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Abstract

This thesis examines the contribution made to the political, ecclesiastical and social development of the Isle of Man by Isaac Barrow, bishop of Sodor and Man (1663-71) and governor (1664-69). The condition of the Island and its people after the civil wars and interregnum is described and the nature and scope of the challenges faced by Barrow are assessed. Barrow’s vision for the people in his care and the pastoral and educational strategies he adopted to better their moral, spiritual and social condition are described, and his motives in introducing his wide-ranging reforms are considered. The civil legislation enacted during his administration and the ecclesiastical legislation which he initiated are analysed, and the immediate and longer term effects of his reforms are evaluated.

Barrow identified two key targets for reform: improved education and conditions for the parish clergy; and the provision of English elementary schools for every boy and girl, with grammar and academic schools for the most able. Barrow’s skill in exploiting four different sources of funds and setting up well-constructed endowment instruments to ensure effective investment management is considered, and the quality and consistency of the oversight of schools and other aspects of pastoral and social care provided by the clergy and the courts are also evaluated.

The thesis then reflects on Barrow’s continuing interest in and contribution to the development of education in the Isle of Man during his episcopate in St Asaph (1670-80), and considers reasons for his relative lack of success in addressing comparable social challenges in north-east Wales. The impact of variations to the conditions of the academic endowments which Barrow made in his will (1680) is also assessed.

At the centre of the thesis is a reflection on Barrow’s life before 1663. The contrast between his high church, royalist convictions and academic career in Cambridge, Oxford and Eton on the one hand, and the liberal credentials of his reforms on the other, is considered. The thesis questions the extent to which the influence of former friends and colleagues, and the strengths and weaknesses of his self-sufficient, authoritarian character may have contributed to his ideas and the success of their implementation.

The thesis evaluates the long-term effectiveness of Barrow’s reforms, notably in education, by analysing evidence for the progress of literacy in reading and writing in the Isle of Man through the eighteenth century. It assesses particularly the efficacy of schooling in English in an isolated community where only Manx Gaelic, a vernacular without a written orthography, was spoken, and considers similar challenges in the teaching and acquisition of reading skills in Wales. Comparisons are then drawn with contemporary developments in the dioceses of Chester (Cheshire and south Lancashire) and St Asaph (Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery) and in the wider context of the progress of literacy in England and Wales. In conclusion the continuing contribution of Barrow’s ideas and endowments today is summarised.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

Historical context

The Isle of Man lies in the northern part of the Irish Sea midway between Cumbria and County Down. Much of its area of 572 km² is upland fell, rising to 620 m at the summit of Snaefell. Lowlands in the north and in the southern parishes below South Barrule provide good pasture and agricultural land. Fishing and crofting sustained its early Celtic inhabitants, but the Island’s strategic situation guarding the North Channel, together with its favourable terrain and mild climate, attracted Scandinavian adventurers in the ninth century who came first as raiders and then as settlers.

They brought with them their traditional system of law and government, and when Godred Crovan forged the Kingdom of the Isles from his victory at Skyhill in 1079 he confirmed the establishment of a Norse þing for the Island, the Court of Tynwald.¹ The relationship between the Norsemen and the indigenous Manx was uneasy, but the ‘strangers’ took Celtic wives and their gall-gael (‘stranger-gael’) children signalled a new demography on which a resilient and vibrant society would be built. The Kingdom of the Isles lasted for nearly two hundred years until 1265, when Alexander III of Scotland ended Scandinavian rule in Man. The Scottish and English crowns then vied with each other for control of the Island, appointing ‘baillies’ as administrators, most of whom cared little for its welfare. This turbulent period came to an end in 1405 when Henry Bolingbroke gave Man to John Stanley. So began over three hundred years of rule by the Stanleys as lords of Man.²

The establishment of the Kingdom of the Isles brought to the Christian church in the Isle of Man a new influence to challenge its old Hiberno-Scottish and Celtic roots. Godred Crovan’s son Olaf favoured the continental way of Rome; he invited the abbot of Furness to establish a Cistercian monastery at Rushen Abbey in 1134 and granted the monks the right to elect the bishop of the ecclesia sodorensis, the diocese of Man and the Hebrides. The waning Celtic

¹ Statutes, I, pp. 3-4; The Chronicle of Man and the Sudreys (Manx Society, 1874), I, p. 53: ‘Hence it arises,’ wrote the Rushen Abbey chronicler, ‘that up to the present day the whole island belongs to the king alone, and that all its revenues are his.’ The Court of Tynwald is the ancient parliament of the Isle of Man.
church drifted away to Iona, and for the next four hundred years the *ecclesia* was part of the Scandinavian archdiocese of Nidaros (Trondheim). The power of the monasteries ended with the dissolution of Rushen Abbey in 1540, while in contrast the reformed episcopal church came to play an increasingly important role in Island politics and the maintenance of some kind of social fabric in the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.³

In 1610 unequivocal right to the title, lordship and revenues of the Isle of Man, including the old abbeylands, was granted by statute to the Stanleys: the Island was ‘noe parcel of the Realme of England’.⁴ Apart from the *interregnum*, the Stanley lordship continued until 1736 when their line failed and the lordship passed to James Murray, second duke of Atholl. By the middle of the eighteenth century the enterprising Manx were enjoying unprecedented prosperity at the expense of the exchequer through the success of the running trade, until the patience of the British government ran out in 1765 and the Revestment Act returned the lordship to the crown.⁵

The Isle of Man’s ancient constitution is preserved today. It is a self-governing crown dependency, part of the British Isles but not of the United Kingdom, of which the sovereign is lord. Its legislature and government are vested in the Court of Tynwald, the oldest continuous parliament in the world.⁶ The little diocese of Sodor and Man still exists, too, though it is now part of the archdiocese of Canterbury. (Figure 1)

**Isaac Barrow**

Isaac Barrow was appointed bishop of Sodor and Man in 1663 at a time when the turbulent events of the mid-seventeenth century, rebellion against the royalist Stanleys in 1651, surrender to parliament, and nine years of stagnation during the *interregnum*, had left the Isle of Man in a period of economic and social decline. When Charles Stanley was restored to the

---

⁴ J.R. Oliver (ed.), *Monumenta de Insula Manniae*, vol. 3 (Manx Society, 1867), IX, pp. 99-120; PRO, SP 14/27/38.
⁶ David M. Wilson, *The Vikings in the Isle of Man* (Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 2008), pp. 122-24, 126, 137. By tradition the Isle of Man’s first þing was held in c. 979.
Figure 1 – The Isle of Man in the mid-seventeenth century.\footnote{BL ADD. MS 27362, ‘A collection of views of the Isle of Man, formerly belonging to Ralph Thoresby, Esq. Leeds [1650]; published in J. Chaloner, A Treatise of the Isle of Man, appendix to The Vale-Royall of England. Or, the County Palatine of Chester Illustrated, Daniel King, 1656. See Eva Wilson, A Book of Prospects, Castletown Heritage: Occasional Papers, no. 4 (Castletown, Isle of Man: Castletown Heritage, 2014), pp. 9, 13, 27.}
lordship in 1660 his sole interest in Man was as a source of income. He left its reconstruction to Barrow, appointing him additionally governor in 1664.\(^8\)

Barrow directed the civil and ecclesiastical administration of the Isle of Man for less than seven years as bishop and governor. During this time he embarked on a programme of wide-ranging political and social reform in church and state: he instituted new civil and ecclesiastical legislation and removed long-standing duplication in existing laws; he planned renewal of the church; he brought in extensive social reforms, delivered by the church and its ministers, and promoted or supported civil initiatives in Tynwald; and he established an Island-wide system of education which provided elementary schools for every child, and grammar and academic schools for the most able. In 1669 his health broke down. He sailed for Liverpool to take the waters at Lathom as Charles Stanley’s guest, but recovered sufficiently to accept the diocese of St Asaph in 1670. Through the 1670s he continued to influence Island affairs by working closely with his successor, Henry Bridgeman, who as dean of Chester was a near neighbour. He remained at St Asaph until his death in 1680.

Barrow’s reforms had the potential to reverse the economic decline of the civil wars and interregnum and improve the wretched condition of the poor majority. His motive was pastoral: as their bishop, he would work to strengthen the moral and spiritual standing of the people. His strategy was equally simple: he would provide well-educated and diligent parish ministers who would lead them in Christian living within the framework of the old established church; and he would give the people literacy skills, in English, so that they could read for themselves the Scriptures and Christian literature as their means of moral and spiritual renewal.

\section*{Aims}

The research on which this thesis is based has three aims: to evaluate Barrow’s reforms, civil and ecclesiastical, looking in particular at the measures he put in place to strengthen the clergy and parishes and enhance the pastoral guidance and support which the people relied on their ministers to provide; to consider the extent to which the circumstances of his life before 1663 might illuminate the paradox of his inclination to high church, royalist conservatism in

\footnote{MNH, MS 00810C (Episcopal Registry), p. 1, Barrow’s commission as governor, 31 May 1664.}
political and ecclesiastical affairs on the one hand, and the enlightened, practical nature of his social reforms on the other; and to assess how effective these reforms were in changing lives and establishing foundations on which the Island and its people might build for the future.

Sources

Most of the primary sources are held in the Manx National Heritage archives. In addition to the statute books and records of convocation, there are Barrow’s own orders and correspondence. After 1680 similar evidence may readily be found in the observations and correspondence of churchmen, notably Bishops Wilson and Hildesley and Philip Moore, civil officers like Governor William Sacheverell, and independent commentators like the Cumbrian traveller Thomas Denton. Extensive use is also made of a wide range of court and administrative documents. In addition there are four documents which are key to understanding Barrow’s plans and motives: his report on the condition of the diocese at the beginning of his episcopate, the foundation instruments of his Impropriate and Academic Students’ Funds, and his will.9 Nothing of Barrow’s personal correspondence before 1670 has survived, but in addition to a limited number of official documents written during his time at St Asaph there are some personal letters in the Gwysaney collection.10

Documents from the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries held in the Island’s archives have survived in variable condition; a few are illegible, some are bound in the wrong volumes (for example, most Libri Causarum documents are bound as Presentments), and the binding at times frustrates the search for dates and names. But this is an invaluable resource.11 Some documents are very fragile, and where copies are available in later eighteenth-century collections, like the Atholl Papers, these are listed in footnotes alongside the original sources. Transcriptions of deeds and letters in *The Isle of Man Charities* (1831)

---

9 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Weeden Butler, *The Memoirs of Mark Hildesley D.D., Lord Bishop of Sodor and Man* (London: J. Nichols, 1799), pp. 303-10; Lib. Caus., 1669, fol. 2; MNH, MS 00524/1C (a), fol. 3v, (b), fol. 1r; Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668; MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3; TNA, Wills PROB 11/363/622, 14 September 1680. Impropriate tithes were income entitlements which had been transferred from the church into lay hands.


11 Some volumes of archidiaconal and episcopal wills and parish registers contain stray ecclesiastical orders and records of court proceedings. Presentments and records of cases in the church courts (Lib. Caus.) are invariably bound together as Presentments.
are also noted. In some cases important documents have been cited in authoritative writing with inadequate or obsolete references. Most of these have been traced, but where it has not been possible to locate the originals secondary sources are referenced (for example, note 388).

