

absent child," as illustrative of the mother's sorrow. A woman's love in relation to her husband, to ambition, to her child having been thus handled, the lecturer turned to Juliet who is love personified. Out of it she has no life. She is in love, but not lovesick. She is no common-place Miss, her love is deep as the sea, no weak creature could have drunk that cup which was to bring her to the brink of the grave. She is as frank as she is modest, reposing in conscious innocence and the strength of her affections. She had been a spoilt child, she was a tender girl, ready to lay her fortune at her lover's feet, with a delicate form but a heart of gold. Love, however, is not the business of life, the world has no recompense for such a love as hers.

The lecturer then turned to Cordelia, who disdains all competition in love, her love—the love of child to parent—is richer than her tongue. Love for her goes hand-in-hand with truth and duty. When she shall wed, her husband will take half her love, her care, her duty. "Sure I shall never marry like my sisters, to love my father *all*." The pathos in the fool being the only one to see the death of her love, and in her dying for him who despised her love till trouble proved it, was noticed. The lecturer then rendered most pathetically the speech of King Lear when he enters with Cordelia dead in his arms. It is upon sacrifices like Cordelia's that the gods themselves throw incense. The ending of King Lear is as we find it in real life, it is not according to rule. Shakespeare had no petty solution for the cares of life.

Portia, in the Merchant of Venice, was the next heroine. The exercise of her intellect was in the direction of love. She calmly restrains her feelings in the casket scene. She is modest and dignified in her estimate of self, and good-natured in her satire of others. Her appeal for mercy was not the prologue to a farce, but an attempt to reach the heart of Shylock, that he might be content to take thrice the money. An imagined sequence to this play is that Portia goes to Shylock's house with nourishment to the body and ease to the mind, and Shylock dies with prayers, not curses, on his lips.

In Othelia we see weakness which is fragile delicacy. She could not be a fitting wife for Hamlet. In her madness her mind runs on fields and rural scenes. Here was a tender woman not suited for the storms of court life, but fit to make happy a quiet home. The lecturer then quoted a beautiful simile to her life, viz., a dove caught in a tempest, striving to bear up, but after a few whirls falling into the troubled waters and swallowed up forever.

The lecturer said that had time allowed he would have liked to speak of Isabel, of Beatrice, of Miranda, of Rosalind, of Cleopatra. Shakespeare lets us into the secrets of their hearts, we don't look at their faces. Then followed a burst of admiration for Shakespeare from the heart of the lecturer. What Englishman that our country has ever produced would we not give up before the peasant of Stratford? It has been said that Englishmen were slow to appreciate Shakespeare, but at all events they do appreciate him now; he is England's and England's only, his words have the true English ring, such as "This fortress built by nature for herself," etc. In the darkest days, 'mid clouds which seem to be settling round our loved country, there is one beyond party and its temptations who pleads for his country above everything. The question has been raised whether Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic or a Protestant. He is an Englishman who believed in England and her destiny, who would have "England, my country, great and free." The best altar we can raise in his honour is a life, manly, generous, open, honest, in a word truly English, the embodiment of them all.

After the applause had subsided the Chancellor in a few

words moved a vote of thanks to the lecturer, emphasizing the sentiments with which Mr. Pitman had concluded. Canon Dumoulin, in a humorous speech seconded the motion, saying how striking it was to see the hall graced to so unusual and blessed an extent by the numerous assemblage of ladies.

## THOUGHT AND LANGUAGE IN JAPAN.

BY THE REV. PROF. LLOYD, M.A.

Of all the dry and uninteresting subjects in the world the study of Comparative Philology is probably the most uninteresting.

It is a science which digs up the mummified body of some word which has been dead and buried for centuries; it proceeds to dissect that word—resolves it into root and stem, its inflectional base, suffix, affix and prefix; then, having chopped the word into its most minute fragments, it takes one of those fragments, a suffix it may be, or a stem, and points out to you that if you will change all the letters in it you will find in another language a corresponding word of similar meaning which must be connected with it.

Thus philology tells us that *vrikas* in Sanskrit, is the same word as *lupus* in Latin, and as *wolf* in English.

It is an unaccountable science, and, as I said, a very dull subject, and therefore in speaking of Japanese language and thought I trust my audience will forgive me if, acting on the familiar principle of "meat before pudding," I give you first the dull portion of my lecture and afterwards that which is a little more interesting and human.

Comparative philology has hitherto principally worked on two great families of language—the Semitic and the Aryan. It has shown us on the one hand that the Hebrews, the Phœnicians, the Assyrians and Babylonians, the Arabs and the Moors were all originally of one family. It has shown us again that there are linguistic affinities which go to prove that the thinkers who spoke in Sanskrit on the plains of the Ganges, the poets who sung in the streets of Athens, the orators who thundered in the Roman forum, the toilers in English factories and the pioneers of civilization in Canadian backwoods, were all of one stock again.

There is a third great group of languages which is practically unexplored—the group which, for want of a better name, I will call the Pacific, though Pacific does not quite describe it—the group which contains the languages of Eastern Asia—the Chinese dialects, Korean, Japanese—and the Indian languages of the American continent. The establishment of the connections between this group of languages will advance the science of Comparative Philology one step in the task which is set before her,—which is not the multiplication of uninteresting grammars and cumbersome dictionaries, but the establishment of the fact that God hath made of one blood all nations of the world for to dwell on the face of the earth; and the contribution of its mite towards universal goodwill amongst nations in the sense indicated by the German thinker when he said, that if we would reach to the affections and heart of a nation we must first learn their language.

When the history of the languages of the Far East comes to be written, we shall have a great eastward movement of the nations. Coming up from the Malay peninsula and Siam we shall, by the memorials which they have left us in their languages, be able to trace the nations of the Far East moving northwards up the coast of China to Corea and Siberia, crossing the China sea to Japan, crossing from island to island over the Aleutian sea to Alaska, whence they spread themselves downwards over the North American