

unforced and colloquial. Most actors make the egregious mistake of showing the real nature of the man so openly, as to make it a matter of wonder to the audience that any one possessed of common sense should be lulled by so shallow a trickster. Mr. Booth carefully avoids this pitfall, and in his hands *Iago* really appears to be the plausible friend, the "fellow of exceeding honesty," that Shakespeare designed. Indeed, if there be a fault in the interpretation, it is that the baseness of the man is too much veiled from the audience as well as from Othello, so that it is not till the very last scene that the human fiend stands fully revealed in all the hideous deformity of his nature. Next to Mr. Booth's *Iago*, we should rank his *Richelieu*. In the fourth act of Bulwer's fine drama, the actor more nearly rose to the level of greatness than at any other moment during the week. In the other portions of the play, however, he was comparatively tame. His *Hamlet* was a very unequal performance, and on the whole inferior to Fechter's, T. C. King's, and Barry Sullivan's. There were several fine passages, however, notably the scene with Ophelia, and the earlier portion of that with his mother. In the latter portion of this scene he was too loving, and committed the egregious mistake of kissing the guilty woman, at the words "I must be cruel only to be kind." The cruelty of the act was not easily detected by the audience. One of the principal features of the

week's performances was the production, for the first time in Canada, of Shakespeare's "Richard II." The play, though containing many fine thoughts, and much magnificent language, is not a good acting one; the tone is one of gloom and depression, absolutely unrelieved by any enlivening episodes, or even by a single spark of humour—a very rare thing with Shakespeare. Nor was Mr. Booth's effort to represent the principal character a successful one, his vicious style of elocution being here exemplified at its worst. Of the other characters played by Mr. Booth, his *Shylock* was fairly good, but his *Claude Melnotte*, though at times striking, was too sentimental and melodramatic, even for the sentimental and melodramatic hero of Bulwer's somewhat lackadaisical play. As *Benedick* he was natural and spirited, but, with the assistance of Miss Cummins, he spoilt the great scene where *Beatrice* tells him to kill *Claudio*, by converting it into the merest farce.

Mr. Booth was assisted by Mr. Warde, a young English actor who has been travelling with him during the past winter, and by the stock company from Mr. McVicker's theatre in Chicago, but the support was not as good as might have been expected. We may add that Mr. Booth's engagement was so eminently successful in a pecuniary sense, that he may probably be induced to pay Toronto another visit next season.

TO OUR EXCHANGES.

WE have observed, with mingled feelings of pain and pleasure, that some members of the Press of the Dominion appear to look upon the contents of the CANADIAN MONTHLY much in the same light as Lord Dundreary's valet regarded his master's wardrobe, and, acting upon principles similar to those which actuated that eccentric individual, transfer, without scruple, from our columns to their own, whatever strikes their fancy. Among those of our contemporaries that have exhibited their enterprize in this way may be mentioned a Hamilton paper, which, without even an acknowledgment to us, transferred to their columns the whole of Mr. F. W. Robinson's novelette, "The Romance of a Back Street," which had been copyrighted at Ottawa, and for which we had paid the English author; a Peterborough paper, which a couple of months ago copied the whole of Mr. Phipps's article on "The Advantages of Protective Tariffs;" and a new Toronto daily, from which better things might have been expected, and which should rather set an example of good behaviour to its erring Provincial brethren, but which last month appropriated bodily, from the first word to the last, Mr. Goldwin Smith's article on "The Immortality of the Soul." Now, while we are quite alive to the appreciation of the Magazine which such things indicate, and while we do not object to fair, reasonable, and acknowledged quotation from our columns, we must emphatically protest, in the name of journalistic decency,—to say nothing of common honesty,—against any such wholesale appropriation of our property as we have referred to; and would suggest that whatever appreciation of our efforts any of our contemporaries may desire to show, should be testified in a different way—for instance, by a monthly critical review of the contents of each number. Should this caution not prove efficacious to put a stop to the practice complained of, we shall be reluctantly compelled to resort to a legal enforcement of our rights.