
A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

forbidding of them, hath within itself the promise of eternal life, the end of all our wearisome labours and all our sustaining hopes."[1]

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. III.—THE VALIDITY OF THE PRESBYTERIAN SUCCESSION.

THERE are two separate and distinct questions connected with the problem of the Reunion of the Churches which are capable of being discussed quite independently of one another. The one is that of the Reunion of the members of the several Churches—the Reunion of the *laity;* the other is that of the recognition of the *officers* of those Churches by the separate organizations, in the matter of the interchange of pulpits, the administration of Sacraments, and the official status that is conveyed by the fact of such ministers being qualified and regularly constituted officers of any particular Church. It would be quite possible for either of these two separate aspects of the question to be brought within the sphere of practical politics without the other being considered at all. There might be a real Reunion of the laity of the churches without any discussion of the question of Orders, and there might be a recognition (or otherwise) of the Orders of the various classes of ministers without furthering the Reunion of the laity of the Churches in any way whatever. So since most people, when they speak or write of the problem of Reunion, confine their purview to the latter question, and think that, when it is settled, the whole matter has come to a definite and satisfactory conclusion, it is, perhaps, worth while to point out that the two sides of the question are separable. Tempting as this phase of the problem is, I only mention it to pass it by and to proceed to the more immediate special topic of my paper, namely, the Validity of the Presbyterian Succession.

And let me say very clearly at the outset that the task that I have set before myself is a limited one. I am only going to state what the lawyers call an A B C case. I am not going to advocate a cause. My own view of the question is rather different from the view that I shall now present; but since my own view does not matter, and the view that I shall state is that held by a large body of men within the limits of the Church of England, in essence by the Church of Rome, and in principle by many of the prominent ministers of the Church of Scotland, it is one that is worth while considering, because it

[1] Milton: Prose Works.

will have to be reckoned with, and reckoned with very seriously, when any proposals are made for Reunion between any of those bodies. I am therefore simply the exponent of other people's views, and I shall try and state them as fairly and dispassionately as I can, and to make no quotations that have not been carefully verified and compared diligently with the contexts in which they appear.

The position, then, is this: That a ministry is not possible, as an ordinary thing, which is not based upon the principle of Apostolical Succession. I say advisedly *ordinary*, because all theories of the Apostolic Succession recognise that in extraordinary circumstances, where the succession should fail or not be available, then the ministry falls once more into the province of the priesthood of the laity, and men are at liberty, as on a desert island, to take upon themselves all those functions which ordinarily are performed by the recognised ministry of the Church. What, then, is the doctrine of Apostolical Succession? The answer to this question depends upon the period of Church history of which we ask it, and on the branch of the Church to which the inquiry is addressed. The succession of St. Ignatius is not quite the same thing as that of modern Rome, nor either of these quite the same as that of the modern High Church party. The succession of St. Ignatius is that of the Apostles as representing God, the Presbyters as representing the Apostles, and the deacons. He says (Epis. xx.) "Be ye zealous to do all things in godly concord, the Bishop presiding after the likeness of God, and the Presbyters after the likeness of the council of the Apostles, with the deacons also, who are most dear to me, having been entrusted with the diaconate of Jesus Christ." The theory of the Roman Church recognises no orders as valid except those that have been conferred by a Bishop in communion with the See of St. Peter, and having a commission from the Pope to confer the same. The theory of the Anglican party in the Church of England may perhaps be best stated in the language of Mr. Gore, its ablest and most moderate advocate. He says ("Church and Ministry," p. 71), "It was thus intended that there should be in every Church in each generation an authoritative stewardship of the grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ, and a recognised power to transmit it, derived from above by Apostolic descent. The men, who from time to time were to hold the various offices involved in the ministry and the transmitting power necessary for its continuance, might, indeed, fitly be elected by those to whom they were to minister. In this way the ministry would express the representative principle. But their authority to minister in whatever capacity, their qualifying consecration, was to come from above, in such sense that no

ministerial act would be regarded as *VALID*—that is, as having the security of the Divine covenant about it—unless it was performed under the shelter of a commission, received by the transmission of the original pastoral authority which had been delegated by Christ Himself to His Apostles. This is what is understood by the Apostolic Succession in the ministry."

