Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

A Monthly Magazine

CONDUCTED BY CLERGYMEN AND LAYMEN

OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

VOL. XII.

LONDON
ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW
1885

35? This is the only method by which the Revisers' strange inconsistency with reference to *Sheol* could be justified.

In Exod. xxiii. 20 we read, "Behold, I will send an angel before thee;" see also xxxii. 34, and xxxiii. 2. This was no ordinary angel, as is plain from the context in the first-named passage; compare Josh. v. 14. Would not a capital letter have been well placed in these passages, and in the reference to them in Isa. lxiii. 9?

Public attention has already been drawn to the absence of the capital *S* in the word "spirit" in some passages, *e.g.* Gen. i. 2, and viii. 3; but there are other noteworthy passages where the defect is to be noticed, *e.g.* Isa. xlii. 1, "I have put my spirit upon him;" Isa. lxi. 1, "The spirit of the Lord God is upon me;" Isa. lxiii. 10, "They grieved his holy spirit." The Revisers of the New Testament are far better in this respect, for in the passages where these three verses are referred to, the capital letters are retained. See Matt. xii. 18, Luke iv. 18, and Ephes. iv. 30. There are certain passages where it may be difficult to decide what to do about capitals, but we cannot acquit the Old Testament Revisers of serious blame for cutting the knot in this rough-and-ready fashion.

R. B. GIRDLESTONE.

(To be continued.)

ART. II.—THE CHURCH AND ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

SINCE the passing of the Education Act of 1870, it is to be feared that an idea has been gaining ground that the Church is no longer under any obligation to give her attention to the formation and maintenance of Elementary Schools. This idea has, of course, been fostered from the first by the advocates of a purely secular education, and also by those who, having taken up the Board School System like a new toy, have made up their minds that there is no school to be compared with a "Board" school, while others have gradually adopted it as a natural effect of the twofold tax which has been laid upon their purse by the demand for a School Board Rate in addition to their accustomed voluntary subscriptions to their Parochial Schools. These influences have operated, more or less powerfully in different neighbourhoods, to chill the growing enthusiasm which was formerly felt in favour of Voluntary Schools, and to endanger the continuance of the Voluntary System; so that up to the present time no fewer than 750 Church Schools have already been abandoned, while

clergy are still found who openly avow their readiness to throw their schools upon the tender mercies of a Board, and Lay Churchmen, in increasing numbers, who refuse any further support to Church Schools. It shall be our endeavour in this paper to show that the idea to which we have alluded is a most mistaken one, and that the policy of surrender and inaction to which it gives rise is likely to be as disastrous to the interests of true religion in the future as it is unjustifiable from the experience of the past.

The earlier history of elementary education is sometimes forgotten in the revolution caused by its later development under the Act of 1870; and people are apt to talk as if the work had been originated by the State simply for the purpose of promoting secular knowledge. Thus the teaching of religion comes to be regarded as a questionable importation into the scheme, or at best as an addition to it of only secondary value. But as a matter of fact, it was the Church, and not the State, that was first struck with the importance of educating the children of the working-classes, and it was a religious impulse and a religious aim that prompted the Church to embark upon the work, in the face of great difficulties and not a little opposition; so that elementary education may be said to owe everything—even its very existence—to religion, and that religion the Faith of Christ, mainly as it is enshrined in the life of the Church of England.

It was during the latter part of last century that the Church of England awoke to a consciousness of her responsibility in this matter. The wisest of men had said long since, "Train up a child in the way he should go," and there was the National Church, the spiritual mother of the people, altogether neglecting this important duty so far as regarded the poorer classes. The Master had said, speaking as the Saviour of the world and as the living Head of the Church, "Feed My lambs;" and the lambs were either perishing where they were for want of knowledge, or straying to other pastures. Once alive to this great shortcoming, the Church of England took vigorous measures to supply what had hitherto been wanting. With the assistance of the venerable Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, she commenced a system of national education based upon the great principle that "the fear of the LORD is the beginning of wisdom," and therefore having as its main object instruction in the Scriptures and in the Book of Common Prayer. The work grew with such rapidity that in 1811 it became necessary to form the National Society, for the purpose of giving it a more individual and careful attention than the S.P.C.K. could then do. And now the country began to be covered with a network of "National

Schools," where boys and girls were taught their duty towards God and towards their neighbour, and were fitted for the fulfilment of that duty by further instruction in all useful elementary knowledge. In the year 1832 this excellent work came under the tardy notice of the State; and although the State was not yet prepared to make the work its own, an annual grant was nevertheless voted by Parliament in order that it might be fostered and encouraged. Thus the Church, and to no small extent other religious bodies as well, went on creating an appetite for elementary education throughout the country, until at last, in 1870, the State felt itself constrained to take the matter up more seriously, in order to secure without further delay to every child in the realm the opportunity of being educated.