**Historiography**

The earliest biographical account of Barrow appears in Anthony Wood’s *Athenæ Oxonienses*. Sacheverell, Wilson and Philip Moore, using Wood, note Barrow’s contribution to the church and education, but most historians of the Island add little, and Barrow’s contribution is invariably eclipsed by that of Wilson. Spencer Walpole gives a whole chapter to Wilson, but a single sentence to Barrow. John Gough, E.H. Stenning and Peter Clamp write more fully on some controversial aspects of Barrow’s policies.

It is A.W. Moore, in his general and diocesan histories of the Isle of Man, who gives the most detailed and positive picture of Barrow. He explores in depth the relationship between church and state and the church’s role in the community, and it is particularly fortunate for this thesis that more than 35% of the content of Moore’s *History* for the period 1660 to 1800 deals with socio-economics. His account of the development of education is limited, however, and although he gives credit to the contributions of Barrow, Wilson and Hildesley, for Moore the story of the schools is marginal in the wider context of the long ‘power

---

12 J. McHutchin and G. Quirk (eds), *The Isle of Man Charities* (Liverpool, 1831).
13 Anthony Wood, *Athenæ Oxonienses. An Exact History of all the Writers and Bishops Who have had their Education in the University of Oxford, to which are added the Fasti or Annals of the said University*, 3rd edn, ed. P. Bliss, 4 vols (London: Rivington, and Oxford: Parker, 1813-20).
struggle’ between church and state in the Isle of Man which he explores in depth. Moore’s perspective throughout is an insular one, and his historiography reflects not only his common affinity with his fellow Manxmen, but also the popular constitutional, cultural and political aspirations which underpinned the Island’s drive for ‘home-rule’ and a national identity in the late nineteenth century. Since Moore’s agenda is to celebrate the ‘otherness’ of the Isle of Man, it is not surprising that his only comment on Manx education in the wider context of social change in England and Wales is a late reflection on the Island’s 1872 Education Act.

There are two detailed histories of education in the Isle of Man, by Peter Clamp (1986 and 1988) and Hinton Bird (1995). Both set Barrow’s reforms and the early development of the Island’s schools in the longer context of the progress of education into the twentieth century, but the events of 1663 to 1670 are fully described and each gives a considered assessment of the distinctive nature of Barrow’s ideas and the implementation of his policies. But the conclusions drawn are markedly different. Bird places Barrow’s schools as the high point at the beginning of an Island story of alternating innovation and retrenchment, and the distinctive, and contradictory, policies of bishops Wilson and Hildesley towards the schools in the eighteenth century are considered within the framework of these wider changes. Above all, for Bird the story is an Island story; his work is particularly valuable in offering thoughtful contextual comment on developments in Britain, but he demonstrates convincingly how often the Isle of Man was the innovator in the progress of education: it is ‘an Island that led’. This argument strikingly contradicts the picture of Manx education, at least before 1848, given by Clamp in his introduction to his 1986 study. According to Clamp, as a direct consequence of the Revestment in 1765 the Isle of Man ‘became a de facto off-shore English county, subject to mainland dictates in all things, including education [. . .] Island schools, of necessity, modelled themselves upon English exemplars [. . .] conforming to enactments deemed desirable by [. . .] Whitehall’. For Clamp this was not ‘an Island that led’; Manx education, the product of Barrow’s reforms, was nothing more than ‘a

---

17 Moore, History, I, pp. 470-72, 510-12.
20 Bird, An Island, pp. 37, 41, 82.
transplanted English paradigm of schooling’. Much of the evidence presented in this study questions these conclusions, and challenges in particular Clamp’s description of Manx education as a product of English policy, and his assertion that Barrow pursued a narrow political agenda in making English the language of instruction in his schools.

A number of informed articles on selected aspects of education and social history in the period by Anne Ashley, David Craine, Norman Crampton, William Cubbon and others help to add detail to the picture. Of particular interest is Crampton’s ‘Schools in Man’ (1956), which looks briefly at Barrow’s schools through the lens of twentieth-century Manx nationalist aspirations (cultural and political), and argues that his language policy ‘would have meant the obliteration of Manx Nationality’ if English had wholly displaced Manx Gaelic.

There are additionally more recent studies of the Island’s affairs, reflecting a less insular historiography, which illuminate key areas and help to put into perspective the challenges and changes which people and authority alike had to face in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Particularly notable are Roger Dickinson’s work on government and economy, Kit Gawne’s study of the causes and consequences of the running trade, and Jennifer Platten’s investigation into the workings of the church courts.

But there are two significant gaps. Very few modern studies of key personalities in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries comparable to Jennifer Kewley Draskau’s biography of William Christian have been written; the most recent biographies of Bishops Wilson and Hildesley, for example, date from 1863 (John Keble) and 1799 (Weeden Butler) respectively. And there have been no attempts to apply the methods of statistical analysis used by Dickinson to make a systematic assessment of the effectiveness of the legislative and social reforms of the 1660s, and in particular to evaluate what kind of education was made

---

21 Clamp, ‘Schooling, 1650-1950’ (1986), p. vii. Although Clamp is writing in 1986, a number of his assertions about the Island’s demography, economy and social conditions (for example, on youth emigration and the pre-eminence of tourism) refer to conditions at least thirty years earlier which no longer applied in the 1980s: see ‘Schooling, 1650-1950’ (1986), pp. 2, 4.  
available, the extent to which it improved literacy, and the contribution it made to the provision and quality of social support for the poor majority.\textsuperscript{25}

**Methodology**

This thesis attempts to fill this gap. It is divided into five parts and the methodologies vary accordingly. Chapter 2 sets the historical context, highlighting the formidable task Barrow faced in setting the Island back on its feet after the Restoration. In chapters 3, 4 and 5 Barrow’s strategies to reform the regulation, conduct and effectiveness of civil and ecclesiastical affairs are described. In each case his purpose, or that of his associates, whether stated or implicit, is assessed, the way changes were expected to work in the community is considered and, where evidence of outcomes can be identified, there is an attempt to determine the extent to which the intended aims were achieved. Chapter 3 deals with civil and ecclesiastical legislation and governance together, reflecting the commonality of the two branches of law and administration recorded side by side in the Island’s statutes and Barrow’s dual role as bishop and governor.\textsuperscript{26} Chapter 4 looks at Barrow’s social reforms, his measures to improve the quality of the clergy and, most especially, his educational programme. Chapter 5 follows the progress of Barrow’s schools through the 1670s when he continued to influence social change in the Isle of Man during his episcopate in St Asaph, and also considers why he achieved relatively little in his Welsh diocese. The work of the schools and teachers and the effects of Barrow’s educational programme in the Isle of Man are dealt with in later chapters, but some collateral evidence which illustrates the impact of other social reforms in the period from 1663 to 1680 is considered in this chapter.

The biographical dimension of this study is placed centrally in chapter 6. Barrow’s political conservatism and high churchmanship were the product of his upbringing, education and academic career, but he chose practical rather than ideological solutions to the social

---


\textsuperscript{26} See William Harrison, *An Account of the Diocese of Sodor and Man and St German’s Cathedral* (Manx Society, 1879) XXIX, pp. 36-37.
challenges he faced in the Isle of Man. This chapter considers how he was able to bring to the Island ideas and skills which so admirably matched the challenge of rebuilding its church and society, and asks to what extent leading clerics and academics of his time, together with former friends and associates, influenced his thinking.

Chapters 7 and 8 offer an evaluation of Barrow’s educational programme. Evidence of the availability of schools, take-up of places, quality of teachers and progress of literacy is assessed, together with the effects of changes introduced by Bishops Wilson and Hildesley, which may in part have compromised the system at elementary level. The consequences of Barrow’s strategy to provide ‘English schools’ are also considered. In chapter 9 the story of education in the Isle of Man is viewed in a wider geographical context, and an attempt is made to judge whether Barrow’s reforms produced in the long term a more literate and resourceful society in the Isle of Man than was achieved in Cheshire, south Lancashire and the Welsh counties of the diocese of St Asaph. Two further questions are considered in conclusion: why did Barrow develop such a strong affection for the unsophisticated Manx, and what lasting benefits of his reforms does the Isle of Man enjoy today?

**Comparative evaluation of the development of education and literacy in three dioceses**

There is a clear rationale for choosing the constituent counties of the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph for comparative study. Although parts of the diocese of Chester, notably north-east Cheshire and south Lancashire, changed rapidly in the later eighteenth century as industrialisation and urbanisation developed, there remained substantial areas of both counties where a rural, agricultural economy continued much as it had been for generations before. Furthermore, by the early 1700s Liverpool had superseded Whitehaven and Furness as the point of contact for trade and communications, and the Island’s link with the mainland Stanley estates had become more important. Life in the predominantly rural Welsh counties of Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery continued to have much in common with the Isle of Man right up to 1800. Equally significant is Barrow’s own close association with both dioceses, through the Stanleys and men like Richard Sherlock and Thomas Cholmondeley in Chester, and in St Asaph through his time there as bishop from 1670 to 1680. The choice of the Welsh counties also reflects one key dimension in the story of the development of education and literacy which Wales and the Isle of Man share: each has its own vernacular.
Evidence of the provision of elementary education and school attendance in the Isle of Man may be found in visitation returns, presentments and court records, anecdotal references and official surveys (for example, by Sacheverell and Philip Moore). It is also possible to assess in various church records the quality of the teachers until 1700, when Bishop Wilson separated the schools and churches. Some sense of the effectiveness of grammar and academic teachers and the success of students may also be found in these documents. The methods used to evaluate changing literacy, for example through analysis of signatures and marks in documents, and book ownership in probate records, are those developed by David Cressy, R.A. Houston, R.S. Schofield and others. This evidence is especially important in the Isle of Man since other drivers of literacy, identified by Thomas Laqueur and David Vincent, were not available in an oral, vernacular community.

In the comparison areas there is little local information about elementary education before the establishment of the first Charity Schools and subsequent data is largely limited to broad figures. The effectiveness of the schools and their contribution to the development of literacy can only be estimated according to surveys of other areas in England. By contrast grammar schools, particularly in the two English counties selected, are well documented, both in county surveys and in numerous histories of individual schools and foundations. Some of these give a picture of the quality of the teachers, who the pupils were, what they were taught and how this prepared them for further study at the universities.

There have been a number of detailed statistical analyses of changing literacy in London and some English regions, including the north-east, East Anglia and Bristol. But data in south Lancashire and Cheshire has not been studied in this way, and it is only possible to reach a general sense of trends through contextual evidence, such as the provision and take-up of school places through the eighteenth century. There have similarly been few comparable

regional studies of changes in Wales. The availability and impact of Griffith Jones’s circulating schools are widely documented, but their medium was Welsh and they taught only reading skills. In the period of study there were also important developments in the provision of education and changes in literacy in Ireland and Scotland, and some of this evidence is referenced where it illuminates the wider context of developments in the Isle of Man. More detailed studies outside England and Wales may be found in Houston’s work.

This thesis explores the nature of all Barrow’s reforms and attempts to assess the extent to which his strategies brought any significant benefits by the end of the eighteenth century. It seeks also to evaluate what happened in the Island within the comparative context of social change, specifically in the provision of education and the acquisition of literacy, in Cheshire, south Lancashire and north-east Wales. Whether any further progress in the economic and social affairs of the Isle of Man after 1800 may also be attributed to aspects of Barrow’s reforms is a separate question inviting further study.

