Love cannot be explained without referring to his novel, *Esmond*, and understanding *Esmond* depends on seeing how it expresses what Thackeray felt about Jane Brookfield, and his relations with her husband, the Rev. William. The three of them were linked (as the Carlyles were) with Lady Harriet and Lord Ashburton, to whom *Esmond* was dedicated. And the whole affair leads into what his novel has to say about marriage and love, which Carlyle so disliked and Jane admired. (3)

Jane's attitudes to love were never easy to fathom. She shared her friend Geraldine Jewsbury's opinion that women needed more freedom in marriage, a theme that Jewsbury explored in her novels such as *The Half Sisters* (1848), which she dedicated to Jane and their friend

Elizabeth Paulet. The society that Jane enjoyed was considerably less restricted than her biographers assumed. But, as Fielding pointed out, it is equally true that Jane Carlyle “had a very feminine (or human) delight in admiration” (7), and *The Simple Story* clearly reflects her pleasure in recounting earlier love affairs.

Not surprisingly, Froude and Alexander Carlyle used the story and doctored the manuscript to support different interpretations of Jane’s character. Inevitably, their alterations diminished the originality of her achievement and reinforced their prudish predilections. For example, Alexander “did his best to make it more bland, leaving out such references as those to the scandalous Ninon de Lenclos, the Duke of Wellington’s amours . . . and even tidying away Shakespeare and the Duke of Rochefoucauld” (7). Summarizing their efforts, Fielding commented: “Both editors were either somewhat confused or controversially dishonest” (10). Yet as the transcription of the story reveals,

it is an extremely personal paper, written with great liveliness, without a pedantic attention to actuality, perhaps called out like most of [Jane’s] writings by a wish to address someone particular who is needed as an audience. It is a scrap of her autobiography as she liked to think of it: neither as fantastic as *Sartor Resartus* nor as pedantic. (8)

The autobiographic strands combine uneasily in the story with fictional elements. Fielding speculated that “perhaps it was written for self-expression daunted by an inability to express her full feeling about love in open discussion at the Grange. She is clearly exasperated with her husband, though not all her comments are ill-natured” (8). Her motives are never easy to disentangle, yet the author bears little resemblance to the passive heroine envisaged by Froude and Alexander Carlyle.

In volume thirty of the *Collected Letters*, Fielding continued to explore previously unknown or unpublished manuscripts of Jane Carlyle in order to develop a more complete view of her remarkable character. This volume includes the full version of Jane’s *Simple Story*, a complete

version of her notebook, 1845–52, another complete version of the journal she wrote between October 1855 and July 1856, and an interview that Jane entrusted or dictated to her American friend Ellen Twisleton, which Fielding had previously discovered in the Houghton Library at Harvard University and published as “The Cry from Craigenputtoch” in 1999. In the volume’s introduction, he posed questions that cut through the standard explanations of the Carlyle marriage and the Froude controversy. This manuscript evidence provoked important questions that required careful thought. Fielding outlined some of the interpretative difficulties involved:

The main Journal, 1855–56, has always compelled us to consider their lives in the light of her extreme despair. Then we have to consider how the Journal has been used, and probably misused. Ellen Twisleton’s account of their early life at Craigenputtoch, which seems to have been practically dictated by Jane, raises the question of how far her memories were coloured by her later life. All these accounts are given only from Jane’s viewpoint, and some allowance has to be made for the extent to which they agree with Jane and Thomas’s letters, and with his point of view about controversial incidents in their marriage, which he rarely mentions except in his *Reminiscences*. (xii)

Readers of the recently published *Jane Carlyle: Newly Selected Letters* (2004) will be able to determine how far Kenneth Fielding has progressed in responding to these challenges. Carlyle surmised that the “meaning of life here on earth might be defined as consisting in this: To unfold your self, to work what thing you have the faculty for” (*Heroes* 193). Students of Victorian history should be deeply grateful that Kenneth Fielding continued to “unfold” himself in his work with such indefatigable energy and insight.

