

characters, though mainly drawn from history, may be said to be among the best individualized of the poetic creations of the dramatist. The *Lady Constance* is a marvellous bit of portraiture, and exhibits the feminine character in one of the most touching and impressive features capable of presentation—that of maternal solicitude and affection. With quiet dignity and the *finesse* of true art, Miss Booth unfolded the character of *Constance* in a series of representations which did full justice to the beauty of the creation. The rapid mental transitions that follow upon the development of the play were admirably brought out, and the passages that gave expression to the ever-increasing anxiety and interest in the boy *Arthur*, which advances to anguish and the frenzy of despair, were powerfully and feelingly rendered. The effect of the representation was much enhanced by the interest attaching to the child *Arthur*, who was personated by the youthful Miss Virginia Marlowe with an intelligence and artlessness that won the sympathy of the audience. Mr. Grismer took the part of *Faulconbridge*, and very finely realized the fidelity, the intrepidity and the *brusquerie* of the character; though, perhaps, dignity was too much sacrificed to force and restlessness in his personation of the part. The *Hubert* of Mr. Farwell was a highly satisfactory personation, as the part gave scope for the exercise of such powers as Mr. Farwell possesses in marked degree. The scene in which the usurper of the English throne breaks to *Hubert* his foul designs upon *Arthur*, and the subsequent one in which *Hubert* tries to put them in execution were finely acted. So realistic was the latter scene, that the audience hailed with a keen sense of relief the victory of the *Chamberlain's* better nature in abandoning his fiendish purposes upon *Arthur*—an incident that conveyed its own compliment to the illusion of the scene.

The part of the title rôle was taken by Mr. J. B. Booth, a brother of the celebrated actor, Edwin, who strengthened the *caste* for the occasion, in company with the artiste who played the *Lady Constance*. *Philip* of France was personated by Mr. Davis; the *Cardinal Randolph* by Mr. Spackman; the *Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury* by Messrs. Sambrook and Stokes; and the *Queen Elinor* by Mrs. Vernon—making up an effective dramatic *ensemble* rarely witnessed in Canada. The management may fairly plume itself upon the success of the piece, which was mounted with fidelity to historic reality and splendour, and an attention to scenery, appointments and accessories, that would have done credit to the London or New York stage.

We must speak briefly of the engagement of Miss A. L. Dargon, which followed upon that of Miss Booth, as we have about exhausted the space devoted to the dramatic department.

The re-appearance of this lady at the Grand Opera House was due, we take it, to the interest the literary public took in Mr. Tennyson's recent drama of *Queen Mary*, a stage version of which had been adapted for Miss Dargon, and which Mrs. Morrison desired to give her patrons the opportunity of witnessing. However laudable and enterprising the design of the management, the result proved *Queen Mary* to be a failure, and the piece was withdrawn after a few nights' run. In our August number of last year we reviewed Mr. Tennyson's work, and gave expression to doubts of the suitability of *Queen Mary* for dramatic representation. The adaptation of the work to the stage, in the version made use of by Miss Dargon, has not increased its effectiveness in this respect; indeed, for acting purposes, the text has been shorn of much, in incident and description, that would have been better retained. Certainly, in the stir and effect of street pageant, in the dialogues of the local gossips, and the out-of-door colloquies upon national affairs, the piece would have gained in interest and excitement had these been incorporated in the acted version. The Cranmer scene was entirely omitted, a surrender to religious amity which, perhaps, should not be taken exception to. The drama itself, however, is lacking in the element of interest, or rather the interest there is in the play is misplaced—*Queen Mary* being made the prominent figure for sympathy and interest, which she fails to attract, while the *Princess Elizabeth*, around whom, at the period, hang the garlands of romance, is made the subordinate personage in the drama. For these faults of construction Miss Dargon, of course, is not responsible. She has had to contend against them; and, bearing this in mind, the measure of success attained in the representation of the play was attained in spite of these defects.

But deficient as the drama is in the power of attracting interest for its central character, we doubt if Miss Dargon is quite the artiste to atone for the shortcomings of the play. Though apparently a zealous student of her profession, and a careful and painstaking actress, she lacks the attractiveness of presence and manner that wins, nay commands, success on the stage. She has no grace of deportment, and her elocution is precise and formal, with an occasional *souffron* of brogue that falls harshly upon the emphasized words and destroys the effect of delivery. With these drawbacks, her representation was otherwise satisfactory, and her acting was characterised by intelligence and naturalness. The *Princess Elizabeth* of Miss Davenport was a relieving feature in the play, and was personated with a degree of grace and subdued coquetry quite charming. Mr. Farwell's *Renard*, and Mr. Grismer's *Philip* were effective and meritorious performances, as were Mr. Sambrook's *Courtenay*,