Chapter 2

The fortunes of the Isle of Man, 1594-1663

‘The poverty of this Island is its greatest security’ – James Chaloner

Introduction

Isaac Barrow arrived in the Isle of Man as bishop in the summer of 1663. The diocese of Sodor and Man was in the gift of the lord of Man, whose political and ecclesiastical authority was independent of the crown. The relative isolation of the Island did not protect it from the momentous upheavals of revolution in the mid-seventeenth century and it fared badly through the English civil wars and interregnum. Barrow found it impoverished, without any prospect of regeneration, its inflexible political and administrative structures ill-suited to a new order.33 This chapter recounts the events leading up to the restoration of Charles Stanley, eighth earl of Derby, in 1660 and assesses their impact on the Island’s economy and the welfare of its people.

The lordship of the crown and the Stanleys, 1595-1651

The Manx antiquarian A.W. Moore claims that ‘the restoration of the Stanley government [in 1660] caused as little friction and alteration as its temporary cessation had done eight and a half years before’.34 There was an uneasy fragility about the restored administration, however, the consequence of unsettling confusion in the last months of parliamentary rule in the Island and provocation by Charles Stanley, who found himself at odds with many of the political imperatives and leading personalities of the Restoration settlement, not least the king.35

The initial causes of the Island’s misfortunes may be traced back to 1594 when the death in mysterious circumstances of Ferdinando, fifth earl of Derby, plunged the house of Stanley

---

34 Moore, History, I, p. 375.
into confusion, provoking Elizabeth I to annex the lordship to safeguard the security of the Irish Sea. The crown did not ‘in any sort offer to disturbe or innovate the civill government of the country and people’; but the insular revenues were lost for fifteen years until the lordship was returned to the Stanleys in 1610.36 The Island was administered first by Elizabeth de Vere, wife of William, sixth earl of Derby, and then by their son, James, Lord Strange, both of whom took steps to increase its income, although with little benefit to the Manx people. James Stanley took a dynamic interest in the lordship, but in the 1630s his attention was diverted away from the Island as his father retreated from public life, and by 1639 the growing political crisis between king and parliament required him to devote all his energies into holding the balance between factions in the north-west of England. When he succeeded as seventh earl of Derby on his father’s death in September 1642, just as Charles I raised his standard in Nottingham, equivocation was no longer an option. Thwarted in his efforts to avoid confrontation, he rejected overtures from parliament and accepted the lord lieutenancy of Cheshire and Lancashire.

James Stanley was an uneasy supporter of the king. He was out of sympathy with high church practices, and royalist provocations made difficulties for him in the north-west. He achieved a series of local successes, however, and secured the Isle of Man, together with the sea route to Ireland, against the threat of a Scottish invasion and a revolt by disaffected Islanders.37 The imminent defeat of royalist forces in Lancashire forced his hurried recall early in 1644 to raise the siege of Lathom. On his return to Castle Rushen a few months later he set about turning the Island into a fortress: he imposed levies ‘for the puttinge of the Countrie in a posture of Defence against Foraigne invasion and other inconveniences’, raised rents and entrance fines, and annexed all the diocesan revenues by keeping the see vacant.38 There were other expenses to burden the Island too, not least as a consequence of his defiant declaration of July 1649 calling on ‘all my allies, friends, and acquaintances, all my tenants in

36 Lib. Canc. (10071/5/1), 1595, pp. 34-35, Elizabeth I to the chief Officers of the Isle of Man, 1 August 1595. In 1610 the earls of Derby and their heirs were granted by parliament and the crown the unequivocal right to the title and revenues of the Isle of Man: see Monumenta, I, pp. 104-06.
37 Kewley Draskau, Illiam Dhone, p. 15-16.
the counties of Lancaster and Cheshire, or elsewhere, and all other his Majesty’s faithful and loyal subjects, to repair to this island, as their general rendezvous and safe harbour’. 39

Servicing such costs could not have come at a worse time. The turmoil of the civil wars had curtailed trade, insular commerce stagnated, scarce resources were diverted from the land, and able-bodied labour was increasingly drawn into the lord’s service. The condition of all but a fortunate few was desperate: James Stanley’s appropriation of the bishop’s revenues further impoverished the church, on which the poor relied for relief, there were disastrous harvests in the late 1640s, and the crisis was compounded in the early autumn of 1651 when he took with him three hundred able-bodied men, more than three times the number normally serving in the garrisons, to fight for the pretender king. These were men whose labour or skills were beneficial to the insular economy, and after the disaster at Wigan Lane they were a lost resource; very few managed to straggle home across the Irish Sea. 40

The burgeoning costs of garrisons and munitions and of the extravagant court of refugee royalists in Castle Rushen made the period between 1643 and 1651 one ‘of abnormal expenditure and taxation, various novel extractions, especially in the form of “benevolences”, being imposed on the Manx people’. 41 Christopher Hill’s indictment of Charles I’s court, ‘sucking the life-blood from the whole people by methods of economic exploitation [. . .] influenced by a Court clique of aristocratic commercial racketeers and their hangers-on’, might equally apply to the lordship of James Stanley. 42 His last military expedition further fuelled widespread discontent which influenced the dramatic events of William Christian’s surrender of the Island to parliament in October 1651. 43 A massacre on the scale of Drogheda had been averted, but although parliamentary rule brought political stability, for the most part ordinary people remained in abject poverty more wretched even than conditions in the neighbouring counties of north-west England.

39 Knowsley, MS H/137, ‘A Declaration of the Right Honourable James, Earle of Derby, Lord Stanley, Strange of Knocking, and of the Isle of Man, Concerning his Resolution to keep the Isle of Man for His Majesties service, against all force whatsoever’ (1649).
41 Moore, History, I, p. 324.
43 Receiver-General William Christian negotiated the surrender of the Isle of Man to Colonel Robert Duckenfield, commander of a parliamentary naval force, on 25 October 1651.
The Isle of Man under parliament, 1651-1660

Parliament confirmed the gift of the lordship of Man to Thomas, Lord Fairfax, ‘in public
gratitude of his high deserts’, on the day of James Stanley’s execution. Fairfax
commissioned James Chaloner to ‘enquier into the foresaid estate in the said Isle of Man with the
yearly value and profittes therof’ and to make recommendations ‘for the settling of affairs in the Isle of Man’. He made no changes to the civil administration and fulfilled
Duckenfield’s promise to Christian ‘that they [the Manx] might enjoy their laws and liberties as formerly they had’. Moore judged that ‘the rule of Fairfax, or rather that of his governors [. . .] was evidently just, though severe’.

Chaloner was an able administrator. In preparing his report for Fairfax he took pains to
understand the Island’s ancient constitution and judiciary and shrewdly judged the people to be ‘very civill, laborious, contented with simple Diet and Lodging [. . .] ingenuous in learning of Manufactures, and apt for the Studies of Humanity or Divinity’. Although his dealings with them show him to have been honest and conscientious, however, the wretched state of the people persisted, and the weakness of the economy held back any progress towards developing resources and improving social welfare. There was worse to come in 1659 as Chaloner’s administration began to unravel when he became a collateral victim of the political uncertainty in England following the resignation of Richard Cromwell. He was arrested and imprisoned by John Hathorne, lieutenant of the Peel garrison, ‘for the preservation of the peace of the Island’. At the worst possible time the Island was without effective governance for five weeks until, on 27 December, one day after parliament declared for Monk, Chaloner was released by order of parliament. He subsequently initiated an investigation into Hathorne’s conduct, but this was overtaken by events political and personal

46 Harrison, Illiam Dhone, p. 6; Kewley Draskau, Illiam Dhone, p. 51.
47 Moore, History, I, p. 274.
48 Chaloner, Treatise, p. 5.
– the restorations of Charles II to the crown and Charles Stanley, eighth earl of Derby, to the lordship of Man, and Chaloner’s death.

The church, the clergy and the provision of education

The lords of Man exercised considerable power over the Island church after the Reformation, not only in the appointment of bishops, but also through the appropriation of its revenues and gradual subversion of diocesan authority. John Meryck (1576-99) was the first bishop since 1542 to take the diocese firmly in hand, but he forfeited much of the church’s independence when seven ‘Spiritual Ordinances’ were intruded in 1594 by Randulph Stanley, Captaine of the Isle. Perceval Ward saw ‘this assumption of authority [. . .] on the part of the Civil Power over the Spiritual’ as a defining moment in the relationship between church and state.51

Meryck’s successor John Phillips (1605-33) was appointed by James I during the crown’s lordship. He completed the long process of incorporating ecclesiastical law into the civil statutes in 1610, but his episcopate was dogged by opposition from William Stanley’s governor, John Ireland.52 He also failed to carry the clergy when he attempted to replace their preference for extemporaneous Manx Gaelic translations in public worship with his own Mannish Book of Common Prayer.53 Although Phillips won his long contest with the Stanleys over the exercise of ecclesiastical authority in 1628, by the time of his death five years later the shift towards high church orthodoxy in England threw suspicion on some elements of his episcopate.54

Phillips’s successor Richard Parre (1635-43) was by repute a considerable scholar, but Joseph Train dismissed him as ‘a notorious gamester [whose] character was not much calculated to allay the discontent of the people’.55 Although he received support from James Stanley, he

51 Moore, Sodor and Man, pp. 139-40; Convocation, pp. 6-7; Statutes, I, p. 66; Civil and Ecclesiastical, p. 93.
52 The synods of the early seventeenth century were both judicial and legislative. The close links between the ecclesiastical and civil legislatures exemplified in 1610 resulted in the incorporation of church laws into the civil statutes: see Moore, Sodor and Man, pp. 101-02, 123; Statutes, I, pp. 71-74.
55 Joseph Train, An Historical and Statistical Account of the Isle of Man, from the earliest times to the present date, 2 vols (Douglas: Mary Quiggin, 1845), I, p. 351. Train’s judgements are at times somewhat wayward and unsubstantiated.
failed to deal effectively with festering resentment against the levying of tithes and the authority of the church courts. In consequence, in 1642 the governor, John Greenhalgh, commissioned an enquiry ‘of the true state of the grievances of the clergie and commonaltie’. A year later James Stanley appropriated to himself all the church’s administrative and judicial powers and most of its income, a cynical move aptly symbolised by his seizure of Bishopscourt, which he converted into a ‘retiring house in the summer season’. Moore concluded that it was all designed to satisfy ‘his need of the revenues of the bishopric for paying military expenses’. Yet for all its confusions and ad hoc nature the Manx church, colourfully described by the Presbyterian William Mackenzie as ‘a full-blown Laudian Puseyite system in miniature under a glass conservatory’, reflected closely the wider orthodoxy of the established church.

The endless wrangles weakened the church’s pastoral care of the people, but even more significant was the indifferent quality of the clergy. Just before Parre’s episcopate began it was reported that ‘all the clergy except two or three are illiterate men, brought up in the island in secular professions’, and if the clergy were themselves illiterate then there could be no means of providing even the rudiments of instruction, spiritual or secular, for the people. Some did their best to serve their parishioners; others, like Robert Allen in Maughold, were careless and incompetent: ‘There is no Manx sermon in our Church,’ his indignant parishioners complained, ‘the sick are not visited; the parties dying without prayers, exhortation and the Holy Communion. Children [...] have to be taken to other parishes for their Christendom and to pay for it.’