Kenneth J. Fielding died on 20 May 2005. His extraordinary scholarly achievements will always be valued by those who care about the study of Victorian literature and history.

KENNETH J. FIELDING: A BIBLIOGRAPHY, 1988–2004

This list is intended to be a chronological continuation of one given in *Prose Studies* by Ian Campbell in 1987, which listed Fielding's publications up to that time:

- "The Dickens World Revisited." *Dickens and Other Victorians*. Ed. Joanne Shattock. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1988. 53–64.
- [With Peter Jackson]. "Carlyle's Reminiscences: Dr. Peyton Blakiston and Bessy Barnet—A Note." *Carlyle Newsletter* 9 (1988): 51–59.
- "William Graham and Carlyle's 'Death of Irving.'" *Carlyle Newsletter* 8 (1988): 37–42.
- Rev. of *The Nemesis of Faith*, by James Anthony Froude, intro. Rosemary Ashton. *George Eliot-George Henry Lewes Newsletter* 15 (1988): 11–13.
- "Carlyle and John Tyndall: I." *Carlyle Studies Annual* 18 (1988): 43–52.
- "Carlyle's Unpublished Comments on the Northcote-Trevelyan Report." *Carlyle Annual* 10 (1989): 5–13.
- "Carlyle Makes His Will (1865–1871): New Documents Discovered." *Carlyle Annual* 10 (1989): 56–63.
- Introduction. *The French Revolution. 1837*. By Thomas Carlyle. Ed. Kenneth J. Fielding and David R. Sorensen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. vii–xix.
- "Editing the Carlyle Letters: 1996–1991." *Carlyle Annual* 11 (1990): 3–14.
- "Carlyle Writes Local History: 'Dumfriesshire Three Hundred Years Ago.'" *Carlyle Annual* 12 (1991): 3–8.
- "Ireland, John Mitchel and his 'sarcastic friend.'" *Literatur im Kontext—Literature in Context, Festschrift für Horst W. Drescher*. Ed. Joachim Schwend, Susanne Hagemann, and Hermann Völkel. Frankfurt: Lang, 1992. 131–43.
- "The Sceptical Carlyles and the Unitarian Mrs. Gaskell." *Gaskell Society Journal* 6 (1992): 42–57.
- "New Notes for The Letters: 1. Carlyle's Sketch of Joseph Neuberg. 2. 'Leave it Alone, Time Will Mend It.'" *Carlyle Annual* 13 (1993): 3–16.
- "Carlyle and the Americans: 'Eighteen Million Bores.'" *Carlyle Annual* 15 (1995): 55–64.
- "Bleak House and Dickens' 'Originals': 'The Romantic Side of Familiar Things.'" *Dickens Studies Annual* 24 (1996): 119–34.
- "Dickens and Science?" *Dickens Quarterly* 13 (1996): 200–16.

