"Sartor Resartus" is recently recognized as a significant piece anticipating major philosophical

and cultural developments, from existentialism to post modernism.

His major works include "Signs of the Times", "Sartor Resartus", "The French

Revolution", "On Heroes, Hero worship and The Heroic in History", "Past and Present" etc.

He is associated with the Victorian literature. It refers to English literature during the

reign of Queen Victoria (1837-1901). He was an extremely long-lived Victorian author. The

writing of this era reflected the transformations in most aspects of English life, such as scientific,

economic and technological advances to changes in class structures and the role of religion in

society

**Critical Essay of Thomas Carlyle: The Hero as Poet**

 Like most nineteenth century historians and philosophers, Carlyle promotes the notion that progress is good and inevitable; unlike many of his contemporaries, however, he does not believe that the passage of time in and of itself assures progress. Only when persons of heroic temperament step forward to lead the masses can true progress for society occur. The persons featured in On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History were just such people; their actions, and their willingness to live in accordance with the vision of society that motivated them, changed history for the better. Carlyle finds no one around him acting in a way to set his own age right; given to commercialism and self-gratification, the people of nineteenth century Europe lack the will or the leadership to make something worthwhile of their lives. If his work is not totally successful in conveying a portrait of heroism good for all times, it does succeed in showing Carlyle’s disenchantment with the nineteenth century and its lack of heroes.  
  
Carlyle’s basic idea is that all history is the making of great persons, gifted with supreme power of vision or action. It thus becomes one’s duty to “worship Heroes.” We all of us reverence and must ever reverence Great Men: this is, to me, the living rock amid all the rushing-down whatsoever; the one fixed point in modern revolutionary history, otherwise as if bottomless and shoreless.  
In the world of onrushing liberalism and industrialism, with the memory of God ever dimming through the growth of science and scepticism, Carlyle needs a faith and develops one based on the worship of great men.  
  
This faith, dubious enough under restrictions of law and order, not to mention the existence of great women, becomes even more dubious as handled by Carlyle. As the six lectures progress, he moves from myth to history with no clear distinction. He offers leaders of religious movements, great poets, and military conquerors as equally great or heroic. Hero worship not only should be devout; it actually was. In Carlyle’s estimation, love of God is virtually identical with loyalty to a leader. Despite his scorn for business activity and its operators, Carlyle’s heroes are all men of practical intelligence. He values the same kind of industriousness, resoluteness, and obvious sincerity that could serve to build economic as well as political or clerical empires.  
  
On May 12, 1840, Thomas Carlyle gave his third lecture in his series on Heroes. Titled "The Hero as Poet," it looked into the lives of Dante and Shakespeare. His previous lectures, he said, dealt with the production of older ages, "not be repeated in the new." Divinity as hero and prophet as hero would never happen again, he said. Mankind had advanced to the point where he no longer stooped to such low intellectual things. Or, "if we do not now reckon a Great Man literally divine, it is that our notions of God, of the supreme unattainable Fountain of Splendour, Wisdom, and Heroism, are ever rising higher...." Ah, but the poet! He believed we would always have poet-heroes. "...the hero...can be Poet, Prophet, King, Priest or what you will according to the kind of world he finds himself born into." Concerning the poet, what would it take to turn a poet into a hero—or maybe a hero into a poet. Carlyle says:   
                                               I confess, I have no notion of a truly great man that could not be all                                                       sorts of men. The Poet who could merely sit on a chair, and compose                                                     stanzas, would never make a stanza worth much. He could not sing the                                                 Heroic warrior, unless he himself were at least a Heroic warrior too. I                                                     fancy there is in him the Politician, the Thinker, Legislator,                                                                     Philosopher; in one or the other degree, he could have been, he is all                                                     these.  
So, he picks Dante and Shakespeare, not because of the greatness of their poetry, but because of the greatness of their lives. Or, perhaps he would say their poetry was great because they were great men and heroes, capable of fulfilling many roles in life. He doesn't completely dismiss aptitude, saying both of these men obviously had aptitude for poetry. And in good Carlylean characteristic, he can't help but bring Goethe into the equation when discussing aptitudes. I think, by the time I finish all of Carlyle's works, I shall be very tired of hearing about Goethe.  
  
Dante he (Carlyle) likes because he rose from some limitations to be able to write his book. Although he was born upper class, the political machinations of Florence drug him down. He was, however, a bright light in a dark age. His life was from 1265 and spanned a mere 56 years, into the next century, which was squarely in the Dark Ages (or Middle Ages if you prefer). Thus his accomplishment was even bigger because of these handicaps. And best of all, Dante was sincere in what he did. As mentioned before, sincerity is akin to greatness as the mark of the hero.   
  
