

# Religion, the State, and Education in England

JAMES MURPHY

IT WAS INEVITABLE that from the beginning of the Christian era in England education would rest in the hands of the Church, so that "from the first, education was the creature of religion, the school was an adjunct of the church, and the schoolmaster was an ecclesiastical officer." (1) It was the mission of the Church to teach, and only by doing so could it widen its authority or, indeed, perpetuate itself. Its influence gradually spread throughout the country, and many of its servants had the necessary leisure to give instruction not only in all that concerned religious doctrine but in reading, the study of Latin, and whatever was necessary to ensure that the missionary, liturgical, and administrative needs of the Church were met. By a natural process the study of Latin would in suitable circumstances lead on to the study of secular works, to which a knowledge of Latin provided the key. Of course there were fields of education outside the scope of the Church, but in a relatively uncomplicated society such acquirements as skill in arms, the social graces of aristocratic life, or knowledge of crafts could be learned from their practitioners. King Alfred, who had himself been taught, as he said, "by Plegmund, my archbishop, and Asser, my bishop, and Grimbold, my mass-priest, and John my mass priest," (2) naturally asked for the Church's help to bring it about "as we can very easily do . . . that all the youth of our English freemen who can afford to devote themselves to it should be set to learning." (3)

But more was involved than a mere convenient cooperation of Church and State. In pre-Conquest England, it has been said,

---

*Mr. Murphy is Senior Lecturer in Education at the University of Liverpool.*

. . . the boundary between lay and spiritual authority was never defined . . . the lay and spiritual powers were associated in every action of the Old English state and in the working of all its principal institutions. The bishop sat beside the earl in the shire court, ecclesiastical pleas were heard in the hundred court, and the spiritual element was so strong in the national assembly that it was sometimes described as a synod. (4)

Thus the monarch would meet in council with his leading nobles and churchmen to discuss what he would consider purely secular affairs of state; and assemblies similarly constructed would deal with questions of ecclesiastical rights and discipline. The fundamental basis of all this was that the king was the "deputy elected by the Lord": the protection of the rights and possessions of the Church rested with him, and St. Augustine had laid it down that it was the duty of the State to suppress heresy.

William the Conqueror made it quite clear, both inside his dominions and in his relations with the papacy, that he considered it the prerogative of the monarch to supervise the jurisdiction of the Church. About 1072 he arranged that pleas concerning spiritual matters should no longer be settled, like secular pleas, in the hundred court but be terminated before a bishop according to "the canons and episcopal laws." The failure to obey the bishop's summons could be punished by a fine, and those who defied the rulings could be excommunicated; the king undertook to see that the excommunication was effective.

There were potent factors militating against conflict between Church and State quite apart from the respect felt for a monarch's status, his prerogatives, and his power to enforce obedience. He was himself a son of the Church, sometimes a devout one. From long before the Conquest he had, in practice, a say in the appointment of the higher officers of the Church within his kingdom; the control exerted naturally varied during the medieval period according to the relative strengths of king and pope at different times: during the reign of King Henry V, Pope Martin V angrily declared (with not a little justification) that "It is not the Pope but the King of England that governs the Church in his dominions." (5) By the end of the fifteenth century bishops were nominated by the king, it being taken for granted that the pope would approve; and the king's consent had to be obtained before the election of the heads of all the important

monasteries (and many lesser ones) became valid. (6) It was for centuries normal for high officers of the Church to serve also as high officers of State, and for less important clerics to become State servants or to train others for that role.

Even when a struggle for power did take place between Church and State, and the monarch found himself opposed by a "turbulent priest," there was likely to be little conflict over the provision and supervision of education during the centuries when religious beliefs were almost unquestioned, and the curricula were so restricted and predictable that there was small danger of the kind of subversive political or religious influence that we in our day tend to fear as a possible corollary of the control of education. There was a chance of hostility between Church and State when the anticlerical teaching of John Wyclif (died 1384) inspired a powerful movement that at first received support among members of all classes, including the nobility; but when Lollardy ventured into heresy, and advocated social and political change, Church and State combined to suppress it, especially where it originated, in the University of Oxford. From at least as early as the twelfth century, schoolmasters had to be licensed by the Church, an arrangement that, in principle, suited Church and State alike.

In view of all this, it is not surprising that instances of disputes between Church and State in the field of education during the centuries before the Reformation are significantly rare. J. E. G. de Montmorency, a lawyer, quoted some legal rulings earlier than 1500 which seemed to him to indicate what in one case he called "collision between Church and State," (7) but the evidence is not very impressive, the pleas being concerned mainly with alleged infringements of monopoly rights granted by individual churchmen or religious corporations to local schoolmasters. In 1447, giving a ruling in such a case, one judge asserted, in effect, that, whatever ecclesiastical courts might decide, it was no part of the State's duty to act against a schoolmaster who infringed the monopoly right to teach granted by a churchman, since to teach youth "is a virtuous and charitable thing to do, helpful to the people, for which he cannot be punished by our law"; (8) a second judge felt that "it would be contrary to reason that a master could be disturbed from holding school where he pleased save in the case of a university corporation or a school of ancient founda-

tion"; (9) but the Lord Chief Justice ruled that the case could not be tried in the king's court since "le doctrine et enformation des enfants est chose esprituel" (10)—a phrase that was quoted in Parliament (11) four centuries later to justify the Church of England's claim to control education. In these and similar cases the verdict of the Crown was given with the assurance of a superior authority that does not expect to have its findings disputed.

## II

There has been a good deal of disagreement in recent years both about the extent of educational provision in England during the period just before the Reformation and the immediate effects on education of the religious and political changes that the new movement brought about. (12) Concerning the sources of provision, however, there is rather more agreement. The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge had faculties of arts, ecclesiastical and Roman law, medicine, and theology; instruction and control were in the hands of ecclesiastics, and the prime purpose was to produce learned clerics for the service of Church and State. Those cathedrals not controlled by monks (nine out of the seventeen in the kingdom) and some other collegiate churches conducted grammar schools and sometimes song schools, again chiefly to enable boys either to become priests or at least to assist in the ceremonies of the Church. There were a few colleges of ecclesiastics, such as those at Winchester and Eton, that had been established primarily as schools: these two were closely linked with colleges at Oxford. Where instruction was given in monasteries, it appears almost always to have been restricted to young monks or novices or future parochial priests; but often schools were to be found in the almonries attached to monasteries (and it was not uncommon for a monastery to have some responsibility, as a trustee or otherwise, for a school in its neighbourhood). Three points may be noted about the schools under ecclesiastical control: that since the needs of the Church varied, there was sometimes provision for the mere reading of Latin (not necessarily with understanding) and for singing, as well as for more advanced instruction in grammar schools; that a great deal of time was normally devoted to preparing for, and taking part

in, Church services and observances; and that there was usually provision (even in some of the university colleges) for boys not preparing to enter the Church. It may be added that some nunneries gave a little instruction to a small number of girls and young boys. (13)

There were also schools less closely connected with the Church. Some were set up and controlled by wealthy boroughs or by the guilds responsible for the administration of certain towns. Much of the impulse towards founding university and other colleges had come from the desire of benefactors to provide, by means of "chantries," for intercession for souls in purgatory; similarly, professional or craft or trade guilds or other groups of people associated for some common purpose, as well as individuals, would make endowments for priests to say masses for the dead and also, in some cases, to teach children in their fairly ample spare time, especially (though not exclusively) children who could be trained to take part in the services prescribed. Often chantry priests who were not obliged to teach, or other priests, kept school in return for fees or were paid a stipend to do so by some local group of laymen. Some schools were attached to almshouses; frequently a small school was taught by a parish clerk.