It involves, you will see, two great principles: the principle that no man can take the ministry to himself, as a regular ordinary mode of procedure, and that the authority which gives a man the right to exercise his ministry is one that is given by those who have already themselves received power to give it, by the fact that they stand in the line of direct succession from the Lord and His Apostles. Now, in truth, as a matter of fact, this has been the case in the history of the Church from the earliest times onwards. In some way or another those who have exercised the office of the ministry have received authority to do so from others who were already in the ministry, though the form of such recognition may be very varied. There is no gap in the long line of Apostolic succession regarded as a *fact,* though there may be gaps discoverable when we come to apply any particular theory of Apostolical Succession to special cases. But it is important in this controversy to distinguish between the fact and our ideas as to what the meaning of that fact is. We are all agreed as to the fact. There has been no break in the history of the Church, or in the succession of the ministries of that Church. We are not agreed as to what constitutes a valid succession, and it is this point that is the central one of my paper. I am obliged to omit the discussion of ministries other than those of the Presbyterian Churches. But the loss thus involved is not so great as might at first be imagined, since the Presbyterian case is a typical one, only rather more simple than some of the others. Would it be, then, possible to conclude from a High Church point of view that the Presbyterian orders were valid? And here let me remind you that I am stating a case, and not advocating a cause. What are the facts to begin with? I dare not attempt even a summary of the early history of the Church of Scotland. As an Englishman, I move amid its tangled mazes with hesitating feet, and do not always quite know the path that should lead me to the spot I want to reach. I have never yet met an Englishman who did confess to knowing very much about the subject, and, if I slip, my Scotch brethren will have ample opportunity to pull me up again, and I shall be most grateful.

But it appears to be fairly certain that the first ministers of the Church of Scotland were men who were already in Priests' Orders, and who had received those Orders from Bishops who at

the time that they were conferred were in communion with the See of Rome. I do not lay much stress on this last point, but it is worth while bearing it in mind in view of possibilities which lie within the problem of Reunion. But the main point is that the Orders of the first ministers were in their origin Episcopal, and were thus already in the direct line of succession from the Christ and His Apostles. The second point is that all the ministers of the Church of Scotland, from that time to the present moment, have been ordained by those who had thus in the first instance the Episcopal ordination, or by their successors. The succession in the Presbyterian Church is thus distinctly, historically, and without possibility of refutation, a succession of Presbyters, as regular, as unbroken, as the succession of the Bishops in the Church of England or in the Church of Rome—perhaps more unbroken, indeed, than some of the successions in the latter Church. Let me quote a passage from the most recent authority on the subject to prove that I am not overstating the case. The Rev. Dr. Sprott, in an extremely interesting paper—in a volume full of the most fascinating discussions of the present state of the Church of Scotland, and especially of the new movement that has sprung up in her, and of which such great things are expected, I mean the Scottish Church Society Movement—is discussing the question of the Historical Continuity of the Church of Scotland, and says (p. 164, "Scottish Church Society Conferences, 1894"), "From 1560 till 1571 the Church was governed by Assemblies, Synods and Kirk Sessions. The Synods were presided over by superintendents, who formed the executive of the Church, and who did very much the work of Bishops. The appointment of clergymen during this period consisted chiefly in the admission of old priests to be ministers or readers. Any new ordinations that took place were conducted by the superintendents, some of whom were Bishops, assisted by other Presbyters." So that in the initial stages, which are the all-important ones for this purpose, the ministry was ordained either by Bishops unconverted from the old system, or by those who had changed some of their theological opinions and beliefs, for that is really all that the Reformation came to in relation to this question.

Here, however, comes in a minor issue which must detain us for a few moments. Dr. Sprott continues, "We are told by some that the chain was broken at this point, because, in the case of a few laymen then admitted to the ministry, the laying on of hands by ordination was omitted." And the point has been raised elsewhere. Its history is curious and intricate. In the "First Book of Discipline," which, though it *may* have been the law of the Church, was never the law of the land, there was a passage which spoke lightly of the laying on of

hands. It ran as follows: "In a Church reformed, or tending to reformation, none ought to presume either to preach or yet to minister the Sacraments till that orderly they be called to the same. Ordinarie vocation consisteth in election, examination and admission. And because that election of ministers in this cursed Papistrie hath altogether been abused, we thinke it expedient to intreat it more largely. It appertaineth to the people, and to every severall congregation to elect their minister.

