

the matter, so foreign to the whole fratricidal 'war' (as they call it); self-murder of a million brother Englishmen for the sake of sheer phantasms and totally false theories upon the Nigger, as I had reckoned it—and that probably I should do poor Davis nothing but harm.”

On the 15th of June, in the same year, Thompson makes another visit to Chelsea, when he saw Carlyle's brother and his niece, Mrs. Welsh. “Mr. Carlyle said it seemed to him men were bent on reversing the idea of a millennium, which was to lock up the devil a thousand years, and were going to give him a free passage to do his worst on the earth.”

A portion of Mr. Thompson's diary was edited and published by his friend Mrs. Elizabeth Stoddard, author of several vigorous novels, and wife of Richard Henry Stoddard, the poet. Thompson was a great deal at their house when he lived, after the war, in New York, as an associate editor of the *Evening Post*. Mrs. Stoddard mentioned to me an entry in the journal of a check, “the proceeds of a poem on the obsequies of General Stuart,” sent to me, but “never received.”

I explained to her that there was some mistake about this, since I have now in my album the letter accompanying the check sent as an offering to my work in the hospitals. Mr. Thompson was present at my marriage and wrote an account of it (strictly without names). He did not live long enough after that, poor fellow, in his adopted Northern home to become the frequenter of our house my husband and I would both have wished him to be, for a sweeter-tempered man and one more pleasingly in love with literature never lived, than he! (118–23)



Collecting the Letters of J. A. Froude

IN A FOOTNOTE ON PAGE 5 OF HIS SLIM VOLUME *FROUDE THE HISTORIAN* (1987), the late scholar A. H. Rowse informs us: “Froude's letters have never been collected, though many are quoted in W. H. Dunn, *James Anthony Froude: A Biography*. Oxford, 1961. I recommend their pursuit and publication to the indefatigable American editors of less rewarding letter-writers. Letters

to Caernarvon should be at Highclere, those to Lady Derby at Knowsley, to the Salisburys at Hatfield, etc.” Rowse’s list of private libraries is entirely speculative; consulting the search engines of National Register of Archives (UK), one finds a list of twenty five repositories immediately available to researchers.

On 23 April 1860, soon after the publication of volume 5 and 6 of his *History of England* and on his 42nd birthday, Anthony Froude’s wife Charlotte died, leaving him with the sole responsibility and management of their three children, aged 9, 7, and 6. Benumbed with grief, he made himself very busy in his work, then married his late wife’s dear friend Henrietta Warre and moved to London to start anew. There he reacquainted himself with the Carlyles and took on the editorship of *Fraser’s Magazine*, which he guided for the next fourteen years. Several recent occurrences have prompted fresh examination of the life and the times of James Anthony Froude, particularly the two decades between his relocation to Onslow Gardens, Kensington, and the death of TC on 5 February 1881. With the assistance of Ian Campbell, the editors of this journal have acquired from the Edinburgh University Library (EUL) copies of thirty nine letters from JAF to the American broker Charles Butler and have begun the process of transcription and annotation.

This project soon led to the 2005 biography of JAF by Julia Markus that is reviewed in this issue, and the Markus biography in turn led to close readings of earlier biographical studies by Herbert Paul, Waldo Dunn, and Rowse. Markus, too, noticed problems with JAF’s correspondence: that his handwriting was “atrocious” and that he seldom supplied a year in his datelines. The former is manageable with practice; after all, his many recipients were able to draw sufficient sense from his letters to pen answers to them. But the latter creates real trouble, for an accurate chronology is essential when arranging a sequence of letters. Events are seldom random, and they depend upon strict linear arrangement to make an accurate history with each action followed by its concomitant reaction.

The xerographic copies from Edinburgh have been difficult but not impossible to transcribe, and from the transcriptions a checklist with first lines has been constructed. Occasionally, internal evidence in the letters is sufficient for dating them, sometimes quite closely. On some of the others, the recipient

or Froude's assistant has added the date when received or the date when answered, or both. In addition, there are patterns in the imprinted return addresses that allow groupings: addresses printed flush right in sans serif, addresses printed on center in sans serif, addresses printed diagonally in a very ornate roman, and so forth. During this process, it became useful to compare the several collections of Froude letters held in holograph in the manuscript department of Perkins Library, Duke University. These revealed new clues intrinsic to the paper that is evident in the originals but not at all perceptible in xeroxes. It now appears that reexamining the EUL Froude letters in situ—added to the Duke letters and further specimens at the J. Pierpont Morgan Library, at the British Library, at the National Library of Scotland, and at the Huntington Library—may open up new forensic possibilities.

