

the leading modern authorities. The lecture was rather for those who had not made a close study of the play. The chief point in which his presentation differs from the view generally held is his declining to recognize that if Hamlet had struck the king in the moment of opportunity, it could not have seemed to Denmark anything better than personal assassination. Hamlet was too scrupulous as to his good name and honor as his father's son to consent to stand in such a light before his people. But he does not know why he cannot seek vengeance as the ghost commanded. He has a nineteenth century mind, yet he does not know, as we should know, what influences held him back.

The principal proof of this is contained in the words of the ghost itself:

"But howsoever thou pursuest this act,
Taint not thy mind."

If the vengeance was to be but a personal assassination, if Hamlet's duty was to strike the king down anywhere or at any time, without reference to public sentiment, how could he taint his mind? Hamlet did not specifically bear these words in mind as spoken by the ghost, but was unconsciously subject to the same instincts in his own soul. Not until the king was openly detected in an act of villainy to cover his own crime did Hamlet feel that he could strike without taint to his honor. Yet even then until Horatio shall tell his story, reporting him and his cause aright to the unsatisfied, he feels that only a wounded name will live behind him.

Mr. Clapp dismissed the insanity theory as on its face untenable, since if true, it would have spoiled the play. Similarly, if Shakespeare really has made a hero that is that is not in intention and in his best ability heroic, he has certainly succeeded less than he should, or might. Hamlet is a "tragedy of thought;" that is, the tragedy consists in Hamlet's failure to interpret the antagonism he finds within himself between obligation imposed by the ghost to avenge his father and his obligation to himself. That is right

and true material for tragedy. The fact is, Mr. Clapp, while pronouncing Hamlet not only unheroic but contemptible, really confesses that in his feelings he finds him a hero all the while. He is all the time belaboring the man that is in fact his hero. Can a contemptible man inspire the emotion of the sublime? There is no question but that Hamlet is a sublime hero. Mr. Clapp's views upon Hamlet were held in the last generation but are not now generally accepted.

It is rather hard to interest people in a lecture on the "Merchant of Venice," as it requires previous study almost as much as some of the tragedies. The play is a comedy and the fifth act makes everything come out nice, a fitting consummation of the whole. Shakespeare's comedies are all light anyhow. A more satisfactory play might have been selected like "Lear" or "Macbeth." Ideas might have been given to many upon these profounder plays that they might not otherwise have reached.

FOOT-BALL.

NEBRASKA 6, ILLINOIS 0.

The University of Illinois were defeated in a well played game at Lincoln Park October 24th. It was the opening game of the season and a large crowd was present, Manager Johnston having advertised it well. The game showed up the playing abilities of the men. Taking their short term of training into consideration, they did remarkably well. It was the best game ever seen in Lincoln. Jones, J. G. Yont, Church, A. E. Yont, and in fact, the entire rush line, put up a very good game. Pace receives the ball well and his play was fine. Oliver does not seem to fully understand his position, being new to it, but kicks very well. Flippin and Johnston played a brilliant game. It was their repeated "bucking" the line and their end runs that won the game. Captain Johnston does not talk to his men enough; he should talk to them all the time. The men do not watch the ball. The team is very weak in tackling; none of the men tackle