"Other ceremonie than the public approbation of the people, and declaration of the chiefe minister, that the person there presented is appointed to serve the (that) church, we cannot approve: for albeit the Apostles used imposition of hands, yet seeing the miracle is ceased, the using of the ceremonie we judge not necessarie.

"In their admission, the office and dewtie of ministeris and peopili sould be declarit, be sum godlie and learnit minister. And sua publicklie befoir the people sould they be placit in their kirk, and joint to their flock at the desire of the samin: other ceremonies except fasting and prayer, sic as laying on of hands, we judge not necessarie in the institution of ministerie." —("First Book of Discipline.")

Was, then, the ceremony of the laying on of hands discontinued? The "First Book of Discipline" was approved by the General Assembly in 1560, and, though not formally ratified by the Council, was subscribed by a great portion of the members. Many of them, however, were opposed to it, and by some it was stigmatized as "a devout imagination." It was therefore never formally and fully approved by the civil authorities. It remained the law of the Church till 1578, when the Second Book was agreed on in the General Assembly, inserted in the register of the Assembly, 1581, sworn to in the National Covenant, revived and ratified by Assembly in 1638, and by many other acts of Assembly, and according to which the Church Government is established by Law, A.D. 1592 and 1690. Now, the "Second Book of Discipline" is perfectly clear upon the point of laying on of hands. It says, "Ordinatione is the separation and sanctifying of the person appointed to God and his kirk, efter he be well tryit and fund qualifet. The ceremonies of ordination are fasting, earnest prayer and imposition of hands of the eldership. The minister is to come from the pulpit to the foresaid place, where the intrant kneeling (for the more decent and convenient laying on of hands) and the brethren standing, he, as their mouth, in their Master's name and authority doth in, and by, prayer set the candidate apart (not only the minister who prays, but all the brethren who conveniently can, laying their hands upon his head) to the

office of the ministry, invocating God for His blessing to this effect." (From "Collections and Observations concerning the Worship, Discipline and Government of the Church of Scotland," in four books, by Walter Steuart, of Pardovan, Edinburgh, 1837.)

What, then, happened in the interval during which the First Book was, perhaps, the law of the Church? The book simply states that the laying on of hands was not necessary. It was never law, civil or ecclesiastical, and there is no act of the General Assembly authorizing such an omission. There is not, so far as I can gather, any case in which it was omitted. After a search through such of the contemporary diaries and journals as I have been able to see, I can find no single instance of an ordination at which there was such an omission. The only passage that bears upon it is from a work called "The Babe of Glory," by W. Erkery (p. 55), in which he says, "Yet some Bishops blowed on the Minister to be made, as Christ breathed the Holy Spirit. Indeed, that of the Prelates was but a form and a foolery too; yet it was wiser than this Ordination of our English Presbytery, where no gift of the Spirit is pretended or expected; far foolisher than the Scots Presbytery, who lay no hands at all because no gift followed. These make Ministers and ordained Elders without the laying on of hands." This is only a general statement and cites no definite cases, and receives, so far as I can judge, no contemporary corroboration. We may therefore, I take it, assume that the short interval between the First and the Second Books of Discipline, seventeen years, did not witness at least a universal discontinuance of the laying on of hands, and the interval was not long enough, even supposing that the custom had become general, for all the original ministers to have died out, so that when the practice was again ordained as of obligation, there would be men who had the succession and able to ordain validly according to the law of the Church of Scotland. And from 1578 there has never been any change and no question as to the universality of the practice.

