

"a consciousness in which change and variety is most evident is a dreaming consciousness."

Shakespeare and the modern dramatists at large always present their subjects in the concrete, and this form is the better from a commercial view-point, because, as Gordon Craig has claimed at much length in his *On the Theatre Essays*, the modern actor as a rule is not endowed with very great mentality, and has to rely upon the symbolic gestures with which years of custom have made us all familiar, in order to interpret the emotional moods of the characters. "Every emotion, no matter how complex it may be, has its characteristic conjunction of motor tendencies, which together give rise to the characteristic attitudes and expressions of the emotion. How true this is we may realize by considering how successfully a skillful actor can portray even the most complex emotions." Mrs. Fiske and Mme. Nazimova, the Russian, for example, illustrate the difference in presentation which I am claiming. These two ladies belong to the class which critics have called "intellectual actresses." They appeal to the intellect always. A pause in their hands may be freighted with vast import and means far more than countless words spoken by less capable players.

Maeterlinck is the dramatist of personality, Shakespeare of character. The one writes of mental states, the other of physical. With Maeterlinck we feel gaunt fear as he stalks across the boards in the background; with Shakespeare we see him objectively as projected in the fleshly embodiment of some of the principal characters. The one writes as it were of an emotion, the other of an instinct. The differ-