Now, whatever may have been the design of the State in furthering the cause of elementary education, it is perfectly clear from the foregoing historical sketch that the Church has taken up the work from the first as a *religious* work, for the purpose of training up children in the fear of God. Nothing, therefore, can ever justify the Church in abating her efforts, unless it can be shown that the children of the working-classes no longer stand in need of religious instruction, or that the work of so instructing them is being sufficiently carried out by means of other trustworthy agencies. Such a condition of things has not yet been arrived at, and we have no reason to suppose that it ever will be. The spread of infidelity, the increasing snares and temptations offered by an advancing civilization seem, on the contrary, to make it more and more necessary that the Church should give every possible attention to the religious training of the young through her elementary schools. No other agency has released her from this responsibility. School Boards certainly have not; if anything, they have served to increase her anxiety, for with a great semblance of benevolence their action is so uncertain, that they are as likely as not to withhold from the children under their care the one branch of knowledge of vital importance, or to present it in such a mutilated form that it is practically of no value. Sunday-schools have not; for although we would not say one word in disparagement of the loving, patient, self-denying labours of the vast army of voluntary teachers who are week by week employed in our Sunday-schools, yet experience has shown us that, while Sunday-school teaching is a most valuable supplement to the religious teaching given in the day-school, it can never take its place. The constitution of a Sunday-school of necessity precludes it in most places from having either the time or the teaching-power sufficient to impart that thorough grounding in religious knowledge

which is so essential to the maintenance of the Faith. It is, therefore, as much the Church's duty now as ever it was to give her attention to the formation and maintenance of elementary schools, that she may continue, through their instrumentality to provide systematic religious instruction for the children of the working-classes.

But in addition to this great call of duty there are other important considerations of a practical character which should encourage Churchmen to persevere in their support of Church Schools. Take first the immense sums of money which have been voluntarily contributed for the work up to the present time. No less than £11,759,833 has been contributed for school building, and £15,723,180 for school maintenance; while £271,185 has been contributed for the building of Training Colleges, and £375,949 for their maintenance. What capital, therefore, the Church has invested in this holy enterprise! what sacrifices her members have made in its behalf! Shall we, then, for the want of a little enthusiasm, suffer all the labours and self-denials of the past in this cause to become of no avail to future generations? God forbid! Rather let us go on building upon the good foundation which has been so well laid for us, by doing all that we can to maintain and develop the capabilities of our Church Schools.

Then observe the remarkable success which has so far crowned the work. There is no occasion to refer again to the period previous to 1870. We will simply note the position which Church Schools have held since that date. In the eyes of Churchmen the great Education Act did not sufficiently recognise the importance of the religious principle upon which elementary education had formerly been based. They could not, therefore, give it as hearty a welcome as they would otherwise have done. But they saw that there was no use in hopelessly bewailing the defects of the Act, and, for the most part, they adopted the wiser course of accepting accomplished facts, and adapting their educational machinery to somewhat altered circumstances. On all sides where it was pronounced necessary, and where it was found possible, new Church Schools were built, or the old ones enlarged until the original accommodation was increased nearly twofold; so that even now, although so many schools have been abandoned, and although for fifteen years School Boards have enjoyed the power of the rates for extending their operations, the Church of England still provides accommodation for as many children as are provided for in the Board Schools and in the schools of all other denominations put together.[1] The Training Colleges

[1] The statistics are these: Church of England Schools, 2,413,676; Board Schools, 1,396,604; and Religious Denominations, 860,161.

for teachers were also improved and enlarged, so far as the case required, so that the Church of England still trains twice as many teachers as are trained by all other agencies put together. Thus has the Church been enabled in the face of serious rivalry and increased difficulties, not only to maintain, but even to extend, her operations in the work of elementary education. She has only failed in places where the circumstances have been quite exceptional, or where interest and enthusiasm have been chilled through the growth of the half-hearted idea which we are endeavouring to combat.

With the strong sense of duty which has been bequeathed to us by past generations, and with the powerful encouragement which is given us to fulfil our duty by the present position of our own schools, we should exhibit no hesitation in our efforts to promote the cause of elementary education as a distinctly religious work. In some respects the responsibility of the Church in this matter is even greater than formerly. For it has now become necessary to employ the Church's educational machinery not only for directly influencing those who actually make use of it, but also as far as possible for indirectly influencing other educational agencies with a view to encouraging them to be religious. Every Church School which is zealously maintained in a state of efficiency, both trains its own scholars up in the fear of God, and also exercises a kind of constraint upon the neighbouring Board Schools to do the same by their scholars. Whereas, on the contrary, every Church School that is neglected or abandoned, both sacrifices the spiritual well-being of its own scholars and depreciates the importance of religious teaching in the eyes of neighbouring School Boards, so that theirs suffer also.