The question remains as to the relation of this mode of ordination to the custom of the Primitive Church. And here we tread on much more uncertain ground—ground over which I do not propose even cursorily to travel. All I can do is to indicate the fairly well-established results of modern scholarship—results of which it can be said that the more we know, the more we feel the impossibility of *finally* settling the question with our *present* knowledge of early Church documents and practices. But it seems to be established, whether Episcopacy and Presbytery in the very early days were synonymous terms or no, that in the Churches of Asia Minor,

under the supervision and in the lifetime of St. John, the Episcopal system, substantially as we have it, was in full operation, and that from thence it gradually spread over the whole of Christendom, justifying itself by its results and the splendid way in which it adapted itself to the varying needs of the communities in which it had to work. There are some who think that survivals of the earlier system lasted on till later times in scattered portions of the Christian world. The salient passage usually quoted is that of St. Jerome in his letter to Evangelus concerning the ministry, but an independent examination of the passage has made me very doubtful whether any definite conclusion can be drawn from it. The passage runs thus: "Nam et Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclam et Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciant: aut Diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, at Archdiaconum vocent." It is thus translated by Canon Fremantle in his recent editions of the principal writings of St. Jerome: "For even at Alexandria from the time of Mark the Evangelist until the episcopates of Heraclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters always named as bishop one of their own number, chosen by themselves, and set him in a more exalted position, just as an army elects a general, or as deacons appoint one of themselves whom they know to be diligent and call him archdeacon." Now, this may mean that the Presbyters of Alexandria down to the middle of the third century elected and consecrated their own Bishop; but it may also mean that they only elected and installed him, leaving the question of consecration open; or it may be that some of the Presbyters were in Bishops' Orders themselves, and that therefore there was no need to call in outside aid for purposes of consecration. The most we can say is that the point is very doubtful, and cannot therefore be used as decisive on one side or the other in the issue before us. And beyond this passage there is nothing in early Church history that bears on the matter. But it prevents Episcopacy from being insisted upon as of the *esse*.

The real and final issue therefore is this: Would it be possible in the interests of Reunion for those who have the Episcopal succession to recognise, either as a permanent institution or *pro hac vice*, those who have the succession of the Presbyters only? There have been those in the English Church who have recognised the Presbyterian succession as valid equally with the Episcopal. I need only cite the great name of Bishop Andrewes, who does not, however, stand alone, in bygone times, and there are many now living, the Archdeacon of London and others, who take the same position to-day.

It seems, in conclusion, by no means improbable that a solution of this kind will be reached far more speedily in the United States than in England. Let me quote a very remarkable proposal on the lines of this paper, made in a recently-published paper called "The Historic Episcopate," by the Rev. Dr. Shields. He says, "Already they" (*i.e.*, the Episcopalians and the Presbyterians) "have points of contact and agreement in three of the Lambeth Articles: in the Scriptures, the Creeds and the Sacraments. It only remains to attach them in the Episcopate. And that attachment might be begun by concurrent ordinations on the principle advocated by a learned and accomplished Bishop of St. Andrews (the late Dr. Charles Wordsworth) for the reconciliation of Presbyterians and Episcopalians in the Church of Scotland. In such ordinations candidates would be presented to the Bishop, with the concurrence of the Presbytery, by priests who have had formerly Presbyterian ordination, or perhaps by Presbyterian ministers who have had formerly Episcopal ordination. The transaction might be kept within the rubric as well as the book, or at least within the Lambeth proposals, and would involve a practical sanction of all conceivable interests and claims, with no possibility of doubt or controversy. Both parties would have acted upon their respective theories of the Christian ministry, without conceding anything to each other and without reflecting upon one another. The most extreme Episcopalian, from his point of view, would have fully legitimated a ministry which on other grounds he was prepared to appreciate and welcome; and the most extreme Presbyterian, from his point of view, would only have gained enlarged authority for a ministry which he believed to be already valid and regular."

FREDERIC RELTON.

ART. IV.—NOTES ON THE ASPECTS OF RELIGION AND OF EDUCATION IN FRANCE.

