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

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

THE

CHURCHMAN

FEBRUARY, 1886.

Art. I.—CHURCH ELEMENTARY EDUCATION.

THE history of Elementary Education in this country has been treated by various writers in a fragmentary way, but has never yet been satisfactorily handled, though many interesting facts relating to it may be found in Mr. Bartley's "Schools for the People," and Dr. Craik's admirable little book, "The State in its Relation to Education."

During the Middle Ages the only schools open to the lower classes were the Cathedral schools, and the schools attached to the various religious houses. Even so late as the sixteenth century we find grave doubts expressed as to the desirability of teaching the children of the poor. An anecdote well illustrating this condition of things is told by the Rev. R. Whiston in his "Cathedral Trusts." It relates to the substitution of seculars for monks in the Cathedral Church of Canterbury in the days of Henry VIII., for which purpose a Commission had been appointed, headed by Archbishop Cranmer: "It came to pass that when they should elect the children of the Grammar School, there were of the Commissioners more than one or two who would have none admitted but sons or younger brethren of gentlemen. As for husbandmen's children, they were more meet, they said, for the plough and to be artificers than to occupy the place of the learned sort; so that they wished none else to be put to school but only gentlemen's children. Whereunto the most reverend father the Archbishop, being of a contrary mind, said 'that he thought it not indifferent so to order the matter, for,' said he, 'poor men's children are many times endued with more singular gifts of nature, which are also the gifts of God, as with eloquence, memory, apt pronunciation, sobriety, and such like; and also commonly more apt to apply their study than in the gentleman's son delicately educated.' Hereunto it was on the other

part replied 'that it was meet for the ploughman's son to go to the plough, and the artificer's son to apply to the trade of his parent's vocation, and the gentlemen's children are meet to have the knowledge of government, and rule the commonwealth. For we have,' said they, 'as much need of ploughmen as any other state, and all sorts of men may not go to school.' 'I grant,' replied the Archbishop, 'much of your meaning herein, as needful in a commonwealth; but yet utterly to exclude the ploughman's son and the poor man's child from the benefits of learning, as though they were unworthy to have the gifts of the Holy Ghost bestowed upon them as well as upon others, is as much as to say that Almighty God should not be at liberty to bestow His great gifts of grace upon any person. Wherefore, if the gentleman's son be apt to learning, let him be admitted; if not apt, let the poor man's child that is apt enter his room.'" These noble words deserve to be remembered. They indicate that already godly and thoughtful Churchmen were beginning to recognise the duty of affording opportunities to the poorest children in the land for receiving a suitable education.

The foundation of Grammar Schools began in the previous century. These schools were, in many cases, free, and were originally intended, though not exclusively, for the poorer classes. Thus we find that at the Manchester Grammar School the master and usher were to "teach grammar freely and indifferently" to the pupils without receiving "any money or awards, as cock-penny, victor-penny, potation-penny, or any other." The Reformation gave a great stimulus to education, and led to the rapid multiplication of grammar schools; but although these schools, like their predecessors, were open to all classes, the poor do not appear to have largely used them. Provision was made for the religious instruction of the poor by means of public catechizing; and when this was carried on, as it was carried on by men like George Herbert, much good was doubtless effected.

But it was not for a century and a half after the Reformation that any systematic endeavour was made to provide a suitable education for the children of the poor. A Mr. Nedham proposed in 1663 that parish clerks should be paid for the instruction of such children, but we are not told whether the suggestion was carried out. In 1698 the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge was founded, and one of its first efforts was the establishment of "Catechetical Schools in every parish in and about London," "for poor children whose parents or friends were not able to give them learning." The course of instruction given in these schools was to include reading, writing and arithmetic, and the Church Catechism.

The first schools set up were at St. Botolph, Aldgate, and St. Giles, Cripplegate, in 1698: and at St. Andrew, Holborn; St. James, Clerkenwell; St. Martin-in-the-Fields; and at St. Paul, Shadwell, in 1699. By 1714 the total number of such schools in England and Ireland had risen to 1,073, with an attendance of 19,453 scholars. The funds needed for maintaining these schools, in many of which the children were lodged, boarded, and clothed as well as educated, were raised mainly by Church offertories. Among other extraordinary expedients for raising money for this good work, we read that in one parish the clergyman "hath provided two palls, the one of which is let out for 2s. 6d. and the other for 1s. a time, for the more decent funerals of the dead, and the money so arising bears a good part of the charge of teaching the children there." An annual gathering of the children attending the Parochial Schools in the metropolis was first held at St. Andrew's, Holborn, when 2,000 children were present. These gatherings have been continued to the present time, and since 1782 have been held at St. Paul's Cathedral. They suggested Blake's beautiful poem "Holy Thursday." The necessity for periodical examinations was soon felt, and as early as 1700 a clergyman was appointed Inspector of all the schools of the S.P.C.K. in and about London and Westminster. In country towns the examinations were conducted by the local clergy.