A number of schools were deliberately made independent of ecclesiastical control: when Dean Colet refounded St. Paul's School in London in 1508-1512, the Mercers' Company replaced as governors the dean and chapter and chancellor of St. Paul's; this was not a new departure, for "there had been a constant stream of schools with city companies as governors from 1443 at least." (14) Heads of quite important schools were sometimes laymen. (15) The Church had not a complete monopoly even of higher education, since in London there had existed from the fourteenth century important lay institutions, the Inns of Court and Inns of Chancery, which provided instruction in common law and were attended not only by future lawyers but by many who wished to become men of affairs or would have estates to administer. Even at Oxford there were some private tutors who taught, among other things, "the art of writing or composition, or of speaking French, as well as English legal practice," (16) outside the religious framework of the ordinary college teaching. In spite of all this, however, it remained true in the early decades of the sixteenth century that, although social and economic forces were exerting strong pres-

sure to change the system, most school children and students were taught by ecclesiastics, and religious instruction and observances formed an integral and important part of their school lives.

### III

In 1534 the Act of Supremacy made Henry VIII "the only supreme head in earth of the Church of England"; and almost at once the results began to be felt in the sphere of education. The effects of the dissolution of the monasteries and friaries have been much disputed, but at any rate it seems clear that many scholars and novices in training were dispersed; one main source of students for Oxford and Cambridge was cut off, and a number of houses of monks and friars at the two universities went out of existence; schools in nunneries and most of the almonries of monasteries were lost; some schools for which the monasteries were responsible were not continued. On the other hand, some of the great abbeys became cathedral churches with schools attached (usually schools already existing in the neighbourhood); more important was the fact that, in order to prevent the closing of a school, a local lay organization such as a city gild, or the controlling body of a town or borough, provided the means to maintain the school, thus extending the area of education under lay control.

Although Henry proposed the dissolution of many chantries, alleging misuse or expropriation of their funds by others and indicating his own need of money, it was during the reign of his successor that chantries were condemned by Parliament as "arising from vain opinions of Purgatory and Masses satisfactory to be done for them which be departed." The preamble to the Act (1547) giving control of them to Edward VI spoke of the conversion of them "to good and godly uses, as in erecting of Gramer Schools to the education of Youth in virtue and godliness, [and] the further augmenting of the Universities." In effect, many colleges and schools connected with chantries were allowed to continue, among them the university colleges, the colleges at Eton and Westminster, and a large number of grammar schools, especially where these had been provided for when the chantry was first established. In some cases pensions for schoolmasters were allowed for when schools were closed, in others (as when the monasteries had been suppressed) city companies or local governing

bodies purchased the endowments of schools and assumed responsibility for them. The revenues of schools in places where there was little demand were sometimes used to found schools elsewhere. Where a chantry school was allowed to continue the whole or part of the income was sometimes made available to the priest as a fixed stipend payable by the Crown; one consequence was a continuing support and supervision of the school by Crown authorities or by local secular authorities to whom they relinquished control; but another was a decline in real income over a period as the value of money fell. To anticipate a little, one useful action by the State was the setting up in 1601 of the Commission for Charitable Uses, which was empowered to prevent or rectify the misuse, *inter alia*, of educational endowments.

Henry VIII and his immediate successors had no doubt of their right to control education within the kingdom, using the Church as their instrument for doing so. Under Henry the ecclesiastical courts were made subject to the king's courts. The universities were obliged to cease teaching canon law and scholastic theology; they were ordered to abolish ceremonies and observances that "hindered polite learning," and to provide lectures on the Scriptures. Subjects for study were prescribed and changes demanded in the philosophy courses. By controlling the appointment of university chancellors and masters of colleges the Crown exerted great influence, as it did by the visitations of its agents. Before Henry died in 1547 various works had been prescribed for use in schools—an ABC, a Latin grammar, and a primer of prayers in English. (17) The preface to Lily's *Grammar* observed: "As his Majesty purposeth to establish his people in one consent and harmony of true religion; so his tender goodness toward the youth and childhood of his realm intendeth to have it brought up under one absolute and uniform sort of learning." (18) In 1553 it was decreed what religious doctrines were to be taught in schools and must be assented to by all proceeding to university degrees.

It is true that most of these changes appear to have been welcomed by most churchmen; but then disagreement was hardly encouraged by the Crown's control over so many appointments or by the execution of such men as Sir Thomas More, High Steward of both universities, and Archbishop Fisher, Chancellor at Oxford. Of course not all the measures taken were repressive or harmful in their effects: after the

initial shocks a wider interest in education led to an increase in the foundation of schools by laymen and some extension of curricula. But little new provision was forthcoming from the monarch: when Henry VIII, for example, established new colleges and professorships, the funds came from confiscated endowments. As a modern historian has said, after 1560

. . . the official policy of handing schools over to incorporated boroughs continued. Occasionally, lands remaining in the hands of the Crown, or annuities, were granted to schools, no doubt for a consideration. But that monarchs made no personal contribution to school founding beyond this is no matter for surprise; contemporaries would have been astonished if they had. (19)

Queen Mary's short reign continued and strengthened the policy of prescription and repression to bring about unity of religious belief, though of course the State now surrendered its claim to control the Church. New force was given to the requirement that schoolmasters should be licensed by bishops, this ancient regulation having apparently fallen into disuse during the early decades of the sixteenth century. The penalty for unlicensed teaching was now excommunication and three years' suspension from teaching. Elizabeth endeavoured to arrive at a religious settlement acceptable to believers of widely different views and enforce adherence to it; but it had already become clear that the State now had to deal, so to speak, not with one Church, but with three: the official Church which accepted her authority; those who favoured the old religion, whom we now call Roman Catholics; and those (some influenced by Calvinist ideas strengthened during exile under Queen Mary) who felt that the Reformation had yet to be completed—these last, to oversimplify somewhat, we shall refer to as Nonconformists. Moreover, especially after the excommunication of Elizabeth by the Pope (1570), Roman Catholics could be considered as potential traitors, members, as it were, of a foreign church, likely to join in intrigues with the papacy and the Catholic states of France and Spain against the Protestant state of England.

The insistence on religious conformity in schools and universities therefore increased, with the enthusiastic support of the Anglican Church, as did the penalties for unlicensed teaching, refusals to take oaths indicating conformity, nonattendance at Anglican services, and so on: at times it appeared that Parliament might even authorize the



taking of Roman Catholic children from their parents so that they might be taught acceptable beliefs. (20) Of course some illicit schooling was carried on in spite of the severe laws, and some parents who could afford it (mostly Roman Catholics but also some Nonconformists) risked and suffered severe penalties by sending their children abroad for the purpose. (21) Many able men were driven from the universities and many more lost from the schools.