OF all foreign nations France is the one in which we are naturally most interested. The French people have been for ages, and are still, our competitors and rivals in Europe and the world. Their history has been throughout its long course closely interwoven with our own, and we have mutually influenced one another in more ways than can be counted. With the exception of the United States, no country carries on a larger trade with us; and it is estimated that one-fifth of its entire foreign commerce is transacted with the United King-

dom. Add to this the unceasing intercourse that takes place across the Channel; the vast numbers of British residing on French soil, and the perhaps equally numerous colonies of French domiciled in London and other large cities; the interchange of all sorts of publications, from the historical and the scientific treatise down to the light novel or theatrical play; the mutual alterations in fashions and dress, English women borrowing their finery from Paris, and French dandies the cut of their clothes from London—consider, I say, all these points, and you will recognise how closely we are knitted to what I may call our Gallic kinsmen across the Straits. And yet we differ from one another in a hundred ways—so much so, indeed, that we rarely, or with difficulty, understand one another, our manners, customs, ideas, modes of expression, and views—or rather the points of view from which we regard things—being frequently irreconcilable. We live as strangers in each other's countries, and, although inter-marriages are not rare, retain our distinctive characteristics without alloy. The French express this by the phrase "différence de mœurs," but perhaps "difference of racial instincts" would be more accurate. In one respect we are quite alike: in the love of, and pride in, each our own nationality; but this only, of course, widens the natural and historical breach which separates us.

It will be my endeavour in this paper to draw a comparison or contrast between the French and ourselves in respect of two important matters, religion and education; for it is deep down in the foundations of these that we can trace some of the causes of the difference already alluded to, others being assignable perhaps to climate and historical associations.

The sources of my information are threefold: first, personal observation over a great part of the North of France; second, knowledge gathered from a variety of trustworthy persons; and, third, reliable statistics gathered from documents published by the Government.

The history of primary education in France is soon told. Down to the time of the Revolution there can hardly be said to have been any schools for the common people at all—in the villages, at least. Some of the clergy held classes in their houses, or in the aisles of their churches, and occasionally a teacher would set up a school in a cottage or barn, in dependence upon what the parents of his scholars might choose to supply him with in food and lodging. The stock of books consisted, says Mr. Franque, who edited the Government Report of 1842, of a Psalter in Latin; a "Croix de Dieu," or "Abécédaire"; a "Civilité pure et honnête"; and a multiplication table. "Some old parchment, hereditary in the family, perhaps a contract drawn up by a notary public, served," he

adds, "to finish the scholar's course; for when he had got this length, 'il savait lire dans les contrats,' and was accounted a 'savant.'"

In those days instruction of the common people was not only little thought of in any country, except Scotland, it was by most persons considered unsuitable for the class whom Providence had destined to be, and to remain, labourers. Voltaire wrote: "It seems necessary that there should be ignorant ragamuffins (*gueux*). If you possessed land like me, you would be of my opinion. It is not the country labourer you ought to teach, but the burgher (*le bourgeois*), the dweller in the towns."

It was the clergy who first gave an impulse to primary schools in France, as was the case also in Great Britain, the Scotch having the start, however, of the English by two centuries at least. The Bull of Pope Benedict XIII., who founded the Société de frères des écoles Chrétiennes, in 1724, contains these remarkable words: "The object of this society is to prevent the innumerable disorders and inconveniences produced by ignorance, the source of all evils, among those especially who, overwhelmed with poverty, and obliged to earn their livelihood by the labour of their hands, are debarred by want of means from the possibility of acquiring knowledge."

Letters patent granted to the "virtuous" De la Salle in 1725 enabled, in the face of much opposition, the first school for the poor to be started at Rheims, whence the movement spread far and wide in the North of France. It was not, however, till the Revolution that laws began to be passed for the establishment of a State system of instruction, which, however, as will be seen later on, remained, if not a dead letter for two generations, at least very inadequately observed.

The Government statistics of education for 1829, the first year of their issue, show that, out of 38,149 parishes (*communes*), 23,919 only possessed schools, with an attendance of 969,340 pupils, the salaries of the teachers ranging from threepence to one penny per month per scholar, payable by such parents as could afford the fee, otherwise by the parish council. Notice is taken in these statistics of the inadequacy of the school premises in numerous instances, even the buildings provided by the parish authorities being unsuitable. We shall see later on the progress that has been since made.