- [With Lai Shu Fang]. "Dickens, Science, and 'The Poetry of Science.'" *Dickensian* 93 (1997): 5–10.
- "'Kind Arms to Hang on To': Unpublished Thackeray Letters Acquired by the National Library of Scotland." *Times Literary Supplement* 12 Dec. 1997: 16–17.
- "Letters of Thackeray to the Ashburtons." *Dickens Studies Annual* 27 (1997): 245–69.
- Reminiscences*. 1881. By Thomas Carlyle. Ed. K. J. Fielding and Ian Campbell. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- "Thackeray and 'The Great Master of Craigenputtoch': A New Review of *The Life of John Sterling*—and a New Understanding." *Victorian Literature and Culture* 27 (1999): 307–14.
- "'The Cry from Craigenputtoch,' A Newly Discovered Account of Jane Carlyle's Early Married Life." *Times Literary Supplement* 13 Aug. 1999: 13–14.
- [With Lai Shu Fang]. "Dickens, Science, Evolution and 'The Death of the Sun.'" *Dickens, Europe and the New Worlds*. Ed. Anny Sadrin. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1999. 200–11.
- [Contributor]. *The Oxford Reader's Companion to Dickens*. Ed. Paul Schlicke. London: Oxford UP, 1999.
- "Charles Dickens." *A Companion to the Victorian Novel*. Ed. William Baker and Kenneth Womack. Westport, CT: Greenwood P, 2000. 275–82.
- "Robert Scott Tait: His Portraits and Photographs of the Carlyles in their 'A Chelsea Interior.'" *Review of Scottish Culture* 13 (2000): 112–16.
- "Scottish Historical Portraits: An Address by Thomas Carlyle, Written by K. J. Fielding." National Portrait Gallery of Scotland, 5 April 2001. Unpublished MS. 1–15.
- The Simple Story of My Own First Love*. By Jane Welsh Carlyle. Ed. K. J. Fielding, Ian Campbell, and Aileen Christianson. Edinburgh: The Carlyle Letters, 2001. Rpt. with slight changes in *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 33 vols. to date. Durham, NC: Duke UP. 1970–. Vol. 30. 173–94.
- "A Carlylean Elegy in Auchtertool Kirkyard." *Scottish Christianity in the Modern World*. Ed. Stewart J. Brown and George Newlands. Edinburgh: Clark, 2001. 37–51.
- "'The Trump and Her Trumpet': Letters of Harriet Martineau to Jane Carlyle, 1840–1844." *Times Literary Supplement*, 30 Nov. 2001: 16–17.

- [With Ian Campbell]. "New Letters of Harriet Martineau to Jane Carlyle, 1842-44." *Women's Writing* 9 (2002): 379-93.
- "New Letters from Ambleside: HM to Jane Carlyle." *A Harriet Martineau Miscellany*. Ambleside, Eng.: Martineau Society, 2002. 128-36.
- "Likeness in Unlikeness': Dickens and Harriet Martineau." *A Harriet Martineau Miscellany*. Ambleside, Eng.: Martineau Society, 2002. 137-42.
- "Harriet Martineau and William Wordsworth." Wordsworth Memorial Centenary Lecture, Rydal Church Trust, 2002.
- Jane Carlyle: Newly Selected Letters*. Ed. Kenneth J. Fielding and David R. Sorensen. Aldershot, Eng.: Ashgate, 2004.
- [Contributor]. *The Carlyle Encyclopedia*. Ed. Mark Cumming. Madison, NJ: Fairleigh Dickinson UP, 2004.
- [With David R. Sorensen]. "Jane Welsh Carlyle." *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2004. Vol. 10. 144-47.

WORKS CITED

- Browning, Robert. "My Last Duchess." *The Poems and Plays of Robert Browning*. Ed. Saxe Commins. New York: Modern Library, 1934. 94-95.
- [Campbell, Ian.] "K. J. Fielding: Publications, 1949-89." *Prose Studies* 10 (1987): 323-28.
- Carlyle, Alexander, ed. *New Letters and Memorials of Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 2 vols. London: John Lane, 1903.
- Carlyle, Jane Welsh. *The Simple Story of My Own First Love*. Ed. Kenneth J. Fielding, Ian Campbell, and Aileen Christianson. Edinburgh: The Carlyle Letters, 2001.
- Carlyle, Thomas. *Frederick the Great. 1858-65. Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99. Vols. 12-19.
- . *The French Revolution. 1837*. Ed. Kenneth J. Fielding and David R. Sorensen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989.
- . *Historical Essays*. Ed. Chris Vanden Bossche. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002.
- . *Latter-Day Pamphlets. 1850. Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99. Vol. 20.
- . *Oliver Cromwell's Letters and Speeches. 1845. Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896-99. Vols. 6-9.