Since, in its determination to bring about a great degree of religious uniformity, the State was prepared to exercise its control of education through the official Church, two important results followed: first, there was no political need to set up a State system of education; second, the close connection which had hitherto existed between the Church and education was reinforced at a time when there might well have been a separation because of the increasing number of schools established and supported by laymen, the growing need for training in secular pursuits, the declining importance of Latin, and the general widening of intellectual horizons symbolized by the interest in navigation, astronomy, exploration, vernacular literature, and so on. It is true that the New Learning had some influence in the universities, and that, where teachers were available, Greek and even a little Hebrew were sometimes included in school curricula. Less time was devoted to religious observances (but more, in universities, to polemical theology and, in schools, to quizzes on sermons). In general, however, the pressures were in the direction of orthodoxy, uniformity, and the repression of free-ranging thought; so that at the end of the Tudor period, and, for long afterwards, most of the adventures in ideas and intellectual ferment were to be found outside official academic fields.

#### IV

Just as the concept of a monolithic Church had become unrealistic before the end of the sixteenth century, so also had the notion of a single-minded State. Mary had found Parliament recalcitrant over some of her measures designed to restore the *status quo*; Elizabeth had more control, but often found her Commons restive. Especially after the "Gunpowder Plot" (1605), Parliament demanded ever stricter laws to ensure that Roman Catholic children should be educated as

Protestants, but James I and Charles I did much to thwart Parliament's intentions: they used their royal prerogative in accordance with their personal predilections or for reasons of State (to facilitate foreign marriages or foster some agreement with the pope). It is not surprising that this was one of the causes of the Civil War; since both sides accepted the principle that the government must decide the religion and education of the people, it was necessary for those who wished so to decide to become the effective government.

From 1643 Parliament, with Nonconformity now in the ascendant, set up Committees to examine all university teachers and students and all ministers and schoolmasters thought to be "scandalous in their lives . . . or that shall wilfully refuse obedience to the Ordinances of Parliament": those considered unfit for their offices were to be ejected, have their estates and revenues sequestered, and be replaced by the Assembly of Divines sitting at Westminster. In 1654 Cromwell appointed Commissioners to eject all undesirable schoolmasters, including those who held or taught specified "Popish opinions"; "such as have publicly and frequently read or used the Common-Prayer Book since the first of January last, or shall at any time hereafter do the same"; and even those who favoured "Morris-Dances, May-poles, Stage-plays, or such Licentious practices, by which men are encouraged in a loose and prophane Conversation."

At times between 1640 and the restoration of the monarchy in 1660 it seemed that the State might move towards providing a national system of education. In 1627 Francis Bacon had envisaged in his *New Atlantis* a state-supported establishment to engage in scientific research and seek "the knowledge of causes and most secret motions of things . . . to the effecting of all things possible." Inspired by such exciting intellectual prospects, but also by deep religious feeling, the Moravian Bishop Comenius wished to have "all things" taught to "all men"; in his *Great Didactic* he called for state-supported systems of education providing compulsory elementary (but extensive) education, to be followed by secondary and higher education for all who could benefit therefrom. Some of Comenius' English admirers, including some members of Parliament, invited him to England, whence he wrote in October 1641: "They are eagerly debating on the reform of schools in the whole kingdom in a manner similar to that to which, as you know, my wishes tend, namely that all young people should

be instructed, none neglected." (22) With the approach of the Civil War Comenius departed, but the advocacy of State provision for education was continued by others, notably by John Dury, who wished to have a system of publicly supported schools, primary and secondary, under the central and local authorities but supervised by Presbyterian ministers. (23)

Once again a change in the religious beliefs of the government had led to the confiscation of church property, and once again the State professed its anxiety that education should not suffer as a consequence: (24) that the proceeds should be "employed to the Advancement of Learning and Piety." Soon after the execution of Charles I, Parliament passed "An Act for the better Propagating and Preaching of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in the Four Northern Counties and for the maintenance of godly and able Ministers and Schoolmasters there." Some schools were actually founded in the North, and apparently more than sixty were established in Wales under a similar Act. (25)

In 1649 Parliament agreed that certain Church revenues taken over by the State since the reign of Henry VIII should be used annually to pay preaching ministers or teachers appointed by the government: of the £20,000 available, £2,000 was to go to masters of university colleges. If the revenues fell below £20,000, other government income should be used to make up the amount. (26) But apparently the government was more concerned about the ministers than the teachers: "it has been estimated that only one grant in twenty went to a schoolmaster." (27) (In this same year the State even authorized voluntary collections in the parishes of England and Wales for the propagation of religion and education in the New England colonies.) The times were hardly propitious and, in effect, little was done.

With the restoration of the monarchy in 1660, the still unresolved contest began again: was King or Parliament to decide the religious beliefs of the country? The Act of Uniformity (1662) required every minister, schoolmaster, and university teacher or officeholder to obtain a licence from a bishop and declare his acceptance of Anglican doctrine; another Act in 1665 prohibited Dissenters from teaching in any school; meanwhile the Archbishop of Canterbury concisely summarized official policy by ordering that enquiries be made whether teachers "appear well affected to his majesty and the doctrine and dis-

cipline of the Church of England." Charles II had strong sympathies and connections with Roman Catholics, but his efforts to shield them from the penal laws aroused such hostility that he had to desist. His brother, a Roman Catholic himself, could see no reason why a king should not encourage his coreligionists; he used what he considered his prerogative with such unswerving devotion that he lost his throne.

The notion that the monarch should be head of the Church in the sense that he laid down its beliefs had proved unworkable, as it was bound to do. However repressive the laws or compliant some sections of the clergy and people, emotional dispositions, loyalties, habits of mind, and convictions could hardly be altered rapidly enough to match the beliefs of changing rulers, especially in days of poor communications and sparse means of propaganda. Henry IV of France had felt that Paris was worth a Mass; in England the dilemma was dealt with by importing a suitable monarch (1688) and insisting that he and his successors should toe the theological line.

Roman Catholic teaching, whether at home or abroad, continued to be forbidden, and in 1700 the penalty became life imprisonment. But the Nonconformists were strong, and, in spite of a renewed attack on their right to teach in 1714, some tolerance began to be extended to them from 1718 onwards. They were helped by several rulings in the courts. In "William Bates's Case" (1670) it was declared that a schoolmaster could not be removed from office if he had been appointed by the founder or lay patron of the school; (28) while in "Cox's Case" (1700) and in "Rex v. Douse" (1701) it was laid down, in effect, that "neither Church nor State had at this time any control over elementary education. (29) Many teachers (including some who had been expelled from grammar schools, the ministry, and the universities) taught in Dissenters' academies, which often took advantage of their freedom from old traditions and the prescriptions of early founders to include science and modern studies in their curricula.

A movement which might have developed into a nationwide system of elementary education for poor children was fostered from 1699 by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. Inspired by religious and philanthropic motives but also by the fear and detestation of "Popery," the Society helped to organize charity schools, supported by local subscribers and managed by them, in many parts of the country. (30) Though only Anglicans could be members of

the Society many Nonconformists at first "sent their children to the schools in spite of the fact that there they were 'educated in a church way'; and so liberal were they with their contributions that they sometimes exceeded those of the schools' Anglican supporters." (31) But the tolerant policy of William III and his bishops was reversed by the High Church party when Anne became Queen in 1713, and the Nonconformists began to withdraw their support. An attempt by the Whigs in 1716 to have the right to appoint teachers and select pupils vested in local elected representatives caused Anglicans to unite temporarily to maintain control of the schools. Quarrels between Tory High Church and Whig Low Church, largely concerned with political issues (especially the succession to the throne) led to charges and countercharges about partisan political and religious influences in the schools. Moreover, although the chief end of the schools was to teach morality and religion, with a due sense of subordination to superiors, there was much criticism of the teaching of writing and, in some cases, the casting of accounts as likely to give the children ideas above their station. The schools came more and more to be controlled by the Anglican clergy; and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, discouraged by the political and religious disputes, began to give most of its attention to publishing and to missionary work abroad. Before the end of the eighteenth century many of the schools had ceased to exist, and the Nonconformists and Anglican clergy had in general abandoned all ideas of cooperating in the field of education.