A few years later, however, the Lancashire historian William Blundell made a strikingly different assessment: ‘Their ministers truly are not unlearned. I did not converse with anyone, but that I found him both a scholar and discreet.’ Blundell was a ‘kindly, paternal squire’ whose judgement often seems coloured by his inclination to see the best in the people and people.
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56 Moore, History, I, p. 235 n. (‘Rotul., 1631’: this reference cannot be traced in MNH records).
58 Moore, History, I, p. 365.
59 William Mackenzie, Legislation by three of the thirteen Stanleys, Kings of Man (Manx Society, 1860), III, p. 213.
60 Moore, Sodor and Man, p. 134.
events he chronicled, but he spent a considerable amount of time in the Island and due credence must be given to his report.63

Since the Manx church had been administered by James Stanley’s officers since 1643 its transfer to parliamentary authority brought little change. Chaloner recorded: ‘Now that Episcopacy, with Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction accompanying the same, is put down in England, the same is by their example laid here aside.’64 The Island church assimilated moderate Puritan influences, there was apparently no dissent, and stability was preserved. No clergy were ejected, tithes were collected as before, buildings were maintained, and the functions of the ecclesiastical courts were simply transferred to the civil courts, where presentments were dealt with just as they had been before 1651.65 Furthermore, in contrast to the wholesale misappropriation of the diocesan revenues by James Stanley, according to Chaloner some of the income was used ‘for the better encouragement and support of the Ministers of the Gospel’.66 Chaloner, writing in 1656, shared Blundell’s assessment of the clergy: ‘Considering the Ministers here are generally natives, and have had their whole education in the Isle, it is marvailous to hear what good Preachers there be.’67 Yet according to Barrow the Manx church and its clergy were in a sorry state when he arrived in 1663.68

There are similarly contrasting assessments of the provision of education in the Island. The duty of ‘the education of youth, and relief of the poor’ lay with the church, as it had done since before the Reformation, but the loss of its designated income at the hands successively of William and James Stanley left it without effective means to fulfil these obligations.69 Returns submitted to Bishop Foster’s visitation in 1634, which are considered in more detail later, show that parochial schools were operating in a few parishes, but instruction by the clergy was at best fragmentary.70 There is patchy inferential evidence which suggests that

66 Chaloner, Treatise, p. 18.
67 Chaloner, Treatise, p. 8.
68 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, pp. 303-05.
69 Records, p. 37.
70 MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, Bishop Foster’s Visitation, 1634; see also JMM, 2 (1931), no. 28, pp. 25-27, 28-29 (docs 8, 10), no. 29, pp. 33-37 (docs 13, 14, 15), (1932) no. 30, pp. 41-42 (doc. 18), no. 31, pp. 54-57 (docs 21, 22), no. 32, pp. 67-69 (docs 31,33, 34). There is also evidence that children of the lord’s household
some primary education was provided during the *interregnum*, but when Barrow arrived it is likely that only three parochial schools (in Castletown, Michael and Ramsey) and a garrison school in Castle Rushen were being taught.\(^71\)

According to Blundell, there were grammar schools in each of the four towns in 1648, which were ‘maintained out of the revenues’ seized by James Stanley. Chaloner, too, recorded in his 1653 survey that there were ‘Free-Schooles [. . .] at Castletown, Peel, Douglas and Ramsey.’\(^72\) By the time Barrow arrived, however, these schools had gone: ‘A Grammar School,’ he recorded, ‘was also wanting.’\(^73\)

It is difficult to reconcile these opposing assessments of the efficiency of the church, the quality of the clergy, and the availability and effectiveness of the education they provided. Nigel Yates concludes: ‘As in all other parts of the British Isles, the Manx clergy could furnish examples of both extreme diligence and extreme negligence, but most fell into neither of these categories.’\(^74\) Blundell and Chaloner recorded the state of the churches and schools as they found them in 1648 and 1653, but by 1663 the situation had changed. Barrow’s comprehensive report on what he found when he arrived as bishop is almost wholly negative, and his assessment is endorsed by Bishop Wilson, who judged that ‘during the Great Rebellion [the Manx church] suffered in her doctrine, discipline, and worship’.\(^75\)

**Society and the economy**

Moore estimated that the population of the Isle of Man averaged 12,000 during the first half of the seventeenth century. Blundell thought the ‘gentry’ were similar to those of his native Lancashire, but his picture of the poor majority is one of hardship, despite his assessment that ‘the Island of Man is at this day in a mean populous; it neither wanteth nor aboundeth, much less is it overburthened by its natives’. The Island’s four towns, Castletown, Douglas, Peel and Ramsey, each comprised only about five hundred inhabitants; Blundell thought that

---

\(^73\) Butler, *Hildesley*, p. 305.
\(^74\) Yates, ‘Religion and Education’, in Mytum (ed.), *New History*.
\(^75\) MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, *Hildesley*, pp. 303-05, 309-10; Keble, *Wilson*, I, p. 52.
Castletown, the seat of government, ‘above the rest might merit to be called the metropolis of the island’, while Douglas was beginning to make an increasing contribution to the economy because of its advantageous harbour. Most Islanders lived in the country, scattered across a wild landscape of upland fells, in ‘houses, or rather hovels, almost at the end of every other acre of ground [. . .] huts and sleight buildings [. . .] mere hovels [where] doth the man, his wife and children cohabit, with ye geese and ducks under ye bed, the cocks and hens over his head, the cow and calf at the bed’s foot’. They subsisted by unimproved agriculture and fishing, both subject to heavy levies, and herrings, oat cakes and water ‘mixt with milk, or at best buttermilk’ constituted their diet. Yet Blundell judged that ‘tho’ [it] hath no manna in it [. . .] this Man hath everything fit for a man’.76

The lord’s officers controlled the lives of the Islanders. In the first forty years of the seventeenth century England benefited from an unprecedented period of growth in agriculture, manufacture, enterprise and trade as the old tied relationships between landlord and tenant were replaced by a growing market economy.77 But James Stanley’s ever tighter grip on his domain ensured that there was no comparable change in the Island’s social structure and economic activity; no-one could enter or leave without a permit, wages were fixed well below rates in England and enterprise was stifled by restrictive regulation of crafts and markets.78 Nor was there much opportunity for legal maritime trading. Chaloner judged that the Island’s reliance on four chosen ‘Merchant-Strangers’ to conduct all sea-going trade was ‘an especiall benefit for the enriching of the people, and for the generall good’, but the first Navigation Act of 1651 had disastrous consequences for commerce, since the Isle of Man was not permitted to take part in free ‘coasting trade’ with other ports.79 Some illicit enterprise continued, however, as a few adventurers began to take their chance in a fledgling running trade.80
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76 One-fifth of every herring catch was taken by the lord; customs duties and the Water Bailiff’s portion also had to be paid, and the church claimed a tithe: see Statutes, I, p. 83; Gawne, Controversy, p. 15; Blundell, History, I, pp. 52, 54, 56-57, 75.
78 Walpole, Land of Home Rule, pp. 128-29, 139; Moore, History, I, pp. 288-89, 295, 311-12. Moore’s analysis of wages and prices in the first half of the seventeenth century shows a marked disparity with those in England: in 1609 a Manx artisan’s daily wage was 5d, little more than half the equivalent of 9d in England; forty years later the daily wage of a Manx mason and blacksmith was still only 6d.
79 Chaloner, Treatise, pp. 30-31.
80 Gawne, Controversy, pp. 18-19, 21.
James Stanley recognised the advantages of trade: ‘This Isle will never flourish until some
trading be,’ he advised his son Charles; by attracting

strangers or natives to be merchants [. . .] you may grow rich yourself, and others
under you. Your people may be set a work [. . .] Where one soul is now, will be many;
every house almost will become a town; every town a city; the island full of ships.\textsuperscript{81}

But he made no such investment and these words ring hollow. In Antrim and Down privately
funded plantation towns had been successfully developed since 1606. He must have known of
the initiative of entrepreneurs like Randal MacDonnell, first earl of Antrim, who, over a
period of thirty years, brought immigrant artisans and merchants from south-west Scotland,
invested in building townships and improving land across his domain, achieving remarkable
economic success in an area more than twice the size of the Isle of Man. Jane Ohlmeyer notes
MacDonnell’s ‘enterprising [. . .] resourceful and determined’ exploitation of resources
comparable to those available to James Stanley, but despite his professed vision of a domain
enriched by mercantile venture he did not follow Antrim’s example.\textsuperscript{82}

In 1640 Countess Charlotte, James Stanley’s wife, wrote that the Isle of Man was ‘a place
where one can live for almost nothing’.\textsuperscript{83} For those who had almost nothing, however, life
was wretched. Sixty years earlier Bishop Meryck had written to William Camden: ‘This
Island not only supplies its own wants with its own cattle, fish, and corn; but exports great
quantities into foreign countreys every year. Yet this plenty is rather to be ascribed to the
pains and industry of the natives, than to the goodness of the soil.’\textsuperscript{84} But it was the Stanleys,
not ‘the natives’, who benefited from the industry which Meryck commended. ‘The ordinary
Manxman,’ Spencer Walpole concluded, ‘was little better than the chattel of the Lord.’\textsuperscript{85}

\textsuperscript{81} James Stanley, \textit{History and Antiquities of the Isle of Man} (Manx Society, 1860), III, p. 23. James Stanley’s
policies stifled enterprise, whereas ‘the subtil Dutch [. . .] the wisest People now extant, for the contriving and
carrying on their trades’ were commended by Josiah Child for their open policy towards the enterprise of ‘all
that come to them’. See Josiah Child, \textit{A discourse concerning trade} (London, 1689), pp. 4,7.

\textsuperscript{82} Jane Ohlmeyer, \textit{Civil War and Restoration in the Three Stuart Kingdoms: The Career of Randal MacDonnell,
Marquis of Antrim} (Dublin: Four Courts, 2001), pp. 25, 279. Recent archaeological research at Dunluce has
revealed a dynamic township of between seven and nine hundred settlers which flourished before the Ulster
240.

\textsuperscript{83} Moore, \textit{History}, I, p. 288 (Charlotte de la Tremouille).

\textsuperscript{84} Camden, W., \textit{Britannia}, 1\textsuperscript{st} edn, ed. Gibson, p. 1052, Meryck to Camden.

William Christian and his associates hoped that parliamentary authority would bring significant changes to taxation and regulation, especially in regard to restrictive land tenure, but in the event very little changed. Levies were maintained and their collection enforced. Chaloner’s survey confirms that daily life remained harsh, and there was no way out of the drudgery of poverty and hardship. The harvests of sea and land were fickle, an outbreak of smallpox in the winter of 1656 was devastating, and Chaloner could see no prospect of improvement since the Island ‘produceth not any Commodities of value, neither is improved by way of Manufacture; nor hath Merchant or shipping belonging to it’. He found much to commend in the character of the Manx, not least their orderly acceptance of civil authority and their ‘great esteem and reverence to the Publique Worship of God’; but he concluded his report with a telling, if ironic, judgement: ‘The poverty of this Island is its greatest security.’

