

in it in a subordinate capacity. Thus St. Paul, writing to Timothy (2 Tim. i., 6) uses these words, "the gift which is in thee by the putting on of my hands," while in another passage (1 Tim. iv., 13) he speaks apparently of the same gift being given "with the laying on of the hands of the presbytery," in which two passages the different prepositions should be noted. Timothy and Titus are both addressed by St. Paul as having authority to ordain, and that independently of any presbyters either in Ephesus or Crete, from which it is a legitimate inference that they had been solemnly set apart to that office which we now call Episcopal. It may be inferred also that other men, such as Artemas and Tychicus held the same office, inasmuch as St. Paul contemplated sending one of them to relieve Titus in Crete. It cannot be denied then that, in the time of the Apostles, there were other men, besides the Apostles, who had authority to ordain, which authority was not enjoyed by presbyters in general, and these men were of the same Order as those called Bishops.

Another point on which much stress is laid is the assumption that these men, who had authority to ordain, were not restricted in the exercise of their special functions to any particular locality, except perhaps in the case of St. James, who presided over the Church in Jerusalem. This, however, is a matter of organisation, which has proved to be exceedingly convenient, but which makes no difference whatever in the character of the powers exercised by the holders of the office.

Since then there were these Orders of Ministers in the time of the Apostles, from which time they have been continued without intermission to the present day, it is not unreasonable that those who have inherited the "Historic Episcopate" should set a high value on it as an Apostolic institution, which prevailed over the whole Church for fifteen centuries, notwithstanding that some other bodies of Christians during the last four hundred and fifty years have forsaken the Apostolic tradition.

Are your clergy overpaid? Ought they to get much less than the professional man in law, medicine, or commerce? Do they actually receive half as much? Are they less educated, less able, less worthy, as citizens, than the judge, the barrister, the physician, surgeon, or merchant? Have they less to be exact in paying their monthly bills? What are their prospects in old age? What provision can they make for their widows and children?

THE DRAMA IN ENGLAND.

The imaginative faculty has declined for a long time, one of the penalties paid by the nation for material prosperity. With the decay of imagination there is the corresponding decline in public taste. Shakespeare and the classical drama do not represent the public taste of the people of Great Britain as regards the Drama. For four months of the year, the harvest time of theatrical managers, from Christmas to Easter, a season often prolonged into May, in every great city in the British Isles outside London, is the pantomime season. It is the pantomime that provides three-fourths of the profits of theatre managers. A period without drama. For the pantomime is no fairy tale now, it is a mere variety entertainment and spectacle, and many children go home from "Beauty and the Beast" and "Jack, the Giant-Killer" weeping scalding tears of indignation because the fairy tale they knew by heart is no longer recognisable.

For six months in the year the theatre bills advertise "The Chorus Girl," "The Gaiety Girl," "The Everything Girl"—the variety entertainment once more in the modern musical comedy—neither opera nor drama. Many weeks may be sandwiched in with plays like "The Worst Woman in London," "Women and Wine."

The remaining two months of the year are filled in with the latest London successes, the majority of which may perhaps elevate the taste in general, with a few weeks of more or less wholesome melodrama, where virtue always overcomes vice, but belarded with sentimentalism as to exclude finer taste; and a solitary week or two of Shakespeare completes the theatrical year.

Such is the record of the English theatres, and perhaps three times as many people attend the music halls (not halls of music, but places of variety entertainment) as the theatres. Some say that about 1 per cent of the people prefer the masterpieces of the great dramatists. "The level of public taste was never so low as it is now," laments a great artist. "Even the melodrama of the other generation was more wholesome than the meretricious trivialities of the musical farces which are pushing everything out of the theatre."

And what of the actor's point of view? The actor is more often than not a man of the highest ideals and aspirations. He is

crushed by the system and his ideals too frequently irretrievably blunted. The system is too powerful for the ordinary individual. The play run for a thousand nights like "Charley's Aunt" transforms the actor-artist into an automaton. The modern actor is no longer schooled as were Sir Henry Irving and Mrs Stirling on their 400 different parts. Versatility and spontaneity belong to the old school. When a man of exceptional ability appears, in spite of the system, as it were, he is "boomed" for all he is worth, the lights are focussed exclusively on him, and his name appears in larger letters than the name of the play. Things "are so rotten in the state of stageland" that actors have begun to be paid for their social following and not for their wits. As the actor, trained to be elastic in the "repertoire" system, becomes scarce, tout ensemble gives place to mise en scene. The modern production is arrayed in greater splendor at great expense, and the manager needs to be recouped by a long run, and so the actor's art dwindles.

The life of the actor loses much of the healthy tone. Before, daily rehearsals were the rule, nowadays the exception, and Satan steps into the vacuum hours,

THE DRAMA IN EUROPE.

What a contrast! A different system holds. See the Copenhagen theatre dedicated to the people, by the people. Turn to Christiania—where the National Fund provides subsidy to keep the theatre afloat with every masterpiece that uplifts public taste and the same Fund provides for the restoration of a great cathedral. Abroad, a theatre run for individual gain is almost unknown. All drama and opera houses are kept by the Sovereign, the State, or the Municipality, and subsidised. Why, a town like Irkutsk, in Siberia, has a town theatre that would put to shame any theatre in the British Empire. A manager who ran a piece in any privately owned theatre for more than a few nights would be considered inartistic and his reputation suffer. An actor insisting on keeping the centre of the stage would be snubbed.

It is recognised throughout Europe that subsidy is necessary to keep the classical plays before the people. The Austrian Kaiser gives £50,000 a year to the Opera House and Burg Theatre in Vienna alone, and the German Emperor spends over £200,000 a year to keep the best plays and operas before the people. In some places the subsidy is part of the education vote.