

Lamotte, to the unlucky German jeweller with his trivial ambition or the scoundrelly gendarme and his co-conspirators, are all harmonized into one connected bit of life. Their relation to the main theme, and their consequent interaction is never out of sight. The unity the novelist affects shows itself inevitably in the conscientious historian.

Again, his demands are precise with regard to delineation of character. The historian must present a living unity not a catalogue of attributes, and for this purpose should employ characteristic incidents rather than descriptive epithets. His own application of the method may be found in its most condensed form in the Kings of Norway. Very sketchy indeed is the portrait of Harold Fairhair. Yet in the few bare incidents of his winning of Gyda, his prompt steps to avenge Rolf the Ganger's raid, his choice of an adviser and disposition of the latter's succession after his murder, and his rough humorous defiance of English Athelstan, we have outlined to the life the bold, unquenchable barbarian touched by that spark of imaginative vigor which was needed to create a king among a race of pirate-princes. On the other hand his portrait of Olaf Tryggvesson, more highly wrought and that with affectionate care, does not adhere to rule, is not so *living*. Incidents there are which justify a reputation for courage, even for generosity, as his forbearance towards Ironbeard's daughter, his would-be murderess; but none that show the hero a "witty, jocund man," as his biographer pronounces him, "of joyful, cheery temper," with "a bright, airy, wise way of speech." While such multiplied laudations as: "a great, wild, noble soul;" "a magnificent, far-shining man;" "a high, true, great human soul," remind the reader by contraries of their author's pronouncement in his Essay on Burns, that "it is exposition rather than admiration our readers require of us."

But apart from Carlyle's theory of historical writing and his more or less correspondence to it, it may not be unfitting to refer to one or two out of many points which strike his reader as characteristic of the man's method of writing history. In the first place, then, I think that every unscholarly member of the reading public who takes up, say, his French Revolution, will agree with me that we should enjoy it more if we only knew