The restoration of Charles Stanley, eighth earl of Derby, lord of Man

On 28 May 1660, two days after Charles II returned from The Hague, Charles Stanley was restored to the lordship of Man. There is no evidence that he ever visited the Island. His attention was largely taken up with affairs in Lancashire, as Barry Coward has described, and matters were inevitably complicated by the consequences of his long alienation from his mother, Countess Charlotte. Seacome, the first biographer of the House of Stanley, records the eighth earl’s bitter resentment of Charles II’s refusal to support his claim to his lost estates, but he has very little more to say, other than to commend him as ‘a Person of great Affability, Curteus to all, a good Master, a kind Landlord, and a loving Friend and Neighbour’. In 1660 the impoverished state of the Island and its people cried out for positive governance and investment, but Charles Stanley’s interest in the affairs of the Isle of Man was limited to the pursuit of three aims: to sweep away every vestige of parliamentary influence and re-establish the constitution and laws as they had been during his father’s lordship; to exploit the Island’s resources to help pay for the return of his sequestered Lancashire estates; and to avenge Christian’s surrender of the Island in 1651. The House of

86 Chaloner, *Treatise*, pp. 5, 30, 32.
87 Coward, *Stanleys*, pp. 75-79, 177-79.
88 John Seacome, *Memoirs; Containing a Genealogical and Historical Account of the [. . .] House of Stanley [. . .] to [. . .] 1735; as also a Full Description of the Isle of Man, &c.* (Liverpool: Sadler, 1741), p. 155.
Keys, too, seemed to catch the mood of limited political and social aspirations and brought forward little legislation of any consequence in 1661 and 1662.89

Charles Stanley made an attempt to address the question of parliamentary intrusion into the Island by commissioning Samuel Rutter, with six lay commissioners, to undertake ‘full settlement of all matters ecclesiastical and civil’.90 William Sacheverell judged Rutter to be ‘a man of exemplary goodness and moderation [who] governed the Church with great prudence during the late wars’. He would have been the right man for the task, but shortly after his appointment his health began to fail.91 Stanley now turned to his chaplain, Richard Sherlock, to ‘restore the collapsed and most deplorable estate and condition of religion and the Church’.92 Bishop Wilson judged that they settled the affairs of the church ‘to the entire satisfaction of the Lord and People’, but his assessment may reflect the fact that Sherlock was his uncle.93 The reforms actually had little effect, not least because most of the impoverished clergy were incapable of implementing them, and it was apparent that if the church was to benefit from the changes it needed above all the authority of a resident bishop.

It was at this stage that such initiative as Charles Stanley was ready to deploy seems ironically to have slipped from his grasp. Mindful of his father’s advice to ‘choose a reverend and holy man to your Bishop, who may carefully see the whole Clergy do their duties’, he ‘most affectionately besought Mr [John] Barwick that he would condescend to accept the poor Bishopric [as] he was very solicitous to have it well filled’.94 This placed Barwick in an uneasy position; he had just been appointed dean of Durham and was clearly hoping for further prestigious elevation. Countess Charlotte urged her son to appoint her friend and confidant Samuel Rutter, however, and Barwick, no doubt with relief, ‘readily complied with her request’, confiding that ‘the Bishopric in Man [. . .] had been a sort of banishment’.95 Rutter was duly consecrated, but before he could tackle the pressing issues of the diocese his

89 Statutes, I, pp. 111-15; the twenty-four Keys were the appointed representatives of the people in the Court of Tynwald. See note 1.
91 Sacheverell, Account, p. 91.
92 Moore, Sodor and Man, p. 155.
93 Keble, Wilson, I, p. 52.
94 Stanley, History, p. 18.
95 Peter Barwick, Life of John Barwick Dean of St Paul’s (c.1690) (London: J. Bettenham, 1724), pp. 132-33, 163.
health broke down again and he died on 30 May 1662. Once again the Island was without a bishop.

**Conclusion**

With the connivance of a subverted Keys and the pretence that the royal pardon had not reached the Island, Charles Stanley secured William Christian’s conviction for high treason for the surrender of the Isle of Man to parliament in 1651. At dawn on 2 January 1663 Christian was shot by firing squad on Hango Hill. Charles Stanley claimed a moral and spiritual justification: ‘Rebellion being a most heinous sinne against God, calling for justice here on earth, without which that place where it is committed may well be said to be polluted and by a fitting sacrifice ought to be purified by the blood of the most heinously guilty.’96 His cynical manipulation of the trial and subsequent dispossession of some of Christian’s associates and members of his family demonstrate that his motives were personal and political, however, and he had created a martyr to whose memory the disaffected might rally. Furthermore, by antagonising Christian’s son, Ewan, and other prominent Manxmen he set in motion a series of pursuits of grievance which would run for the rest of the decade, a debilitating diversion from what should have been the common purpose: to rebuild the Island.97

The state of the Island in January 1663 was far worse than it had been twenty years before, but it can be argued that the conditions which contributed to its decline were formed long before, in the years following the return of the lordship from the crown to the Stanleys in 1610. Barry Coward makes much of the Stanleys’ exploitation of the Isle of Man: it was a ‘cheap means of fulfilling the needs of the households in Lancashire’, but it remained ‘very poor and underdeveloped’ as a consequence of successive lords’ failure to invest and remove

96 Harrison, Illiam Dhone, p. 1.
97 TNA, PC 2/62, vol. 9 (1 October 1669-28 April 1671), petitions of grievance against Charles Stanley, eighth earl of Derby, submitted by Ewan Curghey, James Christian and James Banks: see note 366. William Christian’s fate was hotly debated well into the next century, culminating in the publication in 1776 of a celebrated version of his last speech, compiled long after his execution: see Harrison, Illiam Dhone, pp. 35-40; Kewley Draskau, Illiam Dhone, pp. 133-37; MNH, MS 09767/1/2, Malew register, 2 January 1662/3, p. 96. The common historiography framed by A.W. Moore and Spencer Walpole in the late nineteenth century owes as much to Charles Stanley’s vendetta against William Christian and his apparent disregard for the Island and its people as it does to the more momentous events of his father’s lordship.
restrictive regulations. Unlike Randal MacDonnell and other Scottish clan lords who successfully re-invented themselves, the Stanleys’ vision for the Isle of Man as an estate no different from their other holdings in north-west England was not open to change. The strategies they adopted to maximise the revenues were static, short-term and limited to the preservation of ‘the prerogative rights, dues and privileges of the lordship of Man’. James Stanley’s long lordship did nothing to advance the Island’s fortunes; William Mackenzie, in *Legislation by Three of the Thirteen Stanleys, Kings of Man* (1860), characterised him as a despot who ‘treated his subjects as if he were the keeper of a lunatic asylum’. He showed nothing of Antrim’s enlightened concern for his tenants, and punitive taxation and restrictive terms of lease held back the agrarian economy; he made no investment to attract artisans and mercantile enterprise; revenues were squandered after 1643 in maintaining his royalist court in exile; and to this waste of money was added the waste of precious manpower in the ill-judged adventure to support the pretender king in 1651. Through the Commonwealth years a more stable administration might have facilitated the beginnings of recovery, but further restrictive legislation, misappropriation of funds by corrupt officials and the feud between Chaloner and Hathorne all worked against it. Finally, two more precious years were lost following Charles Stanley’s restoration as he pursued his vendetta against William Christian and siphoned off the insular revenues to pay for the re-purchase of his sequestered estates in England.

As for the church, although Blundell and Chaloner were able to give positive assessments of the quality of many of the clergy, by 1660 it was seriously weakened; much of its revenue had been improperly appropriated, and during the *interregnum* its leadership was compromised and its judicial authority lost. The grammar schools, too, were lost and very little elementary education was being provided. The church lacked a capable body of men of education, ability and energy to serve as ministers in the parishes, guide the moral and spiritual welfare of the people, and support the needs of the poor and disadvantaged.

Such was the state of the Island in 1663. Its impoverishment was no different from the situation in England, where ‘pauperism required social action but poverty was endemic’, but

---

its isolation compounded its wretchedness.\textsuperscript{102} There was no bishop or archdeacon, Earl Charles was indifferent to its affairs except as a source of revenue, and the effectiveness of the governor, Roger Nowell, may have been compromised by his brother’s implication in the trial of William Christian.\textsuperscript{103} The appointment of a new bishop willing to take residence in the Island would best answer ‘the hopes and expectations of a poor people’.\textsuperscript{104}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{103} TNA, SP dom., Car. II., vol. lxxiii, no. 76. Henry Nowell was summoned to Whitehall on 13 May 1663 to answer to the king for his actions. Roger Nowell was replaced as governor by Isaac Barrow in 1664.
\textsuperscript{104} Sacheverell, \textit{Account}, p. 81.
\end{flushright}
Chapter 3

Legislation and governance in the episcopate and governorship of Isaac Barrow, 1663-1669

‘A man of public spirit, and great designs’ – William Sacheverell

Introduction

Isaac Barrow came to the Isle of Man as bishop in the summer of 1663 when its church had been without effective episcopal leadership for twenty years. His vision of a better future for the Island and its people led to far-reaching reforms and laid the foundations for significant economic and social change. In this chapter key aspects of Barrow’s legislation are considered and the ways in which the new ideas and practical measures introduced during his episcopate and governorship affected the lives of the Manx people are evaluated through exploration of selected examples of ecclesiastical and secular working practice in the courts and in the community.

Bishop of Sodor and Man

It seems most likely that it was Richard Sherlock, Charles Stanley’s chaplain at Knowsley, who recommended Isaac Barrow for the see of Sodor and Man. Sherlock and Barrow were old friends from their days together as chaplains at New College, Oxford, in the mid-1640s, their political and religious allegiances had much in common, and Barrow’s reputation as a determined royalist and ‘fellow-sufferer’ during his enforced retirement after the fall of Oxford commended him as an ideal successor to Samuel Rutter. For Charles II the diocese was a fitting additional reward for Barrow’s unwavering loyalty to crown and church, for which he had already received a fellowship at Eton and two sinecure livings. He had held these for less than three years, however, and the prospect of another change cannot have been

---

105 Peter Draper states that Charles Stanley took up residence at Knowsley after the Restoration, but there is conflicting evidence that he was at New Park (described by Draper as ‘a castellated mansion […] of considerable dimensions […] about half a mile from Lathom House’) until 1664 when, following the death of his mother, he removed to Knowsley. Keble states that Charles Stanley ‘on his mother’s death […] removed to Knowsley’. See Peter Draper, The House of Stanley (Ormskirk: Hutton, 1864), pp. 102, 248-50; Jamie Quartermaine (Oxford Archaeology North), pers. comm., 9 November 2012; Keble, Wilson, I, p. 52.
welcome. Two considerations in particular must have cast a shadow of misgivings. The Isle of Man could not have been further away from his friends and institutional academic life in the quiet courts of Peterhouse, New College and Eton; and the diocese was poor in the extreme: in 1640 the annual income was about £140, and when the Cumbrian traveller Thomas Denton visited the Island some time before 1681 he valued it at no more than two hundred pounds. The cathedral church of St German on St Patrick’s Isle, reportedly in ruins in 1663, sadly but aptly reflected the prolonged neglect and decay of the diocese. It may well be that John Barwick, Barrow’s friend from his Cambridge days, helped to persuade him to accept the bishopric, since it had so little to commend it in terms of financial inducement or advantage on the ladder of ecclesiastical, academic or political ambition. Barrow accepted the call, and the Island gained a bishop who would be, in Mark Hildesley’s judgement, ‘to his diocese, a very singular blessing [. . .] and a zealous friend’.

The speed with which he addressed the Island’s crisis may in part owe something to his age, for his appointment came in his fiftieth year, and he must have been acutely conscious of his fourteen lost years during the civil wars and interregnum. The Island’s need, too, was compelling. The see had in effect been vacant for twenty years, its income misappropriated and for the most part diverted to secular use; and in the shifting politics of the century the Isle of Man had become an impoverished pawn in the struggle between crown and parliament, its constitution, judiciary and administration ruthlessly exploited by the Stanleys.