The laws designed to prevent Nonconformists from teaching were not repealed until 1779, though they fell into disuse before that date (but the universities and some important schools remained barred to them). Similar freedom was accorded to Roman Catholics in 1778 and 1791. The attempt to unify English religion by means of the schools was, so it seemed, abandoned—after untold waste of human resources and centuries of hardship and suffering.

## V

The intimate connection of the Church with education in the Middle Ages had been based, as we have seen, not only on the desire to inculcate religious and moral beliefs but also very largely on the need

to train future servants of the Church or at the least to teach Latin, the language of the Church, as the necessary key to other studies. But even before the Reformation, lay influence on the grammar schools had begun to be felt, and subsequently this had much increased, exerting pressure to make them correspond to wider needs and vocations. The decline in the importance of Latin, within the Church and outside it, naturally strengthened this tendency. By the end of the eighteenth century the role of the Church in the grammar schools was open to question; the legal sanctions imposed by the State with the aim, now abandoned, of achieving religious uniformity were being withdrawn, and various questions arose. Given that the schools had long been largely secular institutions, should religious instruction be considered as one subject among many, or should it in some way have precedence and even pervade the whole "atmosphere" of the school? Again, since tolerance was being extended to other denominations, should Nonconformists be admitted officially to schools that so many of them attended unofficially? If so, on what terms? In effect, these problems solved themselves comparatively easily so far as the grammar schools were concerned, partly because secular subjects loomed so largely in the schools and did so increasingly as time went on; partly because it was felt that parents could correct harmful influences from erroneous or inadequate religious instruction; partly because many relatively well-informed parents insisted on having their children educated on whatever terms.

But very different considerations affected the elementary schools. Both in the eighteenth century and the early years of the nineteenth almost the whole end and purpose was often to teach religion and morality; and indeed it was frequently necessary for those appealing for funds to assure possible donors that not enough secular education would be provided to make the poor insubordinate or discontented with manual labor. (32) Rivalry between denominations or the simple desire to gain adherents or spread the Gospel were powerful motives for opening schools, though of course a genuine desire to help children or society as a whole was often found. Two things naturally followed, first, that the State, as such, was originally not particularly concerned, except for a vague hope that the conduct of the populace might be improved; second, that religious controversy concerning the schools became widespread. When Sunday schools

(teaching religion, with reading as its handmaid and rarely anything else) became important, from about 1784 onwards, there was an early attempt to organize them on a nonsectarian basis, but this soon failed. (33)

The development, during the early years of the nineteenth century, of monitorial schools made it possible for a single schoolmaster, aided by his brighter pupils, to take charge of 200 or more children, and the cheapness of this system led to the establishment of many weekday schools in which, despite the misgivings of many, the three R's, as well as religion, could be taught. Some of the Nonconformists set up denominational schools, but many others supported the British and Foreign School Society, founded in 1808 to foster the establishment of schools to teach the three R's and give religious instruction consisting of the reading of the Authorized Version of the Bible without note or comment. The Church of England established in 1811 a rival association, significantly called the National Society for Promoting the Education of the Poor in the Principles of the Church of England; children in schools in membership with the Society not only read the Authorized Version but were taught the Anglican liturgy and catechism and were required to attend an Anglican church on Sundays. Even instruction in the three R's was linked, as far as possible, with religious themes. Roman Catholic children were forbidden by their priests to attend any school requiring them to read the Authorized Version; since most were poor Irish immigrants or descendants of such, the educational provision for them was even more inadequate than for children of other denominations.

An attempt to obtain help from public funds was made in 1807 when Samuel Whitbread proposed in Parliament the establishment of parish schools to be financed from parish rates, but little interest was evinced; there were the usual fears about unsettling the manual workers, but the most significant opposition came from the Archbishop of Canterbury when he said:

... the provisions of the bill left little or no control to the minister in his parish. This would go to subvert the first principles of education in this country, which had hitherto been, and he trusted would continue to be, under the control and auspices of the establishment. . . . Their lordships would, no doubt, guard against innovations that might shake the foundations of our religion. (34)

The Lord Chancellor and the Chancellor of the Exchequer concurred in the Archbishop's claims and fears; and Earl Stanhope was ignored when he asked whether it was "reasonable or just" that the children of "all the innumerable sects of dissenters from the established Church in this country were to be debarred all sources of public education supported by public benevolence." (35) (In 1816 the State, having declined to authorize the provision of public funds for schools, granted £1,000,000 for the building of Anglican churches; it added another £500,000 eight years later.) In 1820 Henry Brougham unsuccessfully introduced in the Commons a bill for the establishment of parochial schools, the buildings to be paid for by manufacturers and the running costs out of local rates. Religious instruction was to consist only of Bible teaching, though the catechism and liturgy of the Church of England were to be taught on Sunday evenings to those whose parents approved; but, to show that he recognized what he had earlier called "the just prejudices" of the Established Church, Brougham proposed that the curriculum should be laid down by the local Anglican clergymen, whose approval of the schoolmaster, also to be an Anglican, would be essential.

But by now the "special relationship" between the State and the Established Church was much in need of clarification. It remained true that the Head of the State was the Head of that Church; bishops were nominated by the Prime Minister; changes in the Church's liturgy and laws were controlled by Parliament; its archbishops and most of its bishops sat, as of right, in the still powerful House of Lords. Not only were many Church offices at the disposal of the ruling class, who could appoint congenial clergymen to them, but the prevailing admiration (outside the ranks of the Evangelicals) for "rational" and "practical" religion, free from "enthusiasm" and "visionary" fervour, made it easy for Anglican clerics to move socially among influential laymen not remarkable for their piety, and, indeed, for numbers of such laymen, or their nominees, to enter the service of the Church. The relationship between the leading Churchmen and the Tory party was particularly close.

Yet the Nonconformists had much increased in strength: the Congregationalists, the Baptists, and the Presbyterians had now been joined by the Methodists, who had made a particularly great appeal to urban populations living outside the traditional parochial struc-



ture of the Anglican Church. These sects looked to the Whigs for help, though a growing spirit of toleration induced many even of the Anglican clergy to support the political emancipation of Nonconformists and Roman Catholics in 1828 and 1829. The coming to power of the Whigs in 1831 and the extension of the franchise in 1832 seemed to presage great alterations in traditional attitudes, and it is possible that a combination of firmness and tact on the part of the Whig government might have rendered acceptable changes that were half expected.

