

May 20th 07.

June 1st 07.

Spain), and others objected for the sake of quarrelling. Thus the young king's early years were years of storm. Blanche, by diplomatic means, staved off three impending crises. In 1242 Louis repelled the English invasion under Henry III., and in the following year order was so completely restored that the barons ceased from any undertakings against the king. He had a bias for the cloister, for religious exercises and humble service. He not only ministered to the poor, but tended the most repulsive leper that could be found. He loved long sermons, and he mortified the flesh in order to quicken the spiritual life. He would lash himself with chains, or induce another to lash him. In 1245 he fell so ill that preparations were actually made for his burial. But he recovered, and announced that he had decided to go on a crusade. He went to Cyprus, but delayed there too long, giving the Turks time to organise their forces. He sailed with 1,600 ships, conveying 50,000 men with horses and equipments to Damietta, where he delivered a speech to the troops, telling them that if defeated they would be martyrs, and if victorious it would be to the glory of God, and also of France and Christendom. News that the Sultan had been murdered caused the army of the Turks to fly panic-stricken from Damietta. Louis was wrong in taking the most direct route to Cairo. The Nile was in flood, and the weather was hot. The Turks simply flooded a passage behind him, and he was caught like a rat in a trap. He fell ill, and capitulated, restoring Damietta, and paying the sum of £400,000. Louis was a failure in the Holy Land. The crusading enthusiasm had worked itself out in the generality of the people. When he returned to France he was exhorted by Brother Hugh to "do justice to the people." Louis asked the preacher to court, but the latter declined. However, Louis never forgot this advice. He constituted himself a court of appeal, open even to the poorest. He struggled to give equal justice to all, even when it meant parting with his own will. He leaned to the general view of the time that heresy was a crime, and that a heretic could not be a good citizen. He said that no clerk, unless he were very clever ought to dispute with a heretic—but a layman ought to thrust his sword as deeply as possible into the infidel's body. Louis was a persecutor—he used the pillory and the branding-iron, but it was from an intense desire to secure the safety of men's souls. Sir Thomas More, and Queen Mary of England persecuted from the same high motives. Louis had an exquisite sense of duty, and a delicate conscience. He leaned to fanaticism, but he preferred death to dishonor. He was a contemporary of the great Frederic II., but he maintained his power longer than Frederic. He became the arbiter of Europe, and he settled quarrels between England and the Continental Powers, and between the Emperor and the Pope. He was a failure as a military commander, but he made his country one of the most powerful in Europe. Sometimes he did not discern what his duty was, but he never lacked a sense of duty. He was the meekest man in his realm, and yet one of the most powerful sovereigns in Europe, brave in the field, gentle in the home, a shield of the poor, a scourge of the cruel and the base. Gibbon has described him as "a king, a hero, and a man." (Applause).

At the close of the lecture portraits of Louis and Queen Blanche were thrown on the screen, together with maps, and views of "Crusaders on board ship," "The Battle of Mansourah," "The death of Louis," and other pictures. To-morrow (Friday) the first lecture on "Hamlet" will be given.

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES

The Town Hall was crowded last night when Professor Henderson delivered the first of a series of lectures on "Hamlet." He said that they were to consider some aspects of the Shakespearean drama, as seen in "Hamlet." Literary men once looked on Homer as the greatest figure, but now they were inclined to give the first place to William Shakespeare. "Hamlet" was not necessarily the finest of Shakespeare's plays, but it was the most famous, and the most interesting of them all. Furness wrote: "No one of mortal mould, save Him

... "Whose blessed feet were nailed For our advantage to the bitter cross" ever commanded such absorbing interest as this Hamlet, the mere creation of a poet's brain." Coleridge said that the character must have some connection with the fundamental laws of our nature. Most French writers thought that Hamlet was Shakespeare himself—this was a testimony to the human interest of the character. The German writer, Freilgarth held that "Germany was Hamlet"—Hazlitt that "we were Hamlet." He (the lecturer) would say—"If you desire to know yourself, study the character of Hamlet." The struggle between will and fate belonged to the history of all. Tonight they were to consider not the character, or the tragedy, but the language of "Hamlet."—Shakespeare's power over words, and his use of words. In this play he had given us the verb "to illumine," and the noun "control," and in his phrase "to out-Herod Herod," he had given us a hint for making compound words. Many familiar phrases came from this play—"For this relief much thanks," "more in sorrow than in anger," "wild and whirling words," "the time is out of joint," "to be or not to be," "to thine own self be true," "more matter and less art," "metal more attractive," "the lady doth protest too much," "sweets to the sweet," "the rest is silence." Many proverbs came from "Hamlet," e.g., "A man may smile and smile and be a villain"—"there needs on ghost come from the grave to tell us this"—"there are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in our philosophy"—"conscience doth make cowards of us all"—"there's a divinity that shapes our ends." The lecturer then dealt with the "emotional connotation" of words, showing the fitness of the expressions "the air bites shrewdly"—"it is the witching hour"—"the sheeted dead did squeak and gibber." There were more beautiful metaphors in "Hamlet" than in any other play in the language. In the first quarto (1603) the Ghost's injunction that the Queen was not to be punished ran thus:—