The teachers of these schools were to be over twenty-three years of age, to have an aptitude for teaching, to be well grounded in the principles of the Christian religion; and "to be of meek tempers and humble behaviour; to have a good government of themselves and their passions; and to keep good order." The masters were, in addition, to be able to write a good hand and have some knowledge of arithmetic; but this was not insisted on at first in the case of schoolmistresses.

In 1711 the Society issued a circular recommending the teachers of Charity Schools to appoint "some hours in the evening on certain days of the week, to teach such grown persons to read as have been neglected in their youth." In the following year they issued another circular recommending instruction in sewing, spinning, knitting, gardening, ploughing, harrowing, and other handicrafts, on alternate days with the ordinary subjects of the school course. These efforts show how fully alive the Church was, in the early part of the last century, to the need of educating the people, and how far-sighted was her policy, the demand for technical education in our own day being precisely identical in its intention with the half-time system recommended by the Christian Knowledge Society. Unfortunately this educational zeal gradually

abated, and though provincial schools continued to be founded throughout the country, they do not appear to have increased in efficiency. In many cases they were provided for by endowments which were administered without much supervision of the ways in which the schools were conducted.

For nearly a century the Parochial Charity Schools were the only schools for the education of the poorer classes. They rendered a valuable service in towns, but they failed to meet the wants of the agricultural districts, and, on account of their strictly denominational character, they did not satisfy Nonconformists, who, as yet, had no elementary schools of their own.

In 1763 the first Sunday-school in England was opened by the Rev. Theophilus Lindsay, Vicar of Catterick, in Yorkshire; and his example was speedily followed by others. But the first attempt to establish Sunday-schools on a large scale was made by Robert Raikes, a printer of Gloucester, and editor of the *Gloucester Journal*, whose attention had been drawn to the matter by the wretched way in which the young in his native city spent their Sundays. In a short time there were few parishes throughout the kingdom in which a Sunday-school of some sort was not to be found. It has been computed that by 1787 some 230,000 children were to be found in the Sunday-schools of England and Wales. At first the teachers in these schools were paid, but, after the first enthusiasm which had led to the establishment of Sunday-schools had died off, it was found difficult to raise the funds for supporting paid teachers, and voluntary teachers were substituted for them.

Towards the end of the eighteenth century Nonconformists began to establish schools of their own, in which the Scriptures were to be read, but no catechism or other denominational formulary was to be used. In the carrying out of this object they were largely assisted by the enthusiastic labours of Joseph Lancaster, a Quaker, who opened a school in 1798 at his father's house in St. George's Fields, nearly opposite the present British and Foreign Training College. Lancaster was an educational genius, and the rapid increase in the number of pupils attending his school compelled him to seek for means for carrying on the education of large numbers of children at the least possible expense. In the solution of this problem he was greatly assisted by the experiments of Dr. Bell in a similar direction at Madras. He contended that, by classifying pupils and by employing monitors one master was able to conduct a school of a thousand pupils; that by using sheets printed in large type instead of separate books, one book of such sheets would serve for a whole school; that by means of

dictation five hundred boys could speak and write the same word at the same instant of time; that by an entirely new method of instruction any child who could read might teach arithmetic with the utmost certainty; that the expense of education could be reduced, in a school of 300 children, to 7s. per annum for each child; and that religious instruction might be given without touching on controverted points of theology. Lancaster's school attracted great attraction, and was visited by crowds of distinguished persons interested in education, George III. himself becoming a subscriber towards its maintenance. In 1805 the King sent for him to receive an account of his work from his own lips. The interview is thus related by one of Lancaster's friends: "On entering the royal presence, the King said, 'Lancaster, I have sent for you to give me an account of your system of education, which I hear has met with opposition. One master teach 500 children at the same time! How do you keep them in order, Lancaster?' Lancaster replied, 'Please thy Majesty, by the same principle that thy Majesty's army is kept in order—by the word of command.' His Majesty replied, 'Good, good; it does not require an aged general to give the command. One of younger years can do it.' Lancaster observed that in his school the teaching branch was performed by youths who acted as monitors. The King assented, and said 'Good.' Lancaster then described his system, and he informed me that all present paid great attention and were highly delighted; and, as soon as he had finished, his Majesty said, 'Lancaster, I highly approve of your system, and it is my wish that every poor child in my dominions should be taught to read the Bible. I will do anything you wish to promote this object.'"