The years between 1831 and 1843 were decisive. Robert Owen was preaching that every man was formed by his environment and the influential phrenologists, led by George Combe, that great inherited potential was being lost for lack of schooling. While the achievements in popular education of parts of the United States, of Holland, and of Prussia were constantly pointed out, the Manchester and London Statistical Societies showed that in England large numbers of children were receiving no education at all. The voluntary education societies certainly had not the resources or the organization needed to reach the lowest strata of the population, who could be brought into the schools only if education were made compulsory and free. Every year it became more obvious that the cheap monitorial system was quite inadequate. The wider conceptions of what education should be that had emanated from Pestalozzi and Fellenberg merely served to heighten this sense of inadequacy. Men like Henry Brougham, J. A. Roebuck, Thomas Wyse, Richard Cobden, James Simpson, Lord John Russell, and even, when the problem was passed to them, leading Tories like Sir James Graham and Sir Robert Peel saw that the State must either provide funds from the national revenue or arrange for them to be provided from local rates.

Much has been made of the Church's demand to have exclusive control of education as constituting an obstacle to progress, and certainly, under the influence of the Oxford Movement, members of the High Church contingent consistently made this demand; but the great body of Churchmen, and especially the Evangelicals, were by 1839 prepared to recognize that times had changed. The Archbishop of Canterbury's claim in that year was very different from his predecessor's a generation earlier: the Church asked only that the education of Anglican children should not be taken from it; it "had

never advanced any pretention to controlling the education of the country," though he was not prepared to say "that injudicious language might not have been occasionally used upon this subject." (36) The Bishop of London was prepared to have State funds spent on the education of those outside the Church but said, "Let it be done by way of charity . . . not as a matter of right: at all events let it not be done so as to make it appear to the people that the Government withholds its confidence from the Church." (37) Clearly the Church, rather hesitantly, was yielding ground, even though all that had so far been achieved was the grudging acceptance of a plan inaugurated in 1833 whereby £20,000 was made available by Parliament annually to be used by the National and the British and Foreign Societies towards the cost of erecting schools. Yet when, in 1839, the government proposed to provide a teacher-training college ("to include a Model School"), making it available for students of all denominations, the opposition, chiefly from Anglicans and Methodists, was so great that the plan had to be hurriedly withdrawn. (38)

At this period the general policies of the Churches were as follows. The Anglican leaders would not accept any system that involved separating denominational religious instruction from the remaining school programme. Some Nonconformists, mainly Methodists, agreed; but the policy of the British and Foreign School Society was still to require nondenominational religious instruction (the reading of the Authorized Version without note or comment) again as part of the school day. Clearly these were incompatible. The Roman Catholic authorities, desperately short of schools, were prepared to have separate secular and denominational instruction (and the Vatican had authorized the acceptance of this system, (39) but they would not permit the use of the Authorized Version of the Bible. The only solution appeared to be to have separate schools for each group, but it was impracticable or wasteful for a government to provide several schools in "single school areas," *i.e.*, where the population was so small that only one was needed, especially in view of the great need of schools elsewhere.

The Whigs's proposal of 1839 had been based on a compromise that had won a great deal of favour in Ireland since 1831 and seemed likely to facilitate the establishment of a national system of elementary education there: it involved combined secular instruction for

children of all denominations, separate denominational instruction, and (optionally) combined reading of newly translated selections from the Bible. Although it had aroused much controversy, it had been supported by Whig and Tory governments and by some English clergy of all denominations; moreover, it had been introduced into two Corporation schools in Liverpool, and, after meeting with strong opposition, had proved acceptable to many parents, Anglican, Roman Catholic, and Nonconformist. (40) But the failure of the 1839 plan convinced the Roman Catholic authorities that their policy for the future must be to continue to build their own schools, staff them with Roman Catholic teachers, and have fully denominational instruction as an integral part of the school day. In 1843 the Tories, in their turn, tackled the problem with a bill authorizing the establishment of schools for a limited number of factory children, the government to provide loans for building, and the running costs to come from the local poor rate; but the arrangements regarding religious instruction were considered too favourable to the Established Church and had to be withdrawn. The failure on this occasion convinced both political parties that the problem was for the time insoluble, and led many Nonconformists to form a group, the "Voluntaryists," to renounce and campaign against all State aid and State control in education; their success in collecting funds and establishing schools was considerable at first in favourable areas, but by 1870 their policy had proved quite inadequate.

## VI

In spite of the government's defeat in 1839 it remained determined to achieve some control over education in return for public expenditure. In the face of much opposition and suspicion it created a Committee of Council to "superintend the application of any Sums voted by Parliament for the purpose of promoting Public Education"; moreover, it insisted that the Committee should consist of laymen who were members of the government. Its able and energetic first secretary, James Kay-Shuttleworth, felt that the Church of England had been alarmed by the government plan of 1839, less by "the attempt to lay the foundations of the education of the people on the recognition of the equality of their civil rights in matters of religion" than by "the

absence from that plan of any definition of the limits of civil power." (41) He himself was anxious to see schools "continue under religious government"; nevertheless he stressed "the duty of the Civil Power to fit its subjects for the discharge of their functions as citizens." (42) Some High Churchmen among the Anglicans maintained that the State should give all the aid asked for but exert no control whatever; the Voluntaryists among the Nonconformists, as we have seen, rejected both control and aid; even some few Roman Catholics rejected State intervention. (43) These were extreme positions that could not be long maintained, but suspicion and resentment were common enough in all groups.

Yet the State continued to extend both its assistance and its control. In 1842 the annual grant was increased to encourage the building of training colleges; four years later, grants became payable to young apprentice teachers, the masters who trained them in schools, selected students proceeding to training colleges, and certificated teachers (one third of their salaries); even a pension scheme was foreshadowed. In 1847 financial help was made available to the Catholic Poor School Committee, the Wesleyan Education Committee, and some smaller education societies, so that all Christian denominations would be treated alike. (44) From 1853 capitation grants were made to schools in rural districts so as to encourage regular attendance; this added considerably both to the schools' resources and to government expenditure.

In return for all this the State had exacted the right to inspect schools (1840), though the Church of England had thereupon insisted that both secular and religious instruction should be inspected (to emphasise that these could not be separated) and that the two archbishops must approve, or might even propose, suitable inspectors for Anglican schools. In spite of the demand of the Archbishop of Canterbury that Church of England schools should be "solely in the hands of the clergy and Bishop of the diocese," (45) the State successfully insisted that (except in sparsely populated areas) where Church schools received government assistance, the control of school funds and of the appointment and dismissal of teachers should be shared with laymen of the appropriate denomination. From about 1850, when grants were made for new schools the recipients were usually asked to accept a "conscience clause" (exempting children

from religious instruction if the parent wished); Anglicans often objected to granting this "privilege" as a "right," but the condition was made obligatory in 1864. In 1856 the raised status and influence of the Committee of Council was recognized when it became a Department of Education, with a Vice-President responsible to Parliament.

By 1859 the government grant had risen from the original £20,000 twenty-six years earlier to £836,920; it had increased more than five-fold in the previous seven years. In the same year 64.1 percent of the income of the training colleges came from the State. (46) In 1861 there was published the report of the "Newcastle Commission," appointed to "inquire into the present state of popular education in England and to consider and report what measures, if any, are required for the extension of sound and cheap elementary instruction to all classes of people." Some of the Commissioners considered that the State should make grants only for the building of schools, the existing annual grants being gradually withdrawn; the majority, however, felt that the current policy was on the whole satisfactory but was expensive, ambitious, superficial, and helped too few children; they recommended that State grants should be supplemented by local rates. One proposal of the Commissioners led the Department of Education to introduce in 1862 a system of "payment by results," making grants to individual schools largely dependent on the number of children of manual labourers who reached standards laid down in detail by the Department. There could hardly have been a more impressive demonstration of State control. In the five years following 1861 the total annual grant fell by more than 20 percent.

