

DRAMATIC

THAT very gifted little woman, Olga Nethersole, winds up her Salt Lake season tonight with a production of Herivel's "Lahyorth."

Not many people know that Miss Nethersole's gifts extend to literature as well as the stage. "The Awakening" is her own adaptation from the French, and the English in which it is enacted, tells unmistakably of her gifts as writer. Miss Nethersole has a very high opinion of M. Paul Herivel. He is one of the forty "immortals" of France, but his written contributions little for the stage as you compare them with some of his brethren. Most of his works have been introduced to the English speaking public by Miss Nethersole herself. In speaking of the part of the elder prince in "The Awakening," she said that

Irishman the following conundrum: "Now, Mike, suppose that Lucifer was sent to hell. Which would he take first, do you think?" The Irishman looked thoughtfully for a moment, then said: "Your honor, I think he'd take me." "Why?" I asked. "Because he's always sure of you."

The report comes from London that

John Hare, the English actor, has announced his intention to retire from the stage within a year. In September he will begin a farewell tour of the provinces and then give his last performance in London. Mr. Hare is 63 years old, and has given some of the best lights with a long and brilliant theatrical career behind him. He played at the Prince-of-Wales' Theater for 10 years, and then assumed the management of the Court Theatre, which he retained from 1875 to 1879. During the next nine years he managed the St. James' Theater, with the Keggs. In 1884 W. G. Gilbert built the Garrick Theater for him, which he leased for a period. He took the management of the Globe in 1888, where he produced Pinero's "The Gay Lord Quex," a play with which he subsequently toured Great Britain and the United States. On March 1 of this year he opened the Duke of York Theater with "The Great Coonshank," playing the title-role. Although Mr. Hare visited the United States many times, he never met with the same financial success as some other English actors of less ability.

Ned Royle's New Play Produced in New York.

The Grand Theater announces that Ned Royle's new production of "The Holy City," the same scene of "The Holy City," the same scene of "The Struggle Everlasting," The New York correspondent of the "News" wired, last night, that the critics' opinions were somewhat mixed, but the general tone seemed to be that the American stage had witnessed a distinct departure in the way of dramatic creation, and that the piece would tide to success. The report adds: "The New York Times gives it the best verdict and says: 'It is a curiously interesting play, despite some crudities of construction, and its third act spins

Herald of Sunday last, in foreshadowing the production said:

"Mr. Royle's work would seem to involve considerable risk in its dramatic type. 'Everyman,' which achieved success here as presented by Mr. Ben Green's company, but that remains to be seen. Its chief characters are Mind, played by Mr. Byron; Body, which Miss Roberts will impersonate, and Soul, which first appears as baby Jenkins, then in the person of Mr. De Witt Jenkins.

Obviously as the allegory may be, the fact that the characters wear the garb of today, are placed in a modern environment and illustrate a story of modern conditions piques the curiosity. The advance announcements are that

WHY AMERICAN PLAYS FAIL IN LONDON.

HENRY ARTHUR JONES, the famous playwright, now in New York, gives the following as the reason why American successes may not succeed in London:

"I am persuaded that there is no unconscious spirit of unfriendliness among English playgoers toward American plays, and that the reason lies in the fact that they have appeared in the Garrick Theater for him, which he leased for a period. He took the management of the Globe in 1888, where he produced Pinero's "The Gay Lord Quex," a play with which he subsequently toured Great Britain and the United States. On March 1 of this year he opened the Duke of York Theater with "The Great Coonshank," playing the title-role. Although Mr. Hare visited the United States many times, he never met with the same financial success as some other English actors of less ability.

"First—if it is produced at an unlucky or unsuitable theater, or at the wrong time of the year.

"Second—if it is a serious play. A play of fun or bright nonsense is far more likely to capture London audiences than a play that demands from them sustained thought and attention.

"A year or two ago I showed that not a single serious play of modern English life had been a pecuniary success on the London stage for some four or five years. Have matters been much better during the last season? Those of your readers among who have received my letter will know London theaters.

"Failure on the London stage need not imply anything except that London theatergoers are careless about the drama. A fine revival of 'Othello' by Mr. Lewis Waller only ran three weeks last season. After that neither American nor English playwrights need feel themselves slighted.

"I think, however, that American playgoers may claim that they show far greater generosity and courtesy to foreign playwrights than do London playgoers. And I believe that this wise spirit of tolerance and appreciation which American playgoers are showing and which none can more gratefully acknowledge than I—I believe that this wise receptivity will indirectly aid the development of the American drama."

"Third—if it is produced at an unlucky or unsuitable theater, or at the wrong time of the year.

"Fourth—if it is a serious play. A play of fun or bright nonsense is far more likely to capture London audiences than a play that demands from them sustained thought and attention.

"A year or two ago I showed that not a single serious play of modern English life had been a pecuniary success on the London stage for some four or five years. Have matters been much better during the last season? Those of your readers among who have received my letter will know London theaters.

"Failure on the London stage need not imply anything except that London theatergoers are careless about the drama. A fine revival of 'Othello' by Mr. Lewis Waller only ran three weeks last season. After that neither American nor English playwrights need feel themselves slighted.

"I think, however, that American playgoers may claim that they show far greater generosity and courtesy to foreign playwrights than do London playgoers. And I believe that this wise spirit of tolerance and appreciation which American playgoers are showing and which none can more gratefully acknowledge than I—I believe that this wise receptivity will indirectly aid the development of the American drama."

IN LONDON THEATERS.

Special Correspondence.

LONDON, Sept. 18.—Possibly the present theatrical season in London, like its immediate predecessor, will go down to history as essentially an "American" one. At any rate, the new year in the playgoing world here has opened with the Transatlantic influence strongly marked. The first new play to be given was a Transatlantic winner—Jones' "Hypocrites," and in another fortnight we shall have "Sweet Kitty Bellairs" at the Haymarket. Moreover of the two important productions of the present week, one has an American star in the person of Maxine Elliott, while the other boasts a heroine from the land of the dollar.

The last mentioned piece is Seymour Hicks' "The Gay Gordons," and most people who are familiar with the author's dramatic history

expected that in addition to its

Transatlantic central figure the piece

would be supplied with several of the latest American songs, renamed, slightly rewritten and interpolated without the slightest acknowledgment to their authors.

But this time Hicks appears to have resisted temptation, for, so far as my knowledge goes, there is not a single song "American" in "The Gay Gordons." With this actor, however, one never knows what to expect, and being assured by an American friend that his "Mr. Chamberlain" song in "The Beauty of Bath" which everyone here supposed had been written by Hicks, actually came from America, like "Cheyenne," which was uttered in the same piece, and originally eulogized some popular idol at home.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other

parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the

curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other

parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the

curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other

parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the

curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other

parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the

curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other

parts, especially that of the secretary,

which is full of witty satire. It is

rather puzzling when a play is

responsibly fantastic and impossible

at one moment and mild and

mocking at another.

He is knocked on the head by

tramps, who tie the benevolent orphan

to a tree and steal the solid

silver accessories of her simple life.

She is rescued by her secretary, nur-

ses the wounded square and before the

curtain falls, has promised to marry

him.

Unless Miss Elliott misinterpreted

Emerson's intention, it would appear

that he was in earnest when he wrote

his part, and that he had his tongue

in his cheek when he wrote the other