THE MOST FAMOUS TRAGEDY.

CHARACTER OF HAMLET.

LECTURE BY PROSOFY HENDERSON.

A quarter of an hour before Professor Henderson began his Hamlet lecture last evening, there was a vacant seat in the Prince of Wales Theatre—a testimony first to the reputation of the speaker and secondly to the popular appeal of the Esplanade drama. Illuminating studies like these stimulate interest in the art of the stage, revealing unrivalled beauty in language, and bringing out in the characters the geniuses of the great poet-artists. People of the highest type, the tips of a cultured student, and the announcement that no more tickets could be had for the present, occasioned considerable disappointment. The repeat lectures will not wholly obviate the want, University authorities that in future Professor Henderson must have a bigger building for his conclusion, certainly do not suggest to engage the Town hall for the next gathering as a happy one.

On Tuesday night, when the audience included Mrs. Henderson, the Governor and Lady Hamilton, the lecture was received with enthusiasm. The introduction of the subject by the observation that many of the laws and maxims of the great Hamlet were so applicable to the present day, was a most timely hint to the recent consideration of Hamlet's character. Carl Rohrbach found the explanation in that remarkable page—"Hamlet like a soldier (not as a soldier) to the stage; for had he been placed there, he would have called him to the stage instead of the throne; he would have proved most royally." To Rohrbach therefore it was a truth, that was an actor who would have done well in the part of Hamlet, in action he was a failure, and to no one of that stage, of that era, of that character was a "sort of German half-professor, all tongue and no hand, for ever cackling and bawling, nothing but a dog wagging his tail at the sound of his own barking." The best answer was that the world was to be represented in a character—David Werder took the opposite view, and so that critic held second place among interpreters of Hamlet's character: they must take him seriously, Werder would have him remember the extraordinary difficulty of the task. "Hamlet's aim is not the crown, nor is it his first duty to that, but to his father, to remove the murderer of his father, unassailable as that murder is in the eyes of the world, and to satisfy the desires of the righteousest of this procedure." The tragic fault was to be found in rashness rather than excess of meditation. There was nothing that played to lead them to believe that Hamlet after all was Polonius. "Polonius wanted anything but personal revenge, Goethe had said—"Here is an oak tree, planted in the olden time, which should have received into its bosom only lovely flowers; the roots spread out, the vase is shattered to pieces. Not so, but the way that Hamlet was a Prince of noble nature, whose manner of grace and culture could have been improved for the best, to which he lived and moved. But a terrible task was imposed upon him, and the effort, to perform it shatter his manhood violently. The point was more definitely put in the great soliloquy."

Character was formed of its own will. And thus the nature of the action, the character of the Stanley, the man who could not be brought to any conclusion, was the same, the same through to a finish. Hamlet failed in the highest form of action, which was based upon the decisive problem. The point was more definitely put in the great soliloquy.

Was this coincidence due to a用餐, or to the fact that the man who could not be brought to any conclusion, was the same character of Stanley? The man who could not be brought to any conclusion, was the same character of Stanley. The man who could not be brought to any conclusion, was the same character of Stanley.