In comparing or contrasting education in France and at home, let us observe, first, that the population of the two countries may be taken to be nearly the same, the census of 1891 giving a total for the United Kingdom of nearly 38,000,000, and the French census of 1886, 38,250,000. As the returns of the latter, however, show a diminution of over

500,000 within the previous ten years, our population probably already exceeds that of France.

It will be convenient for my purpose to dispose of a few more statistics before proceeding further. Observe, then, that the State Budget in France for primary education amounted in 1891 to a little under £7,000,000, which went to the maintenance of 60,120 schools, with a staff of 97,000 teachers, instructing 4,000,000 pupils. The figures for the United Kingdom in 1888 were:

State subsidy, £5,070,000
Rates, £4,620,000 } = £9,690,000

for the support of 30,500 schools, attended by 4,605,000 pupils. Here comparison by means of statistics ends. For while in England the Government makes grants to all primary public schools alike, in France it leaves to the free (*libres*) or denominational schools the duty of supporting themselves, requiring only that the teachers in them should have earned a regular "Brevet," or diploma granted by the University of France. Of these free public elementary schools there are nearly 9,000 with a staff of 10,600 teachers, and an attendance of 850,000 pupils. By far the greater number of them are under the direction of Roman Catholic committees, as may be deduced from the circumstance that the Protestant population of the country is under 750,000, or under 2 per cent. of the whole, who are ministered to by 700 pastors (Lutheran and Reformed), or, as compared with the 50,000 priests, $1\frac{2}{5}$ per cent. In what follows, therefore, account will not be taken of the Protestant schools or churches, which flourish, moreover, in but few districts, although it is not to be inferred from this that either Christian or Jewish dissentients from the Church of the majority are without considerable influence in the State.

I am aware that statistics are apt to be fallacious, and may be made available for often opposite purposes; but, assuming the figures just stated to be accurate, it would seem that France is twice as well supplied with schools as we are, and that their attendance exceeds ours by some hundreds of thousands. It is to be noted, however, that we have a great number of private or adventure schools, which cannot well be enumerated, and are not taken account of in Government or other official returns and statistics. It is probable, therefore, that the two countries are equally well equipped in the machinery for primary public instruction.

Now a word or two regarding the buildings, the government of the schools, and the instruction imparted.

A great many, perhaps most, of the elementary schools are new, or of recent construction—say ten or twelve years old. They are exceedingly well planned and arranged, with, as is

natural to the French, a considerable attention paid to architectural display. The rooms are large and lofty, with partitions, having windows in the centre, so that the headmaster or mistress may command a view of every class. In front is a sufficient playground, supplied with gymnastic apparatus, and on either side sheds for exercise in wet weather, one for the boys and the other for the girls, with the offices behind. The country schools are generally in the same block as the *mairie*, or town-hall, where the parish business is transacted, and the teacher's house is either over the school or at one side of it. The old schools have been mostly enlarged or made higher, and all are equally well supplied with maps, object pictures, and blackboards. The instruction is in all cases free, and in the Government schools books and stationery are supplied. The education is also compulsory. So far as I was able to ascertain, the teachers are paid on an average £40 to £80, whereas in England the average is about double. They all have, as already stated, a diploma, and have received their training at special seminaries or colleges, of which each department has one. The governing body of every school consists of a committee, of which the mayor is chairman, and the others elected. The curé, or parson, is now by law excluded from the State schools; but in the *écoles libres*, or "free" or "congregational" schools he is generally the most influential of the governors. Christian religion has been banished from the State schools, and to supply its place various manuals have been compiled describing the duties of citizens, the most approved, perhaps, being entitled, "Éducation morale et instruction civique," by M. Mezières, a deputy and member of the French Academy, and "Cours d'instruction civique," by Professor Mabilleau. They are useful books, very simply written, and as regards religion, neutral. Other books published by the Society "Anti-cléricale," such as "Le Catéchisme républicain du Libre penseur," and the "Exposé sommaire de la réligion Chrétienne à l'usage des Écoles laïques," published by the Société de l'enseignement National, are distinctly anti-Christian and Voltairian in their tone. They are recommended by their compilers to be used in the last year of the school course, so that the pupils may finish their "education" well primed with arguments against Christianity, and stored with the teaching of the advanced freethinkers.