Thus elementary education in Church Schools possesses a missionary value which should never be lost sight of. It is indeed as much a mission work as any other Church undertaking, and as such it should be entered upon and developed with spirit and with vigour. Looking at the work of elementary education from this point of view, we shall be better prepared to face the difficulties and discouragements which sometimes surround it, and shall not lose heart at every change in the Code or advance in the School Board rate, which affect prejudicially our own school finances.

Every real mission work has its special hindrances, and the work of Church education is no exception in this respect. The jealousy and opposition of Secularists and of School Board enthusiasts; the troublesome restrictions placed by the State upon the delivery of religious instruction; the obstacles placed in the way of obtaining sufficient pecuniary support by the Code and by the School Board rate—these are some of

the hindrances which Churchmen must expect to meet in the work of elementary education. But while they may take all reasonable steps to remove these hindrances, they should never allow themselves to be dismayed or baffled by them, but should simply endeavour to surmount them in the strength of Him for whom they are working.

It will be found, more especially in town parishes, that wherever this missionary importance of Church Schools is systematically kept before the parishioners, there is seldom much difficulty in raising the required voluntary aid for educational purposes. In some towns, where this has been the case, Church people have both provided the entire school accommodation, and continued ungrudgingly to support the schools with their annual subscriptions. In country parishes where there are no wealthy residents, and where agricultural depression prevails, financial difficulties no doubt press more heavily. But even here they have not been found insuperable, and they might be still more easily met if a more general support was given to the several Diocesan Education Societies. The Archbishop of Canterbury is now appealing to every congregation in his diocese to give some annual support, however small, to the Canterbury Diocesan Society. If this appeal were properly responded to, the Society would be in a position to make grants for the support of Church Schools in any parishes where such external aid was really required. The same plan might easily be followed in other dioceses. We sincerely hope that this may speedily be done. We are confident that elementary education is a work which grows in interest and importance in our parochial organization with cultivation. The Church in any parish without a Church school is in our opinion a maimed and imperfect institution; and we would not only urge that all existing Church Schools should be jealously maintained, but that in new parishes every effort should be made as time goes on to provide new schools wherever it may be possible to do so. We are not prepared to say that no case can ever arise in which it may be necessary to abandon a Church school, but we do feel that such cases are so exceptional that their occurrence should be extremely rare. The Roman Catholics, who in this question at least are our example as well as our allies, have not, we believe, up to the present time surrendered a single one of their elementary schools.

The unworthy abandonment of Church Schools means the sacrifice of a great principle, the betrayal of a great trust. It means the renunciation of a grave responsibility, and the loss of much influence for good. It means the handing over the rising generation to a colourless creed, and perhaps to no

creed at all. It means a step towards national apostasy. Whereas, on the other hand, the careful retention of elementary education as part of the mission work of the Church means the preservation of a religious influence over the mind of the country which does not end with the religious instruction given in the schools, but permeates everywhere, checking the spread of infidelity, opposing the progress of vice, forestalling to some extent the need for those special missions among the people, which have so often seemed in their disappointing results as if they had come too late; in short, promoting generally the spiritual welfare of our nation by spreading the dominion of the Kingdom of God.

J. M. BRAITHWAITE.

ART. III.—SAINTS' DAYS IN THE CHURCH'S YEAR.

VII. JULY. ST. JAMES THE APOSTLE.

A. FIVE SCRIPTURE CHARACTERS.

"*Herod the king stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church; and he killed James, the brother of John, with the sword; and because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.*"—ACTS xii. 1-3.

WE experience no difficulty in identifying that James whom we commemorate during the present month, and in separating him off from others in the New Testament who bore that name. It is well known that we touch now one of those intricate questions which have perplexed theologians.[1] But no such question arises in the present instance. That St. James who is now before our attention is quite accurately defined: he is the earliest martyr among the Apostles, and he is the brother of John, who lived the longest. The Epistle and Gospel for the day set these two aspects of the commemoration before us in this order, and in this order we may consider them. The topics (though not without a deep inner connection) being different in their character, it is not needful in this instance to have regard to chronology.

There is an advantage in taking the whole of the context in its continuity, because in this way we gain a general im-

[1] See remarks on the Festival of St. Philip and St. James in THE CHURCHMAN for May. The St. James before us in this month is the San Iago of Compostella, for whom such strange legends have been invented. There is a touch of edification in one part of the story, where it is said that in Spain he made only seven converts.