Sherlock would have been able to paint for Barrow a detailed picture of what he could expect to find, and he must also have read Chaloner’s account which offered valuable insights into the character and way of life of the Manx. At least some of Barrow’s misgivings would have been answered when he read Chaloner’s opinion of their attitudes to secular and spiritual authority:

They are at this day a very civill People [. . .] apt for the Studies of Humanity or Divinity, bearing a great esteem and reverence to the Publique service of God; which

Figure 2 – Isaac Barrow, fellow of Peterhouse, c. 1641.\[^{110}\]

\[^{110}\] Peterhouse, Cambridge. Portrait by an unknown artist.
they testifie by their seldome absenting themselves from the church, although sometime a great distance from it.111

Barrow was consecrated bishop of Sodor and Man on 5 July 1663 in Westminster Abbey. The sermon was preached by his nephew Isaac, fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, fellow of the Royal Society and Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, who took as his text words from Psalm 132 that could not have been more apt for the service his uncle would give and the benefits the Manx people would receive:

The Lord hath sworn [. . .] here will I dwell, for I have desired it. I will abundantly bless her provision; I will satisfie her poor with bread. I will also cloath her priests with salvation, and her Saints shall shout aloud for joy.112

He arrived in the Isle of Man a month later and took the bishop’s oath ‘in ye gates of Peele Castle’ on 5 August.113

‘At my coming into the Isle of Man’

Barrow did not take up residence at Bishopscourt, but remained in Castletown, the Island’s administrative and political centre.114 He lost no time in taking stock of his new diocese by carrying out a visitation, and his report is invaluable, not only for what it tells us about the state of the Island, but also for the considerable insight it gives into Barrow’s character and vision. According to Butler, this report was ‘preserved by the Rev. Philip Moore, and communicated by Mr Edward Moore, of Douglas, to the editor [Butler]’. This document (transcribed in Butler’s biography of Hildesley) is now presumed lost, but a secretarial copy,

111 Chaloner, Treatise, p. 5.
113 Lib. Irrotul. (GR1/25), fol. 9r, 5 August 1662.
114 Robert Curphey concludes that the bishop’s palace was rarely used after 1660; in 1698 Bishop Wilson found the ‘house in ruins [. . .] nothing but an antient tower and chapel remaining entire’. Barrow probably took a house in the area to the south of the castle cleared by James Stanley in 1643-44 (now Parliament Square): see Curphey, ‘Bishopscourt’, p. 223; Cruttwell, Wilson, I, p. 40; MNH, MS 11314, Papers of J.R. Roscow, box 3; Lib. Assed., Rushen rent rolls 17a and 20a, c. 1703, listed in J.R. Roscow, The Development of Castletown 1601-1703, IMNHAS, 11, no 1 (1997-98), pp. 5-6.
annotated by Barrow and probably written in c. 1668 (after the establishment of the grammar school in Castletown), has survived.\textsuperscript{115} (Figure 3)

Barrow was horrified by what he found:

At my coming into the Isle of Man, I found the people, for the most part, loose and vicious in their lives, rude and barbarous in their behaviour; and, – which I suppose the cause of this disorder, – without any true sense of religion, and, indeed, in a condition almost incapable of being bettered; for they had no means of instruction, or of being acquainted with the very principles of Christianity.

He judged the clergy to be willing but defective in their preaching, ‘very ignorant and wholly illiterate; having had no other education than what that rude place afforded them’. They had no understanding of classical languages and there were ‘not many books among them [. . .] nor they intelligent of any but English books, which came very rarely thither’.\textsuperscript{116} The clergy were not only poorly educated but also very poorly paid, ‘their livings not amounting to above five or six pounds per annum’. There was no money for books, and to Barrow’s dismay poverty forced many ‘to engage in all mechanical courses, even in keeping of ale-houses, to procure a livelihood: and this, also, together with their ignorance, rendered them despicable to the people’. It was a situation without obvious remedy, since the people ‘had no way of instruction but from their mouths’, and the clergy had no way of improving their sorry condition.\textsuperscript{117}

Barrow attributed the poverty of instruction in the churches to the limitations of Manx Gaelic, which was almost exclusively an oral language.\textsuperscript{118} There was not even a Manx Gaelic translation of the Bible: Phillips’s translation of the Prayer Book (1610) had existed only in manuscript, and more than a hundred and fifty years would pass before Bishop Hildesley and his colleagues completed Manx Gaelic translations of the Bible and Prayer Book begun by

\textsuperscript{115} MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, pp. 303-05, 309-10.

\textsuperscript{116} This is at odds with a record six years earlier which credited Fairfax with sending 217 books to the Island to establish an academic library: see Bodl., MS Fairfax 33 fol. 24’ & BL Add. MS 71448, fol. 34, cited in John Callow, ‘“In So Shifting a Scene”: Thomas Fairfax as Lord of the Isle of Man, 1651-60’, in Andrew Hopper and Philip Major (eds), \textit{England’s Fortress: New Perspectives on Thomas, 3rd Lord Fairfax} (Farnham: Asgate, 2014), pp. 35-36.

\textsuperscript{117} MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 304.

\textsuperscript{118} Chaloner noted that English words relating to what he called ‘Manners, Foreign Merchandize and new Inventions’ were readily incorporated into the spoken language: see Chaloner, \textit{Treatise}, p. 4.
Figure 3 – Secretarial copy (c. 1668), annotated by Barrow, of his first visitation report (1663).
Bishop Wilson.\textsuperscript{119} When Hildesley sought financial assistance for these to be published, a memoir from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (SPCK) seized on the Island’s circumstances for special mention:

On the strictest enquiry, it was found, that the antient church of this diocese was probably the only Christian church in the world which was absolutely destitute of a printed copy of the Holy Scriptures in the vulgar tongue (the old translation of St Matthew’s Gospel in Manks being out of print).\textsuperscript{120}

‘There is nothing either written or printed in their language, which is peculiar to themselves,’ Barrow reported, ‘neither can they who speak it best write to one another in it, having no character or letter of it among them.’ His special concern as bishop was the inevitable inadequacy of the biblical and spiritual direction given by the clergy, ‘whose manner of officiating in their churches was by an extemporary translation of the English Liturgy into the Manks language’.\textsuperscript{121} Yet they had no choice but to speak in Manx Gaelic; when English was used the people simply boycotted the services.\textsuperscript{122} The dilemma is reflected in an annual grant of fourteen pounds awarded by Chaloner in 1658 to the scholarly Hugh Cannell, vicar of Michael, who was ‘one of the first preachers in this Isle, and the first that taught the Manks to read the Scriptures in the Manx tongue’.\textsuperscript{123} Barrow’s conclusions may in part reflect the limitations of his knowledge of Manx Gaelic, but Bishop Parre had found twenty years earlier that many priests were incapable of preaching and that the Island ‘was destitute of means of learned education’.\textsuperscript{124}

Other assessments are strikingly at odds with Barrow’s. Chaloner no doubt had in mind men like Robert Parre, who was awarded a salary of £5 by Fairfax ‘to be publicke preacher throughout the Island’, when he commended the ministers as ‘good preachers’.\textsuperscript{125} His view

\textsuperscript{119} A.W. Moore and John Rhys, \textit{The Book of Common Prayer in Manx Gaelic} (Manx Society, 1893), XXXII.
\textsuperscript{121} MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 305.
\textsuperscript{122} David Craine, ‘The Bible in Manx’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 5, no. 5 (1956), p. 541.
\textsuperscript{123} Lib. Scacc. (10071/3/9), 1658, p. 101”; warrant of James Chaloner, 28 August 1658; Chaloner, \textit{Treatise}, p. 7. This is a puzzling reference, since Phillips’s translation was of the Prayer Book.
\textsuperscript{124} Moore, \textit{History}, I, p. 361.
\textsuperscript{125} Harrison, \textit{Illiam Dhone}, p. 17, no. 4, (Lib. Irrotul., 1631-58), deposition of William M’Ylearran in ‘Depositions att Castle Peele the fourth of Octobr 1662”; Chaloner, \textit{Treatise}, p. 8. Parre’s sympathy for the rebellion of 1651 may well have coloured this judgement.
was endorsed by Blundell: ‘Their ministers truly are not unlearned. I did not converse with anyone (yet I discourse with diverse) but yt found him both a schollar and discreet.’ But few Manx clergy were of the calibre of Hugh Cannell and Robert Parre. Barrow’s adverse appraisal no doubt reflects the high standards of scholarship and discipline to which he had grown accustomed in the academic institutions where he had spent so many of his earlier years, although some of his judgements may reflect his natural bias against all things parliamentarian. David Craine concludes that ‘the Manx Church shared in the general decline of public and private morale’ consequent on the debilitating strains placed on the Island’s resources by the civil wars, parliamentary government and the prolonged episcopal vacancy.

Barrow’s survey is comprehensive, detailed and authoritative, its evidence compelling. His perceptive analysis led him to conclude that his priority for action should be twofold: to reform ecclesiastical legislation in order to provide an efficient and workable framework for the governance of the church; and to set in place new structures to improve the quality and education of the clergy and the moral, spiritual and social welfare of the people.

**Ecclesiastical legislation**

Seventeen years of episcopal vacancy, compounded by three more years of delay in settling the affairs of the Manx church consequent on Rutter’s ill-health and untimely death, left the diocese in a weakened state at a time when the part the church would be required to play in re-building a fractured society and supporting an impoverished people had never been greater. Although Bishop Wilson commended the restorative work of Sherlock and the lay commissioners the diocese was in disarray when Barrow arrived. One of his earliest orders urged the vicars general to ‘be carefull to settle all things in good order yt concerne yr office’. (Figure 4)

The clergy were instructed to conduct themselves with diligence and probity, church buildings and furniture were to be maintained with care, and in the churches and

---

127 Moore, *Sodor and Man*, p. 156.
129 EW, Barrow to Vicars General, 17 March 1663/4.
Figure 4 – Barrow’s instructions to the clergy, 17 March 1663/4.
ecclesiastical courts all procedures were to be regularised. That diocesan authority had become seriously weakened is exemplified by challenges from Susanna Ogle and Richard Calcott, executors of Bishop Rutter’s estate, who contested the church’s entitlement to funds intended for reparations which were held by the bishop at the time of his death. Barrow also faced refusals, or at least calculated delays, in the payment of tithes: in an uncompromising letter to Thomas Parr, vicar of Malew, he gave short shrift to any who were playing the system and ordered that ‘all those that are behind [. . .] for any maner of tythes, or any dues or fees belonging to the Church; that they before 14 dayes paye the same [. . .] and if any faile [. . .] to comitt them into St Germans prison’. Barrow’s immediate priority was to restore the church’s former status and independent authority. Irregular practices had grown up since 1610 and he now set about restoration of the lost authority of the bishop and reform of the governance of the church, its officers and the ecclesiastical courts, first by ordering eight ‘Instructions’ which re-established his episcopal authority (a few months after the Cavalier Parliament rejected the Cromwellian church). He was uncompromising in limiting the powers of the archdeacon and diocesan officers, who ‘shall have nothing to do with our fifteen episcopal causes [. . .] but only to act in such things as are proper and belonging to their jurisdiction for the half year’. They were to forfeit the independence acquired by vicar general John Harrison during Rutter’s exile, enforced or voluntary, at Knowsley during the interregnum, and their functions would now be solely executive. Barrow was determined to ensure that the parameters of judgement would be defined by statute and not by precedent: ‘Our vicars-general shall not order or censure causes contrary to our statutes, and spiritual written laws, though there be some precedents

---

130 Two claims, of £150 and £31 2s, were disputed: see Lib. Canc. (10071/5/8), p. 63, 12 August 1663, and EW (Lib. Canc. bound in EW), 12 and 13 January 1663/4.

