

the sympathy. Toleration in matters of religion was then almost unknown, and the individual whose character they were about to consider had been described as a "saint on the Throne." Louis was born just when Francis of Assisi was rising towards the zenith of his fame. During his early years his mother, Queen Blanche, acted as Regent, and these years were years of storm. Great hostility was shown towards the Queen-Regent, and it was declared that "Satan himself had been let loose on the unfortunate kingdom." Diplomacy was first exercised by the Queen, but a resort to arms became imperative, and the kingdom was restored to order after an insurrection had been quelled in 1242. Meanwhile another voice had been calling to Louis. The King showed a bias for the cloister. He found the greatest delight in religious exercise, and indulged in the severest spiritual discipline. He chose for his administrations a most repulsive leper, and fed and washed and tended him in order to learn the virtue of humility. At that time the emaciated monk was the ideal human being, and Louis believed in mortifying the flesh in order that his spiritual life might be quickened. He used to lash himself with chains until the blood flowed, and when he was too weak the chastisement was inflicted by a brother, who, we were told, "lay on strenuously." He fell ill in 1245, and then came the great crisis of his life. On his recovery Louis told his people he had decided to go on a crusade. They would follow him that evening on this most disastrous enterprise. It was one thing to have spiritual ideals, but it was another thing to be a successful administrator who, to reach the end of organised effort, must display the qualities of a leader. In some respects Louis was a leader, but from the military point of view he was a failure so far as this crusade was concerned, although in his early years he had gained considerable warlike experience. Louis went with his men to Cyprus, where he delayed a long time, and Napoleon had criticised his conduct here. While he lay there he gave the Turks an opportunity to organise their forces and to get ready for the onslaught. After a stay of six months at Cyprus 1,600 ships conveyed 50,000 men with horses and necessary equipment to Damietta, near the mouth of one of the streams of the delta of the Nile. The Turks still held Jerusalem and the East, and it was necessary to deliver an indirect attack through Cairo. The Turks were lined up along the strand, and numbers of French nobles rushed against them single-handed, exclaiming, "Who will come with me and breakfast in Paradise?" These men believed in heaven and hell in a way he thought we did not do now. The crusader could not lose. If he died it was "Paradise," and if he won it was "the honour of Christendom." Louis was successful at Damietta and set out for Cairo. Napoleon, in his campaign, landed west of Alexandria, avoiding the streams of the delta, and came in upon Cairo by way of the desert. That was a good route, but it was not the best Napoleon could have taken, because he found himself on the wrong side of the Nile. There was another route, which was known before the time of King Louis, and that was to land on the eastern side of the delta, march southwards, and then turn inwards towards Cairo. Lord Wolseley avoided all the streams of the delta, proceeded in a south-westerly direction towards Cairo, met the enemy, and defeated them at Tel-el-Kebir, and remained on the Cairo side of the Nile. Louis determined, with all the directness of a religious enthusiast or reformer, to go straight to his goal. The Nile was in flood, and when the Turks found Louis among the streams they cut a passage behind him, flooded that, and the King was caught like a "mouse in a trap." The sufferings of his men were terrible, and Louis was forced to capitulate. He went to the Holy Land, but eventually returned to France. The enterprise was a great failure, but it must be borne in mind that even in Richard's time, in 1192, the crusading spirit had largely worked itself out. One of the noblest characteristics of King Louis

was his wonderful struggle in those far-off times to deal out equal justice to all sorts and conditions of men. He constituted himself a court of appeal and the porrest man in the land knew he had a right to put his case before the King. His position in regard to the church, against which he was ready to maintain his rights, was interesting by reason of his attitude towards its creed. It must be remembered in justice to King Louis that toleration was a late acquirement in the history of nations, and Louis inclined to the view that a man could not be a heretic and a good citizen. He went so far as persecution. He had such an intense desire to save men's souls that he was prepared to go to such lengths to prevent them doing what he believed would end in the destruction of their souls. They had other instances of persecution from motives like those. When Sir Thomas More was in power at a much later stage he favoured uniformity rather than toleration, and Mary, Queen of England, acted from high motives when she sanctioned persecution. Louis had an exquisite sense of duty and a most delicate conscience. He leant on the side of fanaticism in regard to persecution and his crusading enterprise. He was more afraid of spiritual than of physical risk. Louis was, in the language of the time, "a man of God," and he became one of the most powerful men in Europe. He was the contemporary of Frederick II., that mighty ruler, fighter, and legislator, and maintained his power and position longer. Frederick II. was considered a heretic, and men shrank from him as from a disease, whereas Louis was the embodiment of that which most of the people believed. Louis became the arbiter of Europe, and that raised France to a position of eminence. The spirit of nationalism was growing, and one of the most glorious epochs in the history of the country was the history of Louis IX. Singularly pure-minded, whose most striking quality was a sensitive moral conscience, sometimes lacking ability to discern what duty was, but never lacking in a sense of duty, victimised to some extent by religious fanaticism, yet owing to religion all that was noblest and most inspiring in his character—a monk in sympathy, but a king for duty's sake, the meekest man in his realm, and one of the most power-