These marks of public and royal favour appear to have turned Lancaster's head. He began to believe that he was divinely called to establish a universal system of education on the lines of his own school, and he proceeded to visit all the chief towns in the kingdom for the purpose of carrying out his plans. His enthusiasm communicated itself to others; large numbers of schools were established at his instigation, and, for a time, he received considerable pecuniary support. But Lancaster was extravagant and reckless in his expenditure, and before long his affairs became hopelessly involved. Happily, in 1808, a gentleman, Mr. Joseph Fox, came to his rescue by advancing him £2,000; his affairs were soon after handed over to trustees, and an association, called after him, was started, under the name of "The Royal Lancastrian Institution," for promoting the education of the children of the poor. From 1807 to 1813 Lancaster continued his

travels. In one year (1810) he started fifty new schools, and travelled 3,775 miles.

In 1814 the name of "The Royal Lancastrian Institution" was changed into that of "The British and Foreign Society," and the new Society put forth as its two leading objects (i.) the furnishing of a practical example in the Borough Road Schools of the working of Lancaster's plans, and (ii.) the training of teachers for the carrying on of similar unsectarian schools elsewhere. It was now found necessary to define Lancaster's position, and prevent the lavish expenditure in which he had indulged as long as he had the supreme management of his school in his own hands. The new arrangements did not suit him. He broke off his connection with the Society, and, after an ineffectual endeavour to establish a boarding-school at Tooting, emigrated to America, where he died in 1839. The work he commenced was destined to prosper, and had no inconsiderable effect in leading the Church of England to re-organize its educational machinery. It is a great mistake, however, to regard Lancaster as the founder of our modern system of elementary education. What he did was to show that, by means of the monitorial system devised by Dr. Bell, education could be vastly cheapened, and that, by sinking denominational differences, large numbers of persons who were indifferent to distinctive religious teaching could be got to support unsectarian schools.

In order of time another distinguished educational reformer should have been noticed before Lancaster. This was Dr. Andrew Bell, who, when a chaplain at Madras, had had charge of a school for educating the orphan children of soldiers. In this position he was led, some time before 1791, to try the effect of employing children to teach children. The school was divided into classes of from twenty-five to thirty boys. The boys in each class were paired off, one superior boy, called a tutor, being placed next an inferior boy, whom he had to assist. Each class had an assistant-teacher (one of the abler senior boys), whose duty was to instruct his class, and to see that the tutors did the work assigned to them. Above the assistant-teachers were the teachers (still taken from the ranks of the pupils), who had the oversight of one or more classes. In the whole school, consisting of two hundred boys, there were in all fourteen teachers and assistants, ranging in age from seven to fourteen years. The function of the schoolmaster was to supervise the whole school, to inspect the classes, and to administer praise or censure where and when it was required. In 1796 Dr. Bell's health compelled him to return to England, where he published an account of his system under the title of "An Experiment in

Education, made at the Male Asylum, Madras; suggesting a System by which a School or Family may Teach itself, under the Superintendence of the Master or Parent." It ought not to surprise us that the author formed an exaggerated estimate of the value of his system, such exaggerations being common to all inventors. "The system," he says, "has no parallel in scholastic history. In a school it gives to the master the hundred eyes of Argus, the hundred hands of Briareus, and the wings of Mercury. By multiplying his ministers at pleasure, it gives him indefinite powers; in other words, it enables him to instruct as many pupils as his schoolroom will contain." We are now able to form a more correct opinion of the value of the monitorial system. It is possible to profitably employ monitors for various routine parts of school-work; they may look after children occupied in mechanical exercises, but they cannot teach what they do not know, nor develop the intelligence of others while their own is undeveloped. The "hundred eyes of Argus" will, after all, be only children's eyes; "the hundred hands of Briareus" will only be children's hands. The chief recommendation of the monitorial system is that it is economical, and renders possible a system of classification by which a master can keep a large number of children profitably occupied, while he himself passes from class to class to teach those subjects that most need handling by an adult.

