Among his first articles were those contributed to Brewster's Endinburgh Encyclopædia. A few years, after he commenced his *Life of Schiller;* which work also met with much favor. Several years after appeared his *Sartor Resartus*, which is generally acknowledged to be his ablest work.

Perhaps we cannot give a better idea of Mr. Carlyle's manner of life, than by quoting the following extract from his letters to Goethe, the great German bard:

"Two ponies which carry us everywhere, and the mountain air, are the best medicines for weak nerves. This daily exercise, to which I am much devoted, is my only dissipation; for this nook of ours (Craigenputtoch) is the lonliest in Britain,—six miles removed from everyone who in any case might visit me."

Mr Carlyle opens his History with a discussion of the character of Louis XV, and, unlike most historical writers, instead of begining with the causes that produced a certain effect, and gradually unfolding their progress; or of giving a connected series of facts, he takes up some of the characters or principles that led to the results, discusses their nature, shows what part they bore in influencing and shaping what was to follow; so that it can hardly be called a history according to the common acceptation of the word; but rather a collection of observations and speculations, or moralizations upon the various themes which bear closely upon the subject. In this respect Mr. Carlyle is thoroughly original, differing widely, in his method of treatment, from all other writers of his age; the most prominent among whom are, Macaulay, Motley, Froude, and Bancroft of this country; most of these being easy, entertaining writers, while Carlyle is just the opposite; his writings being very difficult to read with any degree of ease and rapidity. Each sentence has to be carefully analyzed, in order to bring out the meaning; and sometimes even then it is almost impossible to determine the thought.

One fault with Mr. Carlyle is his constant employment of words of his own coining; sometimes implying considerable knowledge of philology on the part of the reader to understand. As examples of some we give the following: "eleutheromaniac," "simulacrum," "unveracity," "philosophedom;" in some the meaning is evident from the parts of which the word is composed; in others, it is not.

To the ordinary mind he seems to have lost all idea of perspicuity, or of making himself intelligible to his reader; but rather to have written for his own gratification than to benefit his fellowmen. As to the value and importance of this book, and Carlyle's works in general, perhaps we cannot better express our ideas than in the words of a writer in the London *Quarterly Review* for 1840:

"Mr Carlyle—an astute and trenchant critic might, with show of justice, remark—assumes to be the reformer, and castigator of his age—a reformer in philosophy, in politics, and in religion, denouncing its mechanical method of thinking, deploring its utter want of faith, and threatening political society, obstinately deaf to the voice of wisdom, with the retributive horrors of repeated revolution, and yet neither in philosophy, in religion, nor in politics has Mr. Carlyle any distinct dogma, creed, or constitution to promulgate. He is anything but a man of practical utility. Setting aside his style for the present, let us see whether he has ever in the course of his life thrown out a single hint which could be useful to his own generation, or profitable to those who may come after. If he could originate any such hint, he does not possess the power of embodying it in distinct language. He has written a history of the French Revolution, a pamphlet on Chartism, a work on Heroes and Hero-worship, and a sort of political treatise entitled, "Past and Present." Can any living man point to a single practical passage, in any of these volumes? If not, what is the real value of Mr. Carlyle's writings! What is Mr. Carlyle, himself, but a phantasm of the species he is pleased to denounce."

GALE.