ful, if not the most powerful, sovereigns in Europe; brave as a lion in the field, and gracious and gentle in his home; the shield of the poor, the friend of the just, the scourge of the cruel and the base—such was the sainted administrator whom Gibbon had described as "a king, a hero, and a man." (Applause.)

Lantern views, including portraits of Louis and his contemporaries, and maps illustrating points in the lecture, were thrown on the screen. The next lecture—the first of three lectures on Hamlet—will be delivered to-morrow (Friday) evening.

June 1st 07.

## UNIVERSITY EXTENSION LECTURES.

### "HAMLET."

The first of three lectures on "Hamlet and the Shakespearean Drama" was delivered by Professor Henderson in the Town Hall last night. Large as the audiences were at the three preceding lectures, they were exceeded by the attendance last night.

Professor Henderson said he proposed in a series of three lectures to consider some aspects of the Shakespearean drama as they found it illustrated in "Hamlet." He had chosen "Hamlet" not necessarily because he thought it was the finest specimen of Shakespeare's art, but because it was the

most famous. He would assume that they had all read "Hamlet," and this could not but prove helpful to a lecturer. There was something in "Hamlet" which suggested the deepest problems they could wrestle with concerning human nature. "The character of Hamlet," said Coleridge, "must have some connection with the fundamental laws of our nature." The human interest in Hamlet was extraordinary. The French writers said "Hamlet is Shakespeare." The Germans had come to another conclusion. Freilgrath declared "Germany is Hamlet." Hazlitt went further and said, "It is we who are Hamlet." This struggle between will and fate belonged not only to the history of Hamlet; it belonged to the history of us all; hence the work of Shakespeare was eternal—so wrote Victor Hugo. He proposed in that lecture to consider Shakespeare's power over words, and to show what was meant by dramatic language. He wondered if they realised how much of our ordinary everyday speech we derived from "Hamlet." It required as a rule a great genius to introduce a word into a language and to make it live, and it needed a great event in the history of a nation to add to the vocabulary of a people. It would appear that the words "commandeer" and "slim" were to survive the Boer war. "Hamlet" gave us, amongst others, the word "illuminate," and we further got from Shakespeare a hint in the use of combined words such as "to out-Herod Herod." We now spoke of those who would "out-Darwin Darwin." If we turned to the text of "Hamlet" we would further find what were now household expressions and proverbs. It was not enough, however, to get the right word etymologically. There was an "emotional connotation" of words—words which had acquired a certain feeling. In Shakespeare they found words which conveyed an emotional suggestion and prepared them for what was to follow. To pass from the proper use of words to the use of figures, "Hamlet" abounded in metaphors which were the most important figures, and included simile, antithesis, and personification. This device by which the author heightened the effect of his words required a ready imagination in order to construct the images and make them definite in a moment. Shakespeare by a resort to metaphor could idealise the trivial and the commonplace. There was something more difficult than figure of speech in literary work—something absolutely essential to dramatic literature. He meant "literary atmosphere." There was a distinct "atmosphere" in all Shakespeare's work. The atmosphere for "Romeo and Juliet" was warm, for the scene was in Italy and there was plenty of sunshine and bright moonlight which they wanted for lovers. In "Hamlet" it was different. There was the gray atmosphere of the north, fit for ghosts, for melancholy, for tragic events. Good writing was not only a matter of intellect or of art, but it was a matter of soul. "As a quality of style," said Walter Pater, "soul is a fact." Unless the author could stand soul to soul with his reader he would not succeed. If he breathed the breath of life into his pages that breath would come back to the reader if he understood. The right choice of words and of detail and the necessary swing and movement would generate a certain atmosphere. To illustrate what was meant by dramatic language, the lecturer read an extract from the opening scene in "Hamlet." If, he said, the ghost excited ridicule, the play would be a failure, and Shakespeare used all his art in the creation of the necessary atmosphere for the entrance of the ghost. The readers who quietly followed the dramatist's choice of words and psychological preparation for the appearance of the ghost might themselves feel a creepy sensation coming over them. That was Shakespeare's art. (Applause.)

The subject of the next lecture, which will be delivered on Monday evening, will be "The Character of Hamlet."