In spite of the rather complacent tone of the "Newcastle Report," pressure for a more extensive system of elementary education was growing; the least efficient schools now earned the smallest grant or none at all; children could not be compelled to attend until admission was free, yet school fees were necessary to voluntary schools; many schools refused to admit the poorest and most degraded children; (47) the demand for better education from workingclass parents was growing, and there was considerable indifference about the precise nature of the religious doctrine taught; (48) many felt that England's prosperity was endangered by her failure to establish a national system; the extension of the franchise in 1867 not only gave influence to more voters but made it necessary, as Robert Lowe pointed

out, "to compel our future masters to learn their letters." (49) There had been years of agitation and Parliamentary debate (50) in favour of systems wholly denominational, or including nondenominational religious instruction, or making religious instruction of whatever kind permissive or available outside school hours. Wholly secular education was not widely favoured and was usually advocated not because of an absence of religious belief but because of opposition to State interference with religion (as with many Nonconformists after abandoning Voluntaryism). There was despair of achieving agreement unless the policy successfully working in some American states were adopted. (51)

## VII

In 1870, for the Liberal government of Gladstone, W. E. Forster introduced a bill which, after much amendment and heated discussion, inaugurated a national system of elementary education. Far from encouraging the denominational schools to "fade away," as many Nonconformist Liberals had hoped, the government allowed the Churches six months in which to attempt, with the help of building grants, to provide such new school plans as were necessary. After that, grants-in-aid of building would cease, but the schools would henceforth receive as much in maintenance grants as they could raise from other sources, including school fees. The State would no longer inspect religious teaching. To provide the schools still required, local school boards elected *ad hoc* by ratepayers would be set up; these schools would be maintained wholly from public funds (except for the small weekly payments of the children) consisting of the government grant supplemented by local rates. The boards could decide whether religious instruction should be given, but it was provided that "no religious catechism or religious formulary distinctive of any particular denomination should be taught."

The passing of the Act did not put an end to controversy: elections to school boards were often stormy, and decisions about religious instruction, the extension of the curricula, and expenditure were often influenced by denominationalists hostile to the new system. The willingness of school boards to pay fees for needy children attending denominational schools often depended on the religious views of the

majority. Yet great progress was made in school building, and ambitious curricula were often provided. Gradually those Nonconformists who had opposed even nondenominational education in publicly owned schools were won round, and many British and Foreign Society schools became board schools. Even the Wesleyans, who had supported many denominational schools, when faced with the new competition began surrendering their schools, except in relatively prosperous areas. In 1891 they formally approved the extension of the school board system. (52)

The desire to keep their children out of board schools (and the help sometimes given by those anxious to avoid paying rates to a school board) (53) spurred the denominationalists to make great efforts. By 1900 the Roman Catholics had almost three times as many schools, attended by almost four times as many children, as in 1870; and, although the number of Anglican schools declined in the 1890's, there were in 1900 almost twice as many, attended by twice as many children, as in 1870.

Yet three facts soon became obvious. First, that the denominational schools, naturally enough, would not be able to compete with the board schools, whose resources were so much greater and more dependable (the "Cross Commission" in 1888 made this clear enough). Second, that, since the State had accepted responsibility for the continuance of the Church schools, it was unlikely, on grounds of humanity, respect for conscience, or even "practical politics," that any future government would be able to let them fall far behind; developments in educational provision would be impossible if, at each stage, a large proportion of the nation's children were precluded from enjoying their benefits; additional help, therefore, would repeatedly have to be given to Church schools. And third, that, for the foreseeable future, whenever this happened there would be political and religious controversy.

## VIII

Even before the end of the century all this became apparent when new capitation grants had to be paid to the schools to compensate for the abolition of school fees (1891), and in recognition of the fact that the schools with the smallest resources were thereby entitled to the smallest

grant (1876). In 1902, concerned about a threatened rapid decline in the number and standards of the Anglican schools, the Conservative government took advantage of the strong position it held in Parliament (because of the defection to it of many Liberals opposed to Irish Home Rule) and succeeded in passing a new Education Act. This did something to centralize the administration under a Board of Education, though the Board, nominally made up of some leading members of the Cabinet, in fact had only a President, who was responsible to Parliament for, as it was rather vaguely expressed, "the superintendence of matters relating to Education in England and Wales." The local school boards were abolished; for the future the publicly owned schools would be built and controlled (under the general supervision of the Board) by the local government councils elected by the ratepayers. The councils would appoint one third of the managers of the denominational schools and would control the secular education in them; the running costs of the schools, maintenance due to "fair wear and tear," teachers' salaries (even for denominational religious instruction) would be paid from government grants or local rates. The denominational authorities would have to provide the school buildings and maintain the fabric; in return they would be free to give denominational religious instruction and control the appointment of teachers (subject to approval by the local authority). Local authorities were empowered to build secondary schools. In order to ensure a supply of teachers for the expected expansion of schools, local education authorities were encouraged to establish publicly owned and non-denominational training colleges (and from 1907 new denominational colleges in receipt of grant were permitted to select only half of their students on denominational grounds, there being a conscience clause for other students and the members of staff).

The provisions of the Act of 1902 created one of the most bitter and long-drawn-out controversies in English political history, (54) with Conservatives and Liberals, denominationalists and great numbers of Nonconformists engaged in head-on clashes. It was now clear that the denominational schools would become permanent parts of the English educational system; the grievance of paying local rates to support denominational schools, especially in "single-school areas," was bitterly resisted; many indignantly expressed conscientious scruples about "putting Rome on the rates." In 1904 the government had to



take powers to pay direct to the managers of denominational schools grants that were not paid to them by recalcitrant local authorities from the rates. Yet when the Liberals came to power with a very large majority in 1906, all attempts to alter the existing arrangement failed. The passions gradually became more subdued, but the political parties, in particular, grew extremely chary of touching upon "the religious problem"; and the war of 1914-1918 diverted much attention elsewhere.

## IX

By the outbreak of the Second World War the denominational schools were almost all Anglican or Roman Catholic; Methodist and Jewish schools formed a very small proportion of the total. The strength of the Church of England in the field of elementary education was now much diminished, whereas the Roman Catholic Church had more than held its own. (Between 1876 and 1938, of the children on the rolls of public day schools in England and Wales the percentage on the registers of Anglican schools fell from 60.9 to 22.1; the corresponding figures for Roman Catholic schools were 5.7 and 7.4; while for the publicly owned schools they were 16.7 and 69.6). (55) The Roman Catholic clergy and parents had consistently regarded the State schools as Protestant establishments; on the other hand many Protestant parents, whether Anglican or Nonconformist, and many with little or no interest in religion had found the unsectarian religious instruction in State schools acceptable, especially since the absence of Roman Catholics seemed to guarantee their Protestant orthodoxy. Moreover, many of the Anglican schools had been in villages whose population had markedly decreased over two generations.