... "Leave her to heaven,
And to the burden that her conscience bears."

In the second quarto (1604)—our "Hamlet"—the metaphor was effectively changed:—

"Leave her to heaven
And to those thorns that in her bosom lodge
To prick and sting her."

Sometimes metaphors were used for the purpose of condensation, as in the King's prayer, "Help angels! Make assay"—a metaphor from bowls. Shakespeare could idealise the commonplace, as in his allusion to the morn "in russet mantle clad," and in the famous lines about the crowing of the cock, which he had the "literary temerity" to associate with a most sacred theme—the birth of Christ. What a world this must have been to Shakespeare, who could make so much out of the apparently trivial! Shakespeare understood how to generate a

suitable literary atmosphere by means of the swing and cadence of his lines. The atmosphere of "Hamlet" was grey and cold, suited for tragedy and melancholy. Finally, the lecturer analysed the opening scene of the play (as far as the first entry of the ghost), showing how carefully, and yet indirectly, Shakespeare prepared the minds of the spectators, so that they might receive the ghost with due seriousness—if the ghost's message was received with ridicule, the play was a failure. Professor Henderson showed that Bernardo, having seen the ghost once, was nervous and ill at ease. Francisco, who had not seen it, was nevertheless "sick at heart"—a warning of impending evil. Horatio, the scholar, who was to speak to the ghost—it was thought necessary to address a ghost in Latin—was represented as incredulous, and thus he spoke of the ghost as "this thing." By way of contrast the lecturer then read the opening lines from the earlier play, "Tratricide Punished," in which everything was crude and obvious. The next lecture, on "The Character of Hamlet," will be delivered on Monday night.

June 4th 07.

PROFESSOR HENDERSON'S LECTURES

Last night at the Town-hall, Professor Henderson continued his series of Shakespearean lectures, his subject being "The Character of Hamlet." He said that it was a very difficult task to analyse and discourse on the character of Hamlet, and he approached it with considerable humility and deference, being aware that thousands had written on the subject, that no two had entirely agreed, and that even such writers as Coleridge and Goethe had failed to give satisfaction to the world of scholars. He would, however, endeavor to give the views of great writers, and the results of scientific research. To discuss the "madness" would take up too much time. He believed that Hamlet was suffering from a physical or nervous disease, known as "melancholia attonita," which might have developed into insanity, but though on the brink of madness Hamlet was never so mad as not to be responsible. "To decide that Hamlet was mad would be to sweep three-fourths of the population into the madhouse." Hamlet should be considered in his relation to the other characters of the play. A modern writer had said that "Hamlet was morality without action, Claudius was action without morality." This was an exaggeration, but it conveyed much truth. The most contradictory opinions had been urged with regard to Hamlet's character. Carl Rohrbach saw in him little more than a mere actor. This view was based on the words of Fortinbras, "Bear Hamlet, like a soldier to the stage" (the first quarto had "throne"). Rohrbach compared Hamlet to "a half-German professor, all tongue and no hand, like a dog, wagging his tail at the sound of his own barking." In 1875 Carl Werder startled a world which had been accustomed to think that Hamlet's weakness was procrastination, and that he should have taken revenge on the King at once. Werder's view was that Claudius, having been elected to the throne by the nobles, Hamlet could not at once carry out the Ghost's behest—if he did, how could he justify himself to the nobles? Hamlet had another task—to make the King confess—and therefore he assumed the role of madness that he might carry on his schemes without interference. He must "catch the conscience of the King," and he did so in the play scene. The next step was to withdraw the Queen from her allegiance to Claudius. Hamlet's tragic fault was that he was too rash. He killed Polonius in mistake for the King, and this led to Ophelia's madness and