In regard to the secular instruction imparted, it may be pronounced excellent. The French are very skilful in the compiling of simple and well-graduated school-books, of which the educational shops are full almost to overflowing. A number of these books are admirably illustrated, and are often more than a match for our own on the same subjects. There are also in circulation many valuables treatises on the theory

and method of instruction. From what has been already said, it need not be pointed out that under the present system Christianity is excluded from the course. The various ministers of religion are at liberty to impart their own tenets in the church, or "temple," or at home, as the parents may elect, but they are forbidden to open their mouths in the national schools. A generation is in this way growing up to which Christianity may in many cases be unknown, and where known presented in colours which class it with the mythologies and make it ridiculous—with what result is not doubtful, as the statistics of crime have been adduced to show.

The State schools, of course, cover the country, being established in nearly every parish, or, at least, in every school district; whereas the "Congregational" schools are only to be found in the larger towns, where sufficient means may be available for the maintenance, out of private effort and benevolence, of second, or more supplementary, or religious schools, managed, as already said, by the clergy and their friends, and under teachers from the society of the "Frères Chrétiens" or other ecclesiastical source; or, in the case of girls' and infant schools, of a sister of one or other of the religious orders. These religious schools are often preferred by the parents, and as often, perhaps, not—for the State schools enjoy certain advantages connected, for example, with prizes, treats, and the like, organized by the mayor or the Town Council, upon which both parents and children set a certain value. There is, indeed, a sharp rivalry between the two, and in many places the Church attracts more pupils to its schools than the State does to its. As regards the ordinary routine of school learning, there is little to choose between them. The Government inspector does not visit the "free" schools, except to report upon their sanitary condition.

The course of study in the State schools is regulated by a code similar to the one we are familiar with at home, and the Minister of Public Instruction issues circulars from time to time directing attention to matters he may deem important. To every separate subject of instruction a certain number of hours per week is assigned, while the holidays and vacations are directed by the same authority. The masters and mistresses seem thus to be left very little discretion. In practice, however, those sometimes long-winded circulars are said to meet with scant attention, for they are as often as not regarded as academic and impracticable. And here I may observe that the rulers in all departments of the Government inherit from their predecessors a strong disposition to issue ordinances and enact regulations with little or no reference to the possibility of their being observed. When, for example, in

the first outburst of Revolutionary zeal the Constituant Assembly decreed that all children should receive suitable instruction free, and that schools should be everywhere built, it does not seem to have occurred to anyone that no funds were available, and therefore were not assigned for this purpose. This, however, is only one out of many instances that might be adduced to show what the French confess they are often unmindful of—looking before they leap. Some years later Napoleon issued similar orders, which, like the first, remained a dead letter for want of money.

The ministries of to-day, in like manner, it may be added, expend much paper and ink on matters that might be left alone, or to the discretion of the subordinate staffs; but then they would not be in evidence. Much entertainment might be derived from reading a recent long circular upon the desirableness of encouraging out-of-door games in the school playgrounds, in which the English are often referred to as examples. A single page might have sufficed for all the minister had to urge; but in this case he composed a very elaborate academical essay upon the value of physical exercises for the development of the muscles and the promotion of health of body.

And this leads me to observe that in the French schools and colleges generally, for both sexes, such continual watchfulness is exercised over the pupils that they have little opportunity of developing either a muscular physique or an independent character, and consequently they carry with them into life a certain flabbiness of body and a mistrust of themselves, and aversion to act on their own responsibility which distinguishes them remarkably in both respects from the British race. When the scholars go forth into the town or village they are required to march in military fashion, two by two, under the eye of a teacher, and even in the playground a master or mistress is told off to look after them. In this way the sense of being superintended, cared for and observed becomes habitual to them, and when they become men and women they lean upon others, and chiefly upon the Government, to support them in undertakings which Englishmen would start for themselves, or for direction in moral or spiritual affairs upon the priests or anti-clerical leaders, as the case may be. One result of this deeply-rooted system of tutelage, in which espionage plays so great a part, may be seen, among many other instances that might be adduced, in the recent Panama scandals, which exhibited the exceeding credulity of the people and the facility with which they allowed themselves to be fleeced by scheming speculators, who themselves probably were as much misled by others as they misled those who were reposing confidence in

them. It might be alleged, however, that these scandals were the natural outcome of the spirit of gambling, which infects all classes, apparently, of French society.

