

The chief headings of his rule were Chastity, Obedience, Poverty, just as in other orders; but poverty had a fuller and more emphatic meaning to him than it had to them. Poverty was the distinguishing characteristic of his organisation, and when he went to see the Pope two great ideals stood face to face in the church for the first time. Francis represented one, the Pope the other. There were those in the world, said the lecturer, who preferred keeping themselves apart from every material influence and consideration, relying absolutely on the power within them, so that their ideal standard might not be lowered, and that sense of communion within themselves with all that was highest and best might not be lost. The other ideal was different. Its upholders recognised that they lived in a workaday world, and must take men and women as they found them. You might have ideals, these would say, but to realise them you must have power—monetary or political power—you must use levers; and for that reason they were willing to run risks which the others thought so dangerous. Both divisions might be right, and both might be found in the one church. Francis did not claim from the Pope a privilege, but a sanction—a sanction to follow his own ideals. Those ideals were three in number. First of all, he wished to be at peace with his neighbor—and in those days of military violence and persecution the aspiration had a more impressive significance than it could have now. His second great ideal was labor. His life was one long struggle in the uplifting of humanity, and the charge that had been levelled against him of encouraging by his example the swarms of beggars that still infest Italy was absolutely untrue. The modern Francisians in Italy, said the lecturer, did not understand what the life of the great founder of their Order meant. He begged merely as a spiritual exercise and when the labor of his hands could not procure him a meal, and not so that he might lead a lazy life. There was a vast difference between the modern Italian beggar and the man who did it to keep himself humble. His third ideal was poverty, which he considered the special way to salvation. His food was of the poorest, his clothing of the meanest, his lodging a hole in the ground. When one of his followers, in answer to a question, replied that he had just come from his (Francis's) cell, he did not care to go back to it, because it had been called his cell. His idea of poverty did not mean merely getting away from material possessions, for he refused every sort of privilege, holding it to lead only to pride. Before dying he solemnly interdicted his followers from asking any privilege of Rome, even for their personal security. Neither would he have anything to do with glory, "that last infirmity of noble minds," because it conflicted with his notion of poverty. He even denounced learning of a certain kind—the kind which made men superior in tone, exclusive, supercilious. That was no real education at all. True education made a man more sympathetic and open-hearted; and what Francis was afraid of was that superciliousness of mind which was one of the greatest barriers to progress and true education. He feared, too, that his followers would content them-

selves with knowing about things rather than with doing things. True education, Professor Henderson said, was an equipment for performance. Men trying to realise their personal ambitions, continued the lecturer, often found the sky growing black and gloomy over them; but by following an impersonal one, they found everything becoming brighter and clearer, and learned to realise themselves. Francis realised that material possessions made a difference between man and man, and he wished his Order to be absolutely democratic. By poverty he enriched his own inward life and inner nature. People so thoroughly trusted him that his Order had two million adherents before his early death. By giving up all his possessions he found he had got the best thing life had to offer—the love and confidence of his fellow-men. Poverty enabled the brothers to mingle with the poor on equal terms and associate with them without embarrassment; and the

mind of Francis in particular was, as had been well said, by it left "perfectly free to enjoy those hidden treasures which Nature reserves for the pure idealist." Those people who ridiculed and laughed at Francis and his ideals should remember that in censuring him they were censuring Christianity itself, for he had made a strenuous attempt to realise in his own person the doctrines contained in the Sermon on the Mount. Those doctrines might be impracticable, but it was good to reflect that one human being had regulated his conduct by them and had passed his life in promulgating them by his example. (Loud applause.)

May 30th 07.

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES.

LOUIS IX., OF FRANCE.

Professor Henderson delivered the third and final historical lecture of his series in the Town-hall last night in the presence of an audience which filled the building. The first lecture on "Hamlet" will be given to-morrow night.