Of the 39 letters at the EUL, less than a quarter are directly pertinent to the Carlyles. Although the following example may have been written as early as 1879, it was likely written just over a month after the death of TC and within several days of the publication of *Reminiscences*, which was announced in *The Athenaeum* of 12 March 1881. In Ireland, the year was notable for the arrest of Michael Davitt, once a follower of the Chartist Ernest Jones and much later a source of inspiration to Gandhi. It was also the year of the passage—not disconnected—of a Land Act by the Gladstone government for the relief of disenfranchised Irish peasants. The illness of John Ruskin that Froude mentions was his second attack of madness (the first having occurred in 1878) that he experienced just two weeks after TC's death. The *ODNB* describes it thus: "Foreshadowed by troubling thoughts of Rose [La Touche], on 19 February 1881 Ruskin suffered a second and violent attack at Brantwood, and attendants had to be called. He recovered by 22 March, and spent the rest of the year at his house, doing little work, but spending freely on the guild."



March 14

My dear Mr Butler

Your letter crossed mine. Thank you again most heartily. I was ashamed of having given you so much trouble. A further dreadful thought has occurred to me. I fear my last letter was inadequately stamped. It lay with several others on my table and I am afraid may have been passed as an English one.— These [sic] did not need this aggravation— But you will pardon me I know.

We are in a strange state here. . Every day shows more clearly that our Premier did not understand Ireland when he legislated for it so hastily. . He was considering and consulting for the opinion of the world and the interests of the Liberal party in this country—the disease of the patient itself he tried to deal with according to general principles. . He would not recognise that Ireland after 7 centuries of misgovernment cannot be reconciled by concessions. The Irish people desire to be rid of us (no wonder) and every concession which diminishes the authority of the English “colony” there only strengthens at once their power and their determination. . Separation, or reconquest, are more plainly than ever the alternatives. My fear is that there will be more of the alternating policy which has done so much evil in the past. Gladstone will go out of office leaving the problem unsolved. The other party will come in and there will be a rebellion and the Liberal party in England will then side with the rebels. Constitutional Government in England itself is at stake. . When the mass of our people are made to see that the Liberal policy means disintegration of the Empire there will be a wild and blind and probably uncontrollable reaction. The Conservatives are no wiser than their antagonists. Carlyle alone in my opinion really understood the Signs of the present times.

You will soon see what I have to say about Carlyle. There will be more to follow.

You will be sorry to hear that my dear friend John Ruskin is very ill. . He is a man of true genius the most *gifted* perhaps of all his contemporaries. . He started in Life an only son, heir

of a large fortune with splendid talents. At 25 he had made a European reputation. His life has been spotlessly pure. He has been generous to excess, mostly disinterested in thought and action. Yet few men have been more unhappy—his home has been desolate. . He has instructed and delighted millions; and his own portion has been dust and ashes.

But I must not end in this melancholy tone.— The world (meaning its human inhabitants) is like the globe they occupy, in perpetual revolution between light and darkness. The sunlight will come around again, and the good seed which has been sown will then spring up & make itself seen. If it is dark here there is light yonder in the American Goshen. . May you live long to enjoy it and believe me yours most faithfully

J A Froude



An Afterword
 “Give Carlyle His Due”:
 Goldwin Smith, Thomas Carlyle, and
The Bystander

ON A VISIT TO BOSTON IN 1864, THE JOURNALIST, HISTORIAN, AND abolitionist Goldwin Smith (1823–1910) delivered an impassioned lecture, later published as *England and America* (1865), in which he congratulated the North for its resolute opposition to slavery and for its perseverance and fortitude in defending the great principle of human liberty. Smith saw the imminent triumph of the North as a vindication of Anglo-Saxon democracy, and a crushing repudiation of the hero-worshipping philosophy of Thomas Carlyle, who more than any other public figure had been responsible for swaying English opinion in favor of the South. For Smith, the inevitable defeat of the secessionists would also mark the nadir of Carlyle as a prophet and a sage. Yet this was not a conclusion that Smith especially savored. In the 1840s, he had been a member of the “Decade” debating group at Oxford, which included, among others, Matthew Arnold, Arthur Hugh