Another result upon the national character of what may be called their nursery training is not so observable to the French themselves as it is to strangers like ourselves. There are few who hold, or at least confess to, any fixed political creed or opinions, deriving these temporarily from the Government that may happen to be in power. This accounts for the light-heartedness with which they change their rulers and their political systems. Having tried a variety of Governments, they are attached to none in particular, if they have not, indeed, ceased to believe in the efficacy of any or of all. And they are quite ready to make new and perilous experiments, finality being a term as unknown to them as settlement is an unwelcome one. The more instructed among them, indeed, confess that they still retain the character Cæsar gave them—of Gauls with the fickleness and passion of the Celtic race. I seem to be wandering from my subject, so will add no more at present than to observe that this character has been maintained in the course of their history—the suppression of the Parliaments and the absorption of their powers, such as they were, into the sole authority of the Monarchy from the time of Philip Augustus to Louis XIV., and from the "Grand Monarque," through the Revolution to Napoleon, having suffocated the spirit of independence.

I have, as will have been seen, reversed the order of my subjects. This was unintentional, but what has been already said will form a ground-work for observations upon the aspects of religion in France. These at times and places appear dark, at others bright. So far as external circumstances are concerned, the prospects of the Church are not encouraging. Where a generation is in the process of formation, the majority of whom have not been nurtured in religion, the presumption is that they will lose hold or connection with it for life, and will bring up their own children in the neglect of what they themselves have never given attention to. There is a continual friction between the Church and the present State in France. Each desires to be master, and where there is not open war, there is suppressed hostility. In some places the Church appears able to hold its own, and to carry the population with it, in others to be little more than a name and a tradition.

(To be continued.)

W. H. LANGHORNE.

Art. V.—APOSTOLIC SUCCESSION.

Part II.

IF it be alleged that a transmission of Apostolic succession can only be effected through a duly consecrated Bishop, then every minister of the Gospel of the several classes of Nonconformists is cut off from the advantages supposed to be derived from the acquisition of "Apostolic succession." And here I would remind such claimants that the Church of Rome, at the Trent Council, after angry discussions, the sittings in consequence being suspended ten times, ultimately declared, by a majority of twenty-seven votes out of a hundred and eighty-one Bishops present, that there was no *divine right* in Bishops, but that they derived their authority solely from the Pope, and therefore a human institution. Dr. Littledale, in the same tract before referred to on this subject, observes that dissenting ministers "do not undertake to offer *the sacrifice* of the Lord's Body and Blood, nor to bind and loose sins of men;" and that those ministers are "virtually trespassers;" that a sacerdotal character is wholly wanting in them, and that, therefore, the administration of the sacraments by them is wholly void. If, then, an uninterrupted pedigree from the Apostles, in addition to the precise *form* or ceremony, be essential, the chances are fearfully against those who assert the claim of Apostolic succession in their own persons; and, in fact, we assert that no Apostolic succession can be proved to exist. Those who make the claim as applied to themselves, based on *personal* succession and *forms*, in addition to *doctrinal* requirements, should be prepared to produce their credentials. And here it may be also observed that priests of the Roman Church declare that the ministers of religion of any other communion than their own, are not "priests" at all, but simply laymen, having no authority to administer Sacraments.[1]

Our first objection is that "Apostolic succession" on any other basis than the acceptance of Apostolic doctrine, as derived from the teaching of the Apostles, cannot be sustained by the authority of Scripture, the written teaching of the Apostles; and no one ought to be required to accept any doctrine or theory which has not the clear warranty of the sacred Scriptures to support it. If this view of the question be correct, then the entire priesthood of the Roman Church is hopelessly excluded, since they are required, under oath by

[1] See tracts issued by the Catholic Truth Society, "Are the Anglican Clergy Massing Priests?" No. 51; and "Are they Priests?" by Father Breen, O.S.B.