Louis IX. of France, generally known as St. Louis, was, said Professor Henderson, a contemporary of Francis of Assisi. His father had been engaged in a crusade against the Albigenses, persecuting them for what he considered duty's sake before he died. His mother, Blanche of Castile, acted as Regent during his early years, which were years of storm and tumult—years when, as it had been said, it seemed as if Satan himself had been let loose in France. His inclination was to become a monk, but his sense of duty impelled him to remain a king. All the same, he availed himself of the spiritual discipline of doing humble service in a monastery, choosing as his particular care a leper, and doing the most repulsive things for him. He strongly believed in mortifying the flesh in order that the spiritual life might be quickened, and both flagellated himself and got one of the Brothers to flagellate him when he himself was too weak to do it properly. The Brother, it is good to know, acquitted himself of his task in the most conscientious manner. Under the severity of this discipline the King became ill, and at the crisis of his malady was given up for dead. But he came to again, and announced his unshakable resolve to conduct a crusade to the Holy Land. This enterprise was taken in hand, in spite of strenuous opposition, but proved a disastrous failure. It had come to be recognised by then that Jerusalem could not be taken by direct approach, so Louis, after delaying long enough at Cyprus to let the Turks make complete preparations to withstand him, landed at Damietta, on one of the deltas of the Nile. The enemy was drawn up on the shore, and the Christians advanced in the most impetuous and reckless manner to meet them. Instant disaster must have been the result had it not been for a providential rumor spreading amongst the Turks that their Sultan had been killed. This induced the heathen to withdraw, and the invaders effected a landing in safety. This security was of very short duration, however, as Louis, resolving to move direct to his objective, exposed his army in the most imprudent manner, and the Turks cut a passage behind him in such a way as to flood them all in. After scenes of the most appalling misery the King was obliged to capitulate, but upon his paying a ransom of £400,000 he was allowed to proceed to the Holy Land. He did nothing there, however, and the whole enterprise resulted in a ghastly failure. There were reasons, said the lecturer, why failure was inevitable, quite apart from the military in-

aptitude of Louis. The old crusading spirit had weakened, if not vanished, as he had explained in dealing with Richard I. The King ultimately returned to France, and there distinguished himself by the probity of his life and the justice and firmness of his rule. One of his noblest characteristics was the effort he made to deal out equal justice to all, irrespective of condition or influence. It said much for him that he would not allow even his own brother to have any advantages over his poorer adversaries in a suit between them. As for his religion, he was one of those who believed that no one who was a heretic could be a good citizen, and was always prepared to use the sword against schismatics. Whenever spiritual risks came to be weighed in the balance with physical risks he would take the latter. Some of the finest men even in a much later and more enlightened age—Sir Thomas More, for instance—favored uniformity at all costs, instead of toleration; and Queen Mary herself, when she persecuted her heterodox subjects acted from the highest motives. And so it was with St. Louis. The Pope had more than once to restrain his ardor, and tell him he was going too far. Still, he had the most exquisite sense of duty and the most delicate of consciences; and yet he leaned to the side of fanaticism, which Michelet said was indeed his most striking characteristic. He became known throughout Europe as the Man of God, and wielded a tremendous influence in his time. He was the general arbiter of nations, arbitrating even between England and the Pope. By these means he raised France to a commanding position, and one of the most glorious epochs in the history of that country was the reign of Louis IX. Professor Henderson concluded by reading a peroration on the character of his subject, and quoted Gibbon's declaration that Louis was "a king, a hero, and a man." (Applause.)

June 4th 07

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES.

THE CHARACTER OF HAMLET.

Opinions may differ as to Professor Henderson's qualifications as a lecturer, but there can be no doubt of his power to hold the interest of an average audience for the whole of an hour and a quarter. He certainly does not impress one as a man of strikingly original thought, but he had a considerable talent for condensing and giving expression to the thought of other men. His reading has been wide, and his interest in the subjects he has been speaking about in Perth is deep. Two of the historical lectures were disappointing, but it is quite different with his discourses on Hamlet. We now have in this city a Shakespeare Society, and people who would otherwise find their interest in Shakespeare, or any other literary or aesthetic subject, too languid for silent individual study, may derive much advantage from it. For such people Professor Henderson's lectures on Hamlet must have a very distinct value, for there is a system and method about his way of dealing with his subject which is naturally not very commonly to be observed in people who are not trained educationalists. The audience at last night's lecture completely filled the Town-hall, and its approbation of what it heard was unmistakable.

Having dealt with the language of the tragedy in the preceding lecture, Professor Henderson last night devoted his attention to an analysis of some of the principal features of Hamlet's character. The most interesting observation he had to offer was his opinion that most of the critics and commentators have held a very exaggerated notion of Hamlet's tenderness. Professor Henderson