Dr. Bell was appointed Rector of Swanage in Dorsetshire soon after his return to England, and here he introduced his system for the purpose of working a Sunday-school. His system was also tried in London and various other places, but did not attract much attention till the success of the Lancastrian Schools alarmed the friends of distinctive Church teaching, and led them to see in Dr. Bell's system the means for establishing schools of their own in which such teaching could be given. The famous Mrs. Trimmer was the first to sound the alarm with regard to the danger arising from the spread of the Lancastrian Schools. The cry was quickly caught up, and in a short time England was divided into two hostile camps, under the banners of Bell and Lancaster. Southey, Coleridge, and the *Quarterly Review* took up the quarrel in behalf of Bell; Sydney Smith, Brougham, and the *Edinburgh* came to the rescue of Lancaster. If the reader wishes to form some idea of the bitterness with which this warfare was waged, he need only look into Sydney Smith's review on "Trimmer and Lancaster" (1806). A note to the review in Sydney Smith's collected works says, "Lancaster invented the new method of education. The Church was sorely vexed at its success, endeavoured to set up Dr. Bell as the discoverer,

and to run down poor Lancaster." This is a ridiculous version of the relations subsisting between the two rival educationists. Lancaster himself had already written in his first pamphlet in 1803, "I ought not to close my account without acknowledging the obligations I lie under to Dr. Bell. I much regret that I was not acquainted with the beauty of his system till somewhat advanced in my plan. If I had known it, it would have saved me much trouble and some retrograde movements." Good sometimes comes out of evil. The strife between the partisans of Bell and Lancaster gave a great stimulus to education. We have seen how Lancaster's difficulties led to the establishment of the British and Foreign School Society. The dread of a national system of unsectarian education contributed to the establishment in 1811 of the National Society.

The object of the National Society, as set forth in its first report, was "that the national religion of the country should be made the foundation of national education, which should be the first and chief thing taught to the poor, according to the excellent Liturgy and Catechism provided by our Church for that purpose." The Society was supported at once by the Archbishops, Bishops, and many influential persons among the laity, and the Prince Regent became its Patron. The first efforts of the Society were directed to the establishment, under Dr. Bell's able and energetic superintendence, of a Central Model School, where his system could be seen at work. This experiment commenced at 45, Holborn Hill, but was speedily removed to premises capable of accommodating 1,000 children at Baldwin's Gardens. It was at first intended that the Society should establish similar schools in other districts, but this idea was speedily abandoned, it being rightly considered that the localities themselves should take the initiative, and that the Society could best assist education by making grants in aid of local effort. By 1815 there were at work no fewer than 564 National Schools, containing over 100,000 scholars, and officered in many cases by teachers who had been trained at the Central School.

From an early period in its history district branches of the Society were formed in every diocese, and this organization largely contributed to the rapidity with which National Schools were established all over the country. Grants of from £20 to £300 were made toward the building of local schools, and by 1821 there were 300,000 scholars in the 1,700 or 1,800 schools that had been started with the help of the Society. The magnitude of the Society's operations began at last to tell upon its exchequer, and in 1823 it became necessary to consider how its funds were to be increased. In this strait, George IV. issued a Royal Letter, addressed, through the

Bishops, to the provincial clergy, asking them to get their parishes to contribute to the Society's funds. A sum of £27,000 was in this way raised, and, what was of greater importance, the attention of the Church was once more forcibly directed to the importance of elementary education. In order to stimulate teachers, the Society was soon after led to issue a memorandum, drawn up by Dr. Bell, recommending that their salaries should be made partly dependent on their success and on the fees of the children. This important suggestion was very generally acted upon, and thenceforward fees became an important part of school revenue. It was soon found that they rendered the still more valuable service of making the attendance of the children more regular.

In 1832 the Central School was removed to Westminster, where it continued in operation until the establishment of Training Colleges rendered it unnecessary as a nursery for teachers. A second King's Letter was issued by William IV., which brought in a sum of £23,500. We now approach times when the State was beginning to recognise its duties in the matter of education, duties which had been too long left to voluntary effort. The first Parliamentary vote for elementary education was made in 1834; it was for the modest sum of £20,000, which was to be expended in the erection of school-buildings, the vote being left to be administered by the National Society and the British and Foreign Society. By 1838 the total annual grants of the State to the National Society had amounted to £70,122. Several Royal Letters were issued during the early part of the present reign asking for increased support of the Society, which was thereby enabled to multiply its grants. In 1844-5 alone these grants amounted to £63,267. Another important service rendered by the Society at this juncture was the appointment of traveling organizing masters, whose business it was to visit the various schools in connection with the Society for the purpose of advising the teachers in regard to the best methods of organization, teaching and discipline.