It was becoming increasingly difficult for the denominationalists to comply with the requirement of the 1902 Act that they should provide, and maintain the fabric of, their own schools; many existing schools were too old or otherwise unable to satisfy modern standards in educational provision or even in hygiene; new schools were required as population grew, towns expanded, and slums began to be cleared. While building costs soared, a decline in religious belief and church attendance often made contributions for schools harder to obtain. And of course the competition from well-equipped, publicly

owned schools was in many districts very great. Yet in spite of all this the denominational schools still occupied thirty percent of the field; their contribution to the total educational provision was too considerable to be replaced, even had the State wished for this—but Parliament, in fact, contained many supporters of the denominational system, some acting as spokesmen for the churches. Other supporters formed not only a considerable, but a determined and well organized, part of the electorate, as the Roman Catholics, in particular, continually made clear at election times. It followed that if the State wished to effect a general improvement in educational provision it would have to help the denominational schools in the only way available: by making at least a partial contribution to the cost of new building, extensions, and repairs. The acceptance by the government of the recommendation made in 1926 by a consultative committee (56) that the school-leaving age should be raised to fifteen, with separate provision for children over eleven, made the difficulties of the denominationalists particularly acute.

By this time the feelings aroused over the relations between Church and State in education had much diminished, but each of the political parties had some supporters who wished the government to help the denominational schools and some who opposed such a policy. Many Nonconformists still objected to any extension of State provision for denominational teaching, and they continued to be particularly concerned about the "single-school areas." The National Union of Teachers was anxious about any step that might lead to fewer posts and opportunities for promotion available to teachers not willing to accept religious tests. To cope with the immediate problem an Act was passed in 1936 whose terms illustrate the government's recognition of the need to tread warily; local education authorities were permitted to make grants (during the limited period of three years) of 50 to 75 percent of the cost of building denominational schools for senior pupils, the church authorities accepting limitations in regard to the number of teachers appointed as suitable to give denominational instruction.

The war of 1939-1945 put an end to school building, but even before peace came R. A. Butler, the President of the Board of Education in a coalition government, had initiated discussions to pave the way for the educational developments that were hoped for after the war. By the Education Act of 1944 the State accepted greater responsibility for

the education of the people than it had ever done before: the Board became a Ministry, the duty of the Minister being "to secure the effective execution by local authorities, under his control and direction, of the national policy for providing a varied and comprehensive educational service in every area." In particular, there was to be secondary education for all children in well-equipped schools up to the age of fifteen (this to become sixteen as soon as possible). For the sake of brevity we may (as many British educationists do) now refer to the schools wholly supported from central and local government funds as "State schools"; in these schools it became compulsory to provide for "a corporate act of worship" each day, wherever possible, and also for religious instruction according to a syllabus unanimously agreed upon by a committee representing the local education authority, the Church of England, and such religious denominations and associations of teachers as the authority considers necessary. No teacher in a State school may be required to give religious instruction or be refused appointment or promotion on religious grounds. Children in State or other types of schools receiving grants from public funds may be withdrawn from religious instruction if the parent so wishes.

Denominational schools are of two kinds: fully denominational, or "aided," and partially denominational or "controlled." Those who provide "aided" schools control the appointment of teachers and receive running and equipment costs as before; but the 1944 Act provided also for grants of 50 percent (raised to 75 percent in 1959) of such building costs as were authorized by the government and made necessary by government legislation (such as that necessitating the provision of new secondary schools, or consequent upon slum clearance, etc.). "Controlled" schools are those surrendered to a local authority by a denominational body no longer able or willing to continue them; they are in all respects like State schools except that the body concerned, in recognition of its provision of the school, has the right, if the parents so wish, to have denominational religious instruction given in the schools twice a week by a strictly limited number of appropriate teachers; on other occasions the religious instruction must be in accordance with an "agreed syllabus," as in State schools.

The Roman Catholic authorities insisted that their schools should remain fully denominational, (57) but the Church of England felt unable to maintain a large number of its schools and either sur-

rendered them completely or accepted for them "controlled" status: in 1938, of the children in fully denominational public day schools in England and Wales, 72.7 percent were in Anglican schools and 24.4 percent in Roman Catholic schools; but by 1962 the figure for Church of England schools had fallen to 38.1 percent, while that for Roman Catholic schools had risen to 56.7 percent. In the years from 1876 to 1962 the "State sector" of public day education had risen from 16.7 percent of the whole to 77.6 percent, and the Roman Catholic from 5.7 to 8.4 percent; but the "Church of England sector" had declined from 60 percent to (even including "controlled" schools) only 11.9 percent. Much of the activity and finance of some of the denominational bodies has been diverted from the schools to training colleges; but even so, by 1964 about one seventh of teachers beginning training in England and Wales were in (nondenominational) university departments, and of those in training colleges about one fifth were in Anglican colleges and about one tenth in colleges connected with the Roman Catholic Church; a small proportion were in colleges run by Methodists, the Free Churches, and undenominational organizations; but more than three fifths were in colleges wholly supported and controlled by public authorities.

## X

During the last decade there have been marked changes. Although the great majority of English parents wish their children to have some form of religious instruction even in State schools, (58) the decline in religious belief has made it difficult to find enough teachers qualified to give it there, and many who are indifferent to religion are employed even in denominational schools and training colleges. In 1959 the Nonconformist Churches represented by the Free Church Federal Council indicated that the modern situation must lead to a change of policy:

... the great majority of English people ... live like pagans, belonging to no worshipping community, though perhaps vaguely considering themselves to be Christians. Fifty years ago the situation was not nearly so grave ... it could reasonably be hoped that non-sectarian Christian teaching in day-school would be followed by active linking with a worshipping community through home, Sunday School or Church. That is no longer true. The Roman Catholics and the Anglicans are quite justified in being anxious

about the education of their own and other children, and Free Churchmen must face the situation as it now is. (59)

In the same year, at the government's suggestion, the Anglicans and Nonconformists set up a joint Education Policy Committee to deal with difficulties arising between them. The Anglicans have agreed to facilitate the provision of "agreed syllabus" instruction in "single-school areas," (60) and even to ensure that, where appropriate, the Nonconformist Churches will be represented on the managing bodies of its fully denominational schools in those places. (61)

Partly because of this readiness to forget old quarrels, and the greater spirit of tolerance or apathy among the general public, the government was able to announce in 1966 that it intended not only to raise the building grant for those new denominational schools hitherto entitled to it from 75 to 80 percent but to extend this to cover all new denominational schools, including primary schools. The State reserves the right to decide when new building becomes desirable or financially possible. These provisions, the government spokesman said, had been approved by all three parties in Parliament and by the representatives of the religious bodies concerned; "although they fall short of what the Churches have asked. . . . Most Roman Catholics had wanted 85%, but this would have inevitably called into question . . . the whole distinction between the Controlled and the Voluntary-Aided school. None of us wants to re-open this major question now." (62) The appropriate legislation was passed in 1967 and created very little stir.

In spite of the criticisms of some Humanists and others, the provision of religious education in England is not likely in the foreseeable future to be jeopardized by any lack of financial support from the State. Whether the Churches will be able to take full advantage of that support, in a society becoming increasingly secular in outlook, will be the "religious problem" of the future.