Shakespeare, Carlyle says, "has given us the Practice of body" whereas Dante "has given us the Faith or soul." Shakespeare worked as the Renaissance was unfolding, which gave him advantages Dante didn't have. Although, Macaulay said that the mark of a greater poet was a great work produced in a civilised age. Easy for a poet to produce a great work in a dark age, harder in a civilised age. How exactly a civilised age is supposed to hinder a poet is something I haven't quite figured out, but I'm not calling Macaulay wrong. Shakespeare clearly wrote in an age more civilised than the age of Dante's labours. Those more astute than I will have to figure out which had the greater environmental handicap.  
  
Carlyle believes Shakespeare could have done so much more than he did, in terms of politics or public leadership. The greatness of his verse demonstrates this. In the end he says, "Yet Shakespeare was greater than Dante, in that he fought truly, and did conquer."  
  
As was his way, Carlyle did not confine himself to these two giants of the world of the poets. Goethe, as I already mentioned; Mirabeau, Tieck, and even Napoleon are all mentioned in almost the same breath as the hero as poet.

**ON Running After One’s Hat- G.K Chesterton**

In 'On Running After One's Hat' by G.K. Chesterton we have the topic of escape, humiliation and acknowledgement. Taken from his 'On Running After One's Hat and Other Whimsies' collection, after reading the essay, the reader understands that Chesterton might be investigating the topic of escape.  
  
For Chesterton, it is simpler to envision himself, what he acting as a kid would do with regards to the issue of burden. He accepts that an individual will be more joyful on the off chance that they change their viewpoint or view his/her life through the perspective of a kid when experiencing an inconvenience. Then, at that point, not exclusively will an individual resist the urge to panic yet they will regard each inconvenience as an experience, similarly as a youngster may.  
  
Chesterton is using the little boy at the train station for instance. The kid doesn't disapprove of the way that train is late. Maybe he considers everything to be the station as being superbly energizing. In spite of the fact that Chesterton may have a point, it very well may be critical to recall that numerous individuals will experience trouble taking a gander at life through the perspective of a youngster. Humiliation will surpass them and they will feel separated from the world, as numerous individuals who have pursued their caps may feel. It is this humiliation that an individual feels which will stop an individual pursuing their cap as they realize that those spectators who notice what's going on are giggling at the individual as opposed to with them, something that Chesterton doesn't specify in the essay.  
  
For Chesterton, life is essentially better when society brings down its defences and takes into account the person to act naturally without being obviously condemned by society. Society likes to snicker at the incidents that happen in a person's life. It assists society with diverting away from its own issues or stresses. It is simpler to giggle at someone else than to ponder one's own setbacks. Something that won't change paying little heed to Chesterton's statement that it is great to snicker at a man pursuing a hat. One point in which Chesterton may be correct is on the issue of men pursuing ladies. However, this demonstration might be considered by certain individuals as silly. It is regardless of society. So as such, it doesn't justify a similar consideration for other people. Individuals will see a man pursuing his hat faster than they will see a man pursuing a lady down the road.  
  
Chesterton may likewise be recommending that society should take a close look at itself and realign itself with his line of reasoning, which would be a romantic view on life that isn't really useful. Take the flooding in London for instance. For Chesterton, there is a level of fervour. Anyway, for the individuals who live in London, the flooding of their homes might be something that could be considered negative and expensive.  
  
It is additionally intriguing that Chesterton can part himself into two separate camps - the viewpoint of a youngster and the standpoint of a grown-up. Despite the fact that the reader is left pondering with regards to what may trigger Chesterton to see life through the eyes of a grown-up.  
  
Chesterton works on circumstances to keep a heartfelt view of life. It is something that may leave a few readers to propose that Chesterton is basically off-base on his standpoint. Life itself is certifiably not a basic matter and is in fact complicated by the man himself. Then again Chesterton's viewpoint has some legitimacy and might be helpful for individuals.  
  
Life can be a lot easier and less irritating should an individual be positive in their viewpoint paying little heed to the accidents they may bring about. A positive psyche will redress a negative circumstance faster than a negative brain will. In reality, an individual with a positive brain is hard to overcome. Despite the fact that looking after inspiration, while confronting antagonism can be troublesome. Something that Chesterton doesn't concede to nor does he consider it to be being significant.  
  
For Chesterton, inspiration is something that an individual can promptly turn on. The instance of Chesterton's companion and the cabinet is such a model. Chesterton essentially isn't being down to earth however his heartfelt view on life is excellent. He, at the end of the day, has not referenced whether he battles with regards to confessing to pursuing his cap. Chesterton has decided to look outside instead of inside. Something that society itself does.  
  
**Note:**“An inconvenience is only an adventure wrongly considered; an adventure is an inconvenience rightly considered." The statement is quoted by G.K. Chesterton in his essay, On Running After Ones’ Hat, 1908. The main theme of the essay is escapism. Each easily overlooked detail of trouble and burden should be taken with an idealistic standpoint in understanding G.K. Chesterton. Any circumstance being a burden is totally developed by one's psyche. All in all, an inconvenience is a burden in particular if the brain believes it to be so.