It is easier to start a good work than to continue it. The supporters of Church Schools found it very difficult to maintain them, and it was generally felt that the time had now come when the State should not only help to found schools but should contribute to support them. In 1847 this duty was practically recognised, and from that year forward an ever-increasing annual grant, amounting in 1884 to £2,721,000, has been made to elementary schools.

Since the Education Act of 1870 was passed, the State, except during the year of grace allowed after the passing of the Act, has discontinued building grants to elementary

schools, and all new Church Elementary Schools have had to be started by voluntary effort. It is satisfactory to find that during that period the National Society has granted £149,700 for building and enlarging schools in 3,333 places, thereby assisting to provide school accommodation for 410,000 children, But this is only a small part of the Society's operations. The Society makes grants to poor day-schools and Sunday-schools for fittings, books, and repairs; it has an admirable depository for the publication and sale of religious and secular school-books and school apparatus; it makes grants for the Diocesan inspection of schools in religious knowledge; it watches over educational legislation; and it helps to maintain colleges for the training of Church teachers. During the past fourteen years it has voted £50,683 towards the maintenance of students in those colleges, and £12,243 for their examination in religious knowledge.

Altogether the Society, since its formation in 1811, has expended more than £1,100,000 in promoting elementary education, involving an expenditure of at least twelve times as much from other sources for the same end. At the present time Church Schools have accommodation for 2,454,788 children, and have an average attendance of 1,607,823. These figures represent a splendid achievement, and should not be forgotten at a time like the present when the Church is being tried in the balance of public opinion. It is impossible to measure the extent to which the Church has contributed to the welfare and prosperity of our beloved country; but in the matter of education she can put her finger on unanswerable facts to testify to her zeal for the eternal and temporal interests of the poor. She took up the cause of elementary education long before the State contributed a penny towards it, and was mainly instrumental in educating the State to a sense of its duty in this respect. One half of the children attending our elementary schools are to be found in her schools; two-thirds of the teachers who are being trained for elementary school-work are trained in her colleges.

The work of the National Society is by no means accomplished. As long as English Churchmen value religious education they will need the Society to assist local effort; to train teachers not merely for Church Schools, but even for those schools in which distinctive teaching is not permitted; to provide school literature and apparatus; to criticize contemplated changes in our educational machinery, and to organize resistance to any legislation that is likely to injure the interests of Church Schools and religious education. Nor is it on Church Schools alone that the beneficial effect of the Society's operations will be exerted. As long as Church

Schools give religious education, School Boards will be bound to give some sort of religious education also. The existence of the Society is a standing protest against any creedless and godless system of education.

EVAN DANIEL.

ART. II.—THE TEXTUS RECEPTUS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

IN the October number of the *Quarterly Review* for 1885 there is an article upon the Revised Version of the Old Testament, written in a pungent style, and remarkable for the great breadth of its assertion. There is also an abundance of genuine learning, but unfortunately an equally remarkable absence of it upon that subject with which the Reviewer chose to deal, namely, the text of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the relation of the Versions to it.

I do not intend to follow this article step by step, but if its learned writer knows so little of the subject, what must be the case with others? I therefore propose to give some account of the Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic text; and in a subsequent paper I shall hope to show wherein the value of the ancient Versions consists. But I must venture first gravely to remonstrate against statements of which it is mild merely to say that they are misleading. Thus in p. 292 the Reviewer says, "The Targum on Genesis is an ancient authority, no doubt; but then it is 1,500 years later than the text which the Revisers propose to improve by its means." What should we think of a scholar who should say, "The manuscripts of the New Testament are ancient, no doubt; but the oldest of them is 400 years later than the text which critics propose to settle by their means"? We believe that Moses wrote 1,500 years before the Christian era; but the Targum is one of the oldest witnesses to what Moses wrote, and it is by the careful use of these ancient authorities that we obtain the conviction that the Massoretic is a most valuable and trustworthy text. But had there been neither Targums nor Versions to bear witness to its accuracy, then the Hebrew text, coming to us as a work centuries later than our era, and with no early and independent authorities to vouch for it, would have been surrounded with uncertainty of the gravest kind; for it would have had only the testimony of the Jewish synagogue on its behalf. As it is, many reject the vowels as