131 EW, 17 December 1663, 11 November 1664 & 17 March 1664/5. Barrow’s appointment in December 1663 of Robert Parre, rector of Ballaugh, as an additional vicar general may be further evidence that he faced a formidable agenda of ecclesiastical business.


133 The case that the dowager Countess Charlotte and her family were at Knowsley after 1651, with Rutter frequently in attendance there, and not at Castle Rushen as ‘Prisoner in the Island until His Majesty’s happy Restoration’, as stated by Seacome (House of Stanley, p. 154), is convincingly argued in J.G. Cumming, The Great Stanley (London: William Macintosh, 1867), pp. 277-79. See note 90.

37
otherwise.’ For the ministers, too, conformity and uniformity were the watch words; they were to be careful and diligent in their places and callings, and be sober, and give good example in their lives and conversations [and] be obedient to observe all our directions formerly given touching the worship and service of God [and] obedience to the canons and laws of our church.134

Barrow’s ‘Instructions’ empowered him as the lord’s spiritual representative to embark on a programme of sweeping reform in the Island church.135 Charles Stanley gave him a free hand to revise the ecclesiastical statutes and record them ‘fair into a Book, and made the Rule of Proceeding in all Cases [. . .] as a great Expedient for the Preservation of the People’s Peace and Quiet’.136 The random collection of laws, orders and customs constituting the ecclesiastical statutes and regulations were long overdue for review; some were no longer relevant, others contained unresolved anomalies and contradictions, and there was also a political imperative to remove intruded parliamentary legislation. Some of Barrow’s revisions are innovative; others set down in clearer form the substance of earlier orders. He removed ambiguities in regulations for the administration of probate and inheritance, regularised definitions of offences and censures in presentments to the ecclesiastical courts, and ordered due care and equity in recording and proving wills. Of particular note is his concern for the welfare of the disadvantaged, exemplified in his legislation to help the destitute and preserve the inheritance rights of children, especially ‘orphans [who] were very much neglected in their good usage’ (clause 5). By 1667 there were eighty-six reformed spiritual laws, as binding as statutes, which provided a comprehensive code of reference to guide the transactions of the ecclesiastical courts, regulate the keeping of records, enforce conformity and enhance the conduct and standing of ministers and officers.137 In contrast to the disparate and cumulative nature of received canon law in the wider Anglican church, which was restored unchanged in 1661, Barrow’s reform and codification of church law gave the Island church a more practical and relatively efficient form of governance beneficial to clergy and lay alike.138 Legislation alone could not achieve these aims, but the reforms are significant.

---

134 Convocation, p. 95.
when considered alongside other practical measures that Barrow put in place to improve the
education and standing of his priests.\textsuperscript{139} His judicial \textit{dicta} served the Island well; no further
orders were made until 1683.

Barrow planned other practical measures to improve the pastoral and spiritual welfare of his
diocese which should have followed immediately, but Charles Stanley’s priority was the
unfinished business of the parliamentary years, and Barrow’s skill in reforming ecclesiastical
legislation convinced him that his bishop was the right man to take on the civil
administration. Since Barrow had had no involvement in the Island’s affairs during the civil
wars and \textit{interregnum}, his dealings with its men of influence and authority were
uncompromised and uncluttered by preconception; a new broom could sweep clean without
heed of faction or historical bias. Charles Stanley now made the most important appointment
of his lordship:

\textit{Know yee that for & in consideration of the especiall trust & confidence wch. I doe
repose in my trusty & wel beloved friend Isaack Lord B[i]sho[pp] of Sodor & Mann I
have constituted & appointed & by these present doe constitute & appoint the said
Lord B[i]sho[pp]. To be Governour of my said Isle of Mann.}

Sole authority for the Island’s governance, civil and ecclesiastical, was now vested in Barrow
as ‘sword-bishop’.\textsuperscript{140} (\textbf{Figure 5})

Barry Coward has argued that Charles Stanley was wholly pre-occupied with sectarian
divisions in Cheshire and south Lancashire after the Restoration, which accounts for his
indifference to the affairs of the Isle of Man, other than as a source of income.\textsuperscript{141} His primary
motive in appointing Barrow as governor was to ensure the continuance of good order in the
Island. His confidence that the policies and regulations which would frame Barrow’s
administration would support this secular agenda was doubtless matched by a belief that his
bishop’s spiritual authority and guidance would be beneficial, if only in the preservation of
orthodoxy. His description of Barrow as ‘my trusty & wel beloved friend’ was not just a
formulaic civility. Although no correspondence or records giving direct evidence of their
relationship can be found, it seems that a genuine and warm regard had developed between

\textsuperscript{139} For a detailed analysis of Barrow’s ecclesiastical legislation see Moore, \textit{Sodor and Man}, pp. 100-14.
\textsuperscript{140} Dickinson, \textit{Lordship}, pp. 55-56; Moore, \textit{History}, I, p. 482. Authority to enact new legislation was vested in
the governor and the lord’s officers, in consultation with the twenty-four Keys, and subject to the lord’s assent.
\textsuperscript{141} Coward, \textit{Stanleys}, p. 177.
Figure 5 – Charles Stanley appoints ‘my trusty and wellbelov’d friend Isaack Lord Bpp. of Sodor and Mann [. . .] to be Governour of my said Isle of Man’.  

\[142\] MNH MS 00810 C (Episcopal Registry), p. 1, Barrow’s commission as governor, 31 May 1664.
them since the spring of 1663, built in part on their shared faith. It was a dynamic relationship that worked to the advantage of both men: Earl Charles was confident, and doubtless relieved, that he had found an efficient administrator for his domain in whom he could place absolute trust; and Barrow was empowered to legislate, both to preserve order and to initiate reform, in every area of Island life. His far-reaching achievements in the Isle of Man would have been impossible without Charles Stanley’s support, as the relative failure of his episcopate in St Asaph would later demonstrate.

**Civil legislation**

Barrow’s agenda for social reform now had to defer to Charles Stanley’s priority, which was for his governor to bring in ‘Wholesome laws to be observed in this Island in future’. The defining principle of Barrow’s civil legislation, in part determined by the wider legacy of the Puritan rebellion in England, was the preservation of the People’s Peace, ‘the Amity, Confidence, and Quiet that is between Men’, the duty to which his father had subscribed as a Justice of the Peace for Cambridgeshire. Three tranches of legislation were enacted during Barrow’s governorship, in 1664, 1665 and 1667, and most of the new orders were designed to prevent disputes and preserve social cohesion and concord.

Much of the legislation of 1664 addressed areas of potential discord by regulating conditions of hire and wages, defining the rights and duties of servants, and listing the responsibilities of individuals or convened bodies charged with their care. In addition to the preservation of good order, however, some of the new regulations had the beneficial effect of improving efficiency and productivity; in agriculture, for example, although the practice of ‘yarding’ continued well into the eighteenth century, casual ‘yarding’ of contracted farm labourers on the whim of an official was no longer permitted. These measures to encourage efficiency and protect the innocent from exploitation in agriculture were matched by similar provisions for household servants, who for the first time were protected against ‘fallacious Dealing’ by a fraudulent master.

---

143 Records, pp. 111-12; Statutes, I, p. 133.
145 The oppressive and unpopular customary privilege of ‘yarding’, which entitled the lord’s officers, on his authority, ‘to compel people to enter into their service at a trifling fee, fixed by law’, contributed significantly to the inefficiency of the labour market: see Waldron, *Description*, pp. 39–40; Craine, *Manannan’s Isle*, p. 47.
The good order of society in the Island was especially threatened by its increasing impoverishment, particularly since 1643; there were not enough able-bodied men, women and young people to work the land, harvest the sea, and provide essential craft skills. The second tranche of civil legislation addressed this ‘great Scarcity both of Servants and of honest and able Tradesmen in the Isle’, which held back economic progress, by targeting the regulation of apprenticeships. The problem of youths breaking their indentures was not unique to the Isle of Man; significant numbers in the incorporated towns and cities of England left their masters early, and it has been estimated that fewer than 40% of urban apprentices completed their full term. But the consequences for the insular economy were far greater: broken indentures threatened social cohesion by promoting poverty, vagrancy and theft, and in the longer term they were a debilitating drain on scarce resources. New legislation during Barrow’s administration reformed regulations for apprentices and there were new incentives, including deposition of a bond, to bind them to the terms of their indentures, assure the quality of their instruction and help them to set up efficient practice in their craft once qualified. In the Isle of Man, no less than in England, well-regulated and effectively disciplined apprentices were essential to the preservation of social order. There was nothing in the new regulations about the moral education of young apprentices, however, which was made the duty of the masters to whom they were indentured in English legislation. Barrow was in no doubt that the moral and spiritual care of young people was the responsibility of the church; in a letter to his clergy early in his episcopate he instructed: ‘I pray you take care to have ye children taught their Catechisme in all ye parishes, yt they may be fitted to receive Confirmation.’

The new indenture legislation had the potential not just to preserve order but also to bring in advantageous new conditions for apprentices, particularly as the bond could operate like the

146 Statutes, I, pp. 119-23, 129.
148 Qualified journeymen were not permitted to marry for one year after completing an apprenticeship, since youths who married early without craft skills would be financially disadvantaged. See Dickinson, Lordship, p. 147.
151 EW, 17 March 1664.
entrance fee to a guild, ensuring that an apprentice conformed to the rules of his indenture and also protecting him from exploitation by an unscrupulous master.\textsuperscript{152} On the other hand, nothing intended in or consequent on the new regulations could compensate for the constraints which continued to burden the Island; stifling, outdated entrance and emigration controls and eighty miles of sea cut off its master-craftsmen and apprentices alike from new skills and technology, promoted by increasing mobility, in England. None of the impulses that helped to foster burgeoning manufacture and trade in the second half of the seventeenth century in England, particularly the exchange of new techniques and competition, were accessible to the Isle of Man.\textsuperscript{153}

Whether Barrow, his officers or the Keys had any sense of the momentous changes underway, particularly in rapidly growing towns and cities, is impossible to say. As for Charles Stanley, he readily accepted everything that Barrow recommended to him, since increased prosperity for the Island would in turn ensure that he received increased income. It is difficult to assess the success of the new legislation, but there are some clues; for example, there are very few records of cases of broken indentures brought before the courts after 1665, which may suggest that the legislation served its purpose well, although the civil court records are far too patchy to draw any definite conclusions.

Since the availability of skilled labour then, as now, was essential to the building of a prosperous future, recognition of its importance reflects both Barrow’s interest in the education and training of young people and an understanding of the workings of economics and commerce, insights which he may well have gained in earlier years in Cambridgeshire and more recently during his time as a fellow at Eton.\textsuperscript{154} He had no practical experience of manufacture and trade, but he was clearly ready to take on board the recommendations of those who had and to endorse such strategies. The preservation of the people’s ‘amity, confidence and quiet’ was always the primary aim of the legislation enacted in Barrow’s governorship, yet within this context the regulations for employment and social welfare,

\textsuperscript{152} Steven Epstein describes the guild fee as ‘a mortgage on trust’. The Island did not have the benefits of trade guilds; the lord’s Council regulated standards. See S.R. Epstein and Maarten Prak, \textit{Guilds, Innovation and the European Economy, 1400-1800} (Cambridge: CUP, 2008), pp. 16, 61, 74; Barry and Brooks (eds), \textit{The Middling Sort}, p. 60.