## Notes

1. Arthur F. Leach, *Educational Charters and Documents 598 to 1909* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), p. xii.
2. Preface to King Alfred's translation of Gregory's *Curia Pastoralis*.
3. *Ibid.*
4. F. M. Stenton, *Anglo-Saxon England* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1943), p. 538.

5. A. R. Myers, *England in the Late Middle Ages* (rev. ed.; Baltimore: Penguin Books, Inc., 1963), p. 156.
6. *Ibid.*
7. J. E. G. de Montmorency, *State Intervention in English Education* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1902), p. 16.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 52.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 53.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 57.
11. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3d ser., XLVIII, col. 238.
12. See, for example, Arthur F. Leach, *English Schools at the Reformation* (London: Constable, 1896), *Educational Charters and Documents* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), *The Schools of Medieval England* (London: Methuen, 1915) and other writings listed in that work. N. Wood, *The Reformation and English Education* (London, 1931). Joan Simon, "A. F. Leach on the Reformation," I and II, *British Journal of Educational Studies*, III, 128-43, IV, 32-48; "A. F. Leach, a Reply," *op. cit.*, XII, 41-50; *Education and Society in Tudor England* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1966), with references given in those works. W. N. Chaplin, "A F. Leach, a Re-appraisal," *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XI 99-124; "A. F. Leach: Agreement and Difference," *op. cit.*, XII, 173-83. John Nelson Miner, "Schools and Literacy in Later Medieval England," *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XI, 16-27. W. K. Jordan, *Philanthropy in England 1480-1660* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1959). P. J. Wallis, "Leach, Past, Present and Future," *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XII, 184-94. Kenneth Charlton, *Education in Renaissance England* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965).
13. Eileen Power, *Medieval English Nunneries* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1922), pp. 261-62.
14. Leach, *The Schools of Medieval England*, p. 279.  
For examples, see Leach, *English Schools at the Reformation, Part I*, pp. 57-58.
16. Leach, *Educational Charters and Documents*, p. 397.
17. Simon, *Education and Society in Tudor England*, p. 191.
18. Quoted by Foster Watson, *The Old Grammar Schools* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1916), p. 41.
19. Simon, "A. F. Leach on the Reformation," pp. 45-46.
20. For a full account of the penalties against Roman Catholics, see A. C. F. Beales, *Education Under Penalty: English Catholic Education from the Reformation to the Fall of James II 1547-1689* (London: Athlone Press, 1963).
21. *Ibid.*
22. Quoted by W. A. L. Vincent, *The State and School Education 1640-1660 in England and Wales* (London: S.P.C.K., 1950), p. 29.
23. John Dury, "Exercitation of Schooling" (MS, 1646), quoted by

- J. W. Adamson, *Pioneers of Modern Education 1600-1700* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1905), pp. 155-56.
24. For a recent comment on the influence on education of the Civil War and government policy at this time, see J. E. Stephens, "Investment and Intervention in Education during the Interregnum," *British Journal of Educational Studies*, XV, 253-62.
  25. Vincent, *op. cit.*, p. 96.
  26. *Ibid.*, pp. 77-78. It has been suggested that this proposal "may have been the parent of the Connecticut Act of 1650 and inspired the minds of the early legislators of Massachusetts in that scheme of State education which was founded in 1695," J. E. G. de Montmorency, *op. cit.*, p. 104.
  27. F. Watson, "The State and Education during the Commonwealth," *English Historical Review*, XV, p. 71.
  28. de Montmorency, *op. cit.*, p. 170.
  29. *Ibid.*, p. 173.
  30. For a detailed account of the movement, see M. G. Jones, *The Charity School Movement* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1938). For the intention to use the schools as bulwarks against Roman Catholicism, see also Beales, *op. cit.*, pp. 253-54.
  31. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 111.
  32. See, e.g., the charge of the Bishop of Chester to the clergy of his diocese quoted in James Murphy, "The Rise of Public Elementary Education in Liverpool," *Transactions of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire*, CXVI, 171.
  33. See Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 152; Joseph Priestley, *Appeal to the Public on the Subject of the Riots at Birmingham* (1792), p. 6.
  34. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 1st ser., IX, col. 1,177.
  35. *Ibid.*
  36. *Ibid.*, 3d ser., XLVIII, cols. 1,235, 1,241.
  37. *Ibid.*, col. 1,306.
  38. For a full account of the plan and of the attitudes of the churches at this time, see James Murphy, *The Religious Problem in English Education: The Crucial Experiment* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 1959).
  39. *Rescript of His Holiness Pope Gregory XVI, to the Four Archbishops of Ireland, in Reply to the Appeal to the Holy See on the Subject of the National System of Education in Ireland* (1841).
  40. Murphy, *The Religious Problem in English Education*.
  41. *Public Education* (London: Longmans, 1853), p. 3.
  42. *Ibid.*, Preface, p. iii.
  43. The Irish Christian Brothers refused to accept government inspection in Liverpool, V. Burke, *Catholic History of Liverpool* (Liverpool: Tinsling, 1910), p. 106.
  44. Grants became payable for Jewish schools from 1853.

45. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3d ser., CV, col. 1,079.
46. *Report of the Commissioners Appointed to Inquire into the State of Popular Education in England* (London: Her Majesty's Stationery Office, 1861), p. 115.
47. See *Report on Schools for the Poorer Classes in Birmingham, Leeds, Liverpool and Manchester* (Parliamentary Papers, 1870), p. 174.
48. *Report of the Commissioners* (1861), pp. 35-37.
49. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 3d ser., CLXXVIII, col. 1,549.
50. For an account of the various policies advocated at this time, see F. Adams, *History of the Elementary School Contest in England* (London: Chapman and Hall, 1882).
51. For the influence of United States opinion at this period, see W. H. G. Armytage, *The American Influence on English Education* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1967).
52. See Marjorie Cruickshank, *Church and State in English Education* (London: Macmillan & Co., Ltd., 1963), p. 60.
53. *Ibid.*, p. 47.
54. For a detailed account of attitudes at this time, see Benjamin Sacks, *The Religious Issue in the State Schools of England and Wales 1902-1914* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1961).
55. Here, as throughout this article, the calculations take no account of independent schools, schools for handicapped, or delinquent children or a small group of schools receiving grants direct from the state whose religious affiliations are in many cases not easy to ascertain.
56. *The Education of the Adolescent* (London: His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1926).
57. Apparently as the result of an administrative oversight, two very small Roman Catholic school departments were accorded "controlled" status.
58. See P. R. May and O. R. Johnston, "Parental Attitudes to Religious Education in State Schools," *The Durham Research Review*, V, No. 18, 127-38.
59. Pamphlet on *Free Church Federal Council Education Policy Committees* (London, 1959), p. 1. See also James Murphy, "Church and State in Education: England and Wales," *The World Year Book of Education 1966* (London: Evans Brothers, 1966), pp. 19-38.
60. When it was claimed in 1959 that there might be "200 or 300 single-school areas," the Minister for Education pointed out that there had been "some 4,000" in 1944, and he indicated that neither the State nor the Church of England would be likely to encourage the establishment of new denominational schools where this would create new single-school areas. (Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., 608, cols. 488, 494, 495, 498.)
61. G. D. Leonard, *Church Observer* (London, October 1959).
62. Hansard, *Parliamentary Debates*, 5th ser., 724, cols. 918, 923.