

match of the season, and returned to its college delighted with the hearty reception it had received. This fall a mass meeting of the Graduates and Undergraduates of Toronto University was held, and it was unanimously resolved to abolish their own local sports and in their stead open up, with the approval of McGill, annual competitions between the two colleges.

Toronto, then, has taken the initiative, invited our athletes to Toronto, and borne the brunt of the expenses of the first meeting. The trophy, which is to be the temporary property of the winning college, is to be found by the joint subscription of the alumni of the two colleges; and to judge by the enthusiasm shown by the Graduates at the Toronto meeting their quota towards this emblem will be a most liberal one. It then remains for us as Undergraduates, in whose interest these sports have been largely established, to use our united influence to put this very important matter properly before our Graduates in Montreal. This is an inter-university event which, like the famed Oxford and Cambridge boat races, will bring into great prominence the two universities. It will have the effect of making the two universities stand out in bold relief before the public, and as they are, perhaps, the only two in Canada whose interests do not clash, and as they undoubtedly form the great educational centres for their respective provinces, these inter-university games will acquire an interest of broader character than as mere readable sporting items for the daily press.

Physical education is fast forcing itself on the attention of college authorities. The intimate connection and interdependence of mind and body is now no longer a matter of doubt, and if these athletic contests are entered into with proper enthusiasm not only will the latent *esprit de corps* of each college be aroused to higher pitch, but the working mass of students may be induced to take a proper view of the necessity of physical as well as mental culture.

[Just as we go to press a telegram has been received from Toronto declaring the Intercollegiate Sports off. Further particulars will be given in our next issue.]

Contributions.

REMARKS ON SHAKESPEARE'S "TEMPEST."

Ever since the philosophers of the 19th century in Germany and elsewhere succeeded in persuading Shakespearean students that William Shakespeare was a moral philosopher like themselves, busied upon the noble task of darkening counsel by words, of dressing out moral apothegms in apposite stories, the Tempest has been a battlefield of contending theories. If we may compare the play of Hamlet to the *homœum* and *homœum* of the Arians and Athanasians, the Tempest has been as the book of Job or the Apocalypse to modern theorists. To one who comes fresh from reading and assimilating their different theories there is a delightful freshness about what Dr. Johnson called his critical summary of the play. "In a single drama" he writes "are here exhibited princes, courtiers and sailors, all speaking in their real characters. There is the agency of airy spirits, and of an earthly goblin; the operations of magic; the tumults of a storm, the adventures of a desert island, the native effusion of untaught affection, the punishment of guilt, and the final happiness of the pair for whom our passions and reason are equally interested."

In the present paper I propose to take Dr. Johnson's summary as my starting point and to tell you what this beautiful piece of romance looks like in the eyes of one who feels that Shakespeare was above everything else a dramatist who wrote for the stage, whose main purpose was to entertain his hearers for several successive hours, but who was, besides and above this,

the highest intellect of his day, one who could not have been without interest, one way or another, in the thoughts and speculations that agitated the age in which he lived.

There are three points which a careful student of the Tempest will remark as distinguishing it from Shakespeare's other plays. First and most prominently we find in it a *supernatural character*, severing it from all the other plays with the exception of the Midsummer Night's Dream. Though witches play a prominent part in Macbeth, and ghosts are to be found in other plays, they were part of the beliefs of the age, their representation upon the stage was the means by which the author embodied for his hearers the supersensual. They are thus a natural outgrowth of the feelings and actions of personages of the dramas in which they appear. In the Midsummer Night's Dream, on the other hand, and in the Tempest, we find a supernaturalism of quite a different kind.

Secondly, everyone must have remarked the *musical character of the piece*. Not only is it frequently interspersed with songs, but the blank verse rises at times to a height of poetry little short of lyric. Among such passages are Caliban's description of the magic beauty of the island, "Be not afraid; the isle is full of noises, &c.," or again, Alonso's

"Methought, the billows spoke, and told me of it;
The winds did sing it to me; and the thunder,
That deep and dreadful organ-pipe, pronounced
The name of Prosper!"

Thirdly, the *inattention to dramatic requirements* is noticeable. There are few scenes that could have been effective from a dramatic point of view, however perfect they are to the student. There is an absence, too, of definite characterisation in the personages, who are rather types of character than individuals; qualities personified, than creatures of flesh and blood.

These points, it seems to me, should lead us to regard the play before us as different from Shakespeare's other works. Indeed, this conclusion is one which has long been arrived at by the great majority of modern commentators on Shakespeare. But then they most of them insist upon a further conclusion, to which I am unwilling to assent. Forgetting the genius of dramatic poetry, they further see in the Tempest an elaborate allegory which, however, none of them interpret in the same sense. To take you through the different interpretations which have been confidently offered of this play would require more space than the subject deserves. I think it will be sufficient to show you that no such allegorical interpretation is necessitated by the play itself. After having myself been a convert to the theory which I now reject, and after having studied the play carefully, I can think of but one passage—that which follows the sudden dismissal of the spirits by Prospero in the 4th Act—which points to this conclusion, and the sentiment is here justified by the mental perturbation under which Prospero is labouring at the time.

If, however, we reject the allegorical interpretation, some justification is still needed for the presence of the supernatural element, some explanation of the typical character of the personages introduced. And this, I think, we find in the musical character of the drama, and in the tradition that it was acted, if not originally produced, at the marriage of the Princess Elizabeth with the Prince Palatine of the Rhine in 1613. On such occasions it was usual to have masques presented, of which we have so many from the pen of Ben Jonson. I conceive, then, the Tempest to be what the Midsummer Night's Dream is generally allowed to be, viz., a *romantic drama conceived in the spirit of a masque*, that is, a drama in which absence of distinct characterisation was compensated for by musical accessories and by the introduction of supernatural and other personages. In looking through the numerous masques of Ben Jonson I find the following among many other supernatural characters introduced. Of creatures of heathen mythology: Jupiter, Juno, Saturn, &c., from among the gods—Satyrus, Penates, Fates, Graces, Nymphs, Silenus, Sphinx and Januarius, among the lesser demons. From mediæval mythology we find Angels, Fairies, Genii, Hags, Arthur, Merlin, and Robin Goodfellow. Among other personifications there are the Iron and Golden Ages, Reason, Chivalry, Christmas, Poesy, Fame, &c. These

*Read before the Shakespeare Club, Montreal.