\textsuperscript{153} No apprenticeship indentures from this period have come to light in the Isle of Man: see Dickinson, \textit{Lordship}, p. 147 n. A few young Manxmen were sent to be apprenticed in England: see J.H.E. Bennett (ed.), ‘Chester Apprentices Indentures, 1603-1684’, \textit{Cheshire Sheaf}, 3\textsuperscript{rd} s., 8 (1910), no. 1641, 25 July 1621, ‘John Gellion of the Ile of Man, p. [apprenticed] to Richard Broster of Chester, tanner, for 8 y’.

\textsuperscript{154} See pp. 125-27, 130-31, 139-40.
enacted in 1664 and 1665, represent a new interventionist approach to the management of land and labour, equable regulation of markets and investment in skills. For the first time the economic and social conditions of the poor were addressed and, while this was not a charter for the wholesale emancipation of servants and labourers, the introduction of measures to enhance their rights may give an insight not only into Barrow’s awareness of contemporary issues in society which often gave rise to controversy and discontent, but also into his determination to provide legal protection where the vulnerable might lose the advantages of hire and wages and consequently become a burden on the parishes. Good order and equity together would be strengthened.

In his preface to the third tranche of legislation Charles Stanley claimed the initiative for everything enacted during his lordship. There is contrary evidence, however, in the preamble to the ‘cross statutes’, in which he ordered

> an exact Enquiry and Search into the Statutes, that such as are found fit to be abrogated may forthwith be repealed and cancelled, and that the rest that are necessary for Government of the Island [. . .] may be wrote fair into a Book, and made the Rule of Proceeding in all Cases.\(^{155}\)

The request for authority to re-order and transcribe officially all the statutes and orders, civil and ecclesiastical, selected to be ‘made the Rule of Proceeding in all Cases’ must have come from Barrow, who as bishop and governor was uniquely competent to complete the task, as William Mackenzie concluded when he compiled his edition of the legislation of Earl Charles’s lordship for the Manx Society in 1860.\(^{156}\) A letter of 20 November 1667 to vicars general Robert Parre and John Harrison confirms Barrow’s particular interest in his patron’s instructions and his conviction that the whole programme of civil and ecclesiastical judicial revision would be greatly beneficial:

> You see my Lords Order requires a speedy performance supposing it in ye body of his Order a most usefull expedient for preserving [. . .] quiet ending, ease of difference & dispatch of business [. . .] so I pray God bless you with sure success in this affair as may be best both for Church and state.\(^{157}\)

\(^{155}\) Statutes, I, p. 134.

\(^{156}\) Mackenzie, Legislation, pp. 204-05.

\(^{157}\) Lib. Caus., Barrow to Vicars General, 20 November 1667.
It was an initiative of the greatest importance in securing a clear and unambiguous legal framework on which the Island could build for the future. Furthermore, the revision of ecclesiastical law, with ‘cross statutes’ removed, which Barrow had completed earlier was to be incorporated into the commissioned written record: ‘The same Course I require also to be taken with the Ecclesiastical Statutes […] because I look upon this as a great Expedient for the Preservation of the People’s Peace and Quiet.’ Charles Stanley issued the order, but the revision was to be undertaken and validated ‘by the Spiritual Officers, with the Advice and Assistance of such knowing Persons, both of the Clergy and Laiety, as shall be thought fit to be joined with them by the Bishop of my Island’.158 It is a distinctive feature of the Island’s legislation and judicial system that ecclesiastical and civil laws were incorporated together; as William Harrison explained: ‘The Statute Book of the Island shows legislation on almost all manner of subjects – civil, ecclesiastical, criminal, military, revenue, etc [and] contains a great number of points of ecclesiastical common law committed to writing.’159 When Perceval Ward reviewed the legislation in 1837 he concluded: ‘By [these Orders] the internal affairs of the Island appear to have been so well regulated, that no new Statute of any consequence was enacted till 1696.’160

Much of the new civil legislation was promoted by the Keys. It was in their interests as leaseholder farmers to try to reduce labourers’ wages and obstruct entrepreneurial innovation, and it was their agents who provided the statistical and anecdotal evidence used in drawing up regulatory detail. Barrow would have understood their situation, since his father had been a leaseholder farmer at Spinney Abbey in Cambridgeshire, and he was clearly ready to support them in restricting wages. Other reforms, such as those safeguarding the rights of servants and labourers, are more likely to have been his initiatives. The independence of spirit which led him to act against the interests of the Keys on these and other issues reflects his father’s provocative support for a group of Wicken commoners who opposed drainage works in the Fens in the late 1630s.161

To what degree Barrow’s hand may be seen at work directly in the three tranches of new legislation remains a matter of conjecture, but as governor it was he who conveyed all the enactments to Knowsley for the lord’s signature. As for Charles Stanley, it is very likely that

159 Harrison, Sodor and Man, pp. 36-37.
160 Records, pp.113-14.
161 See note 466.
he had little concern at all in what was proposed other than to be assured that his interests and the people’s peace and quiet would be preserved. His readiness to accept all the new ideas embodied in the legislation must owe much to the influence and persuasive powers of his governor.

During the six years of Barrow’s governorship more legislation was enacted than during the next twenty-four years. When Thomas Stowell published his collection of Statutes and Ordinances in 1792 fifteen of Barrow’s acts (40% of the total) were still active, and pre-eminent among them were the laws regulating the working conditions of apprentices, husbandmen and servants.\(^{162}\)

**Ecclesiastical administration and governance**

John Spurr describes the history of the church courts in England in the years following the Restoration as ‘a story of shrinking business and declining authority’.\(^{163}\) R.B. Outhwaite cites the case of the York courts, where each year from 1664 to 1667 fewer than a hundred new causes were presented, less than a third of the levels before 1640.\(^{164}\) But this was not the case in Sodor and Man. Since ecclesiastical and secular law was so closely intertwined in the Isle of Man a wider range of offences was dealt with by the church than was the case in England.\(^{165}\) Anne Ashley argues that the authority of the ecclesiastical courts was widely accepted by the Manx people; the courts had always been regularly convened (their business continued under secular authority during the *interregnum*), they were trusted as administrators of probate, they were equable guardians of the rights of children and the widowed, and they generally upheld public morality in the family and in the community.\(^{166}\) Outhwaite notes that ‘the frequency of official visitations and the prosecuting zeal of individual bishops’, rather than the diligence of churchwardens or other agents, accounted for

---

\(^{162}\) Thomas Stowell (ed.), *Statutes and Ordinances of the Isle of Man* (Douglas, 1792).

\(^{163}\) Spurr, *Restoration Church*, p. 209, 213.


\(^{166}\) Anne Ashley, ‘The Spiritual Courts of the Isle of Man, especially in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries’, *English Historical Review*, 72 (1957), p. 53.
variations in court presentations in England. Barrow’s use of the Manx church courts reflects this; he employed the courts effectively to strengthen moral and spiritual life in the Island and it seems reasonable to assume that discernible trends in the nature of presentments, judgements and sanctions reflect his vision for his diocese.\(^{167}\)

Records of ecclesiastical court proceedings in the Island in the mid-seventeenth century are patchy, but some have survived, and Jennifer Platten’s analysis of presentments has shown significant variations which suggest deliberate changes of policy during Barrow’s episcopate. In 1667 he ordered chapter quests to visit each parish every three weeks, far more frequently than had been the case previously, providing regular opportunities for presentments and other judicial business to be brought forward. Perhaps prompted by this order, 1667 is the first year in his episcopate with a good range of extant records: the number of presentments rose by 30% to 193, a total not matched again until the turn of the century under Bishop Wilson.

While this general rise may reflect a new determination to strengthen discipline, it is possible to draw more striking conclusions from statistics of three types of offences collected by Platten.\(^{168}\) (Figure 6)

In 1667, the fourth year of Barrow’s episcopate, presentments (with verdicts) for cursing and swearing rose from 2 to 18, and for Sunday working from 12 to 71; by contrast, for non-attendance at church there was a marked fall from 28 to 4. The first of these suggests a desire to foster more charitable living and good neighbourliness, while the second and third suggest a purposeful and partially successful drive to improve Sunday observance. In the following year (1668) there were considerably fewer presentments for cursing and swearing (6), and for Sunday working (27), which may be evidence that the new policies were bearing fruit; but Barrow would have been less satisfied with a rise in non-attendance at church (14). Platten suggests that the ministers may have been inclined to abandon non-attendance as un-enforceable, whereas the rise in presentments the following year may reflect Barrow’s determination to reverse such a trend.\(^{169}\) It is interesting that the statistics for 1700, the third year of Wilson’s episcopate, are generally comparable to those of 1668. Wilson was determined, like Barrow, to bring back the church’s old, traditional discipline, and since, as Platten notes, it was the parishioners themselves who brought most cases to the chaptercourts,


\(^{168}\) Platten, ‘Church Court System’, pp. 232-33.

\(^{169}\) Platten, *pers. comm.*, 18 October 2014.
Figure 6 – Ecclesiastical court: selected presented offences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presented offences</th>
<th>1659</th>
<th>1667</th>
<th>1668</th>
<th>1678</th>
<th>1679</th>
<th>1700</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total excluding non-payment of fines/bonds</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cursing &amp; swearing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.5%)</td>
<td>(9.3%)</td>
<td>(7.2%)</td>
<td>(6.6%)</td>
<td>(13.5%)</td>
<td>(9.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunday working</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8.8%)</td>
<td>(36.8%)</td>
<td>(32.5%)</td>
<td>(36.8%)</td>
<td>(16.7%)</td>
<td>(39.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-attendance at church</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(20.5%)</td>
<td>(2.1%)</td>
<td>(16.8%)</td>
<td>(10.4%)</td>
<td>(18.7%)</td>
<td>(13%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
what they accepted as morally right and wrong may well have reflected the priorities of their bishop.

In the chapter court records of 1667 and 1668 the most common censure was some form of penance, which contrasts markedly with the practice during the interregnum of imposing fines. (Figure 7) Although fines or promissory bonds were still imposed in some cases, Barrow generally limited fines and commutation in favour of a more spiritually charged regime. \footnote{Platten, ‘Church Court System’, pp. 73-78; Lib. Caus., 8 April 1667, Jurby 16 October 1668. Among relatively few instances of commutation to fine in Barrow’s episcopate were censures imposed on William Christian of Jurby for persistent fornication: ‘Wm Christian […] hath satisfied his Comutacon 14s. this was paid, and five shillings more of Comutacon that was in my hands unto Mr Thos. Harrisson for ye bridge of peetelton’.} His reform of the administration of the ecclesiastical laws was particularly commended by Bishop Wilson’s biographer, John Keble: ‘They were so administered by Bishop Barrow […] as to make everyone feel the wisdom and usefulness that was in them, especially by what he did towards abolishing the commutation of penances for money.’\footnote{Keble, \textit{Wilson}, I, p. 140.} Genuine penance, humble, though not necessarily humiliating, public acknowledgment of error in church, and encouragement to reform were the imperatives of his drive to enrich spiritually all in his care. Sexual and other secular offences inevitably featured widely. They were censured mostly by penances, but Anne Ashley, Jennifer Platten and Jim Roscow have shown that the courts used additional practical measures to preserve the family, safeguard the rights of women, make provision for the care of children, and promote harmony in the community.\footnote{Anne Ashley, ‘Spiritual Courts’, pp. 53-54; Jennifer Platten, ‘Mid-Seventeenth Century Church