- . *The Life of John Sterling*. 1851. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896–99. Vol. 11.
- . *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History*. 1841. Ed. Michael K. Goldberg, Joel J. Brattin, and Mark Engel. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
- . *Past and Present*. 1843. *Works*. 30 vols. Ed. H. D. Traill. London: Chapman and Hall, 1896–99. Vol. 10.
- . *Reminiscences*. Ed. James Anthony Froude. 2 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1881.
- . *Sartor Resartus*. 1833–34. Ed. Rodger L. Tarr and Mark Engel. Berkeley: U of California P, 2000.
- Clarendon Papers. Bodleian Library, Oxford University, Oxford.
- Fielding, Kenneth J. “A Carlylean Elegy in Auchtertool Kirkyard.” *Scottish Christianity in the Modern World*. Ed. Stewart J. Brown and George Newlands. Edinburgh: Clark, 2001. 37–51.
- . “‘The Cry from Craigenputtoch,’ A Newly Discovered Account of Jane Carlyle’s Early Married Life.” *Times Literary Supplement* 13 Aug. 1999: 13–14.
- . “Editing the Carlyle Letters: 1996–1991.” *Carlyle Annual* 11 (1990): 3–14.
- . Introduction. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 33 vols. to date. Durham: Duke UP, 1970–. Vol. 19. ix–xiii.
- . Introduction. *The Simple Story of My Own First Love*. By Jane Welsh Carlyle. Ed. Fielding, Kenneth J., Ian Campbell, and Aileen Christianson. Edinburgh: The Carlyle Letters, 2001. i–ix.
- , and David Sorensen. Introduction. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 33 vols. to date. Durham: Duke UP, 1970–. Vol. 30. xi–xx.
- . Introduction. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 33 vols. to date. Durham: Duke UP, 1970–. Vol. 27. xi–xviii.
- . Introduction. *The Collected Letters of Thomas and Jane Welsh Carlyle*. 33 vols. to date. Durham: Duke UP, 1970–. Vol. 26. ix–xvi.
- . Introduction. *The French Revolution*. 1837. By Thomas Carlyle. Ed. K. J. Fielding and David Sorensen. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1989. vii–xix.
- . “Ireland, John Mitchel and his ‘sarcastic friend.’” *Literatur im Kon-text—Literature in Context, Festschrift für Horst W. Drescher*. Ed. Joachim Schwend,

- Susanne Hagemann, and Hermann Völkel. Frankfurt: Lang, 1992. 131–43.
- , and David R. Sorensen, eds. *Jane Carlyle: Newly Selected Letters*. Aldershot, Eng.: Ashgate, 2004.
- . [With Ian Campbell]. “New Letters of Harriet Martineau to Jane Carlyle, 1842–44.” *Women’s Writing* 9 (2002): 379–93.
- , and Ian Campbell, eds. *Reminiscences*. By Thomas Carlyle. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1997.
- . “Robert Scott Tait: His Portraits and Photographs of the Carlyles in their ‘A Chelsea Interior.’” *Review of Scottish Culture* 13 (2000): 112–16.
- . “The Sceptical Carlyles and the Unitarian Mrs. Gaskell.” *Gaskell Society Journal* 6 (1992): 42–57.
- . “Scottish Historical Portraits: An Address by Thomas Carlyle, Written by K. J. Fielding.” National Portrait Gallery of Scotland, 5 April 2001. Unpublished MS. 1–15.
- . “Thackeray and ‘The Great Master of Craigenputtoch’: A New Review of *The Life of John Sterling*—and a New Understanding.” *Victorian Literature and Culture* 27 (1999): 307–14.
- Froude, James Anthony. *Thomas Carlyle*. 4 vols. London: Longmans, Green, 1882, 1884.
- Jewsbury, Geraldine Endson. *The Half Sisters*. London: Chapman and Hall, 1848.
- [Phillips, Samuel]. “The Life of *John Sterling*.” *Times* 1 November 1851: 7.
- Tait, Robert. *A Chelsea Interior*. Carlyle House, London.
- [Thackeray, William Makepeace]. “Carlyle’s Life of *Sterling*.” *Leader* 2 (1851): 1066–67.
- Thackeray, William Makepeace. *Henry Esmond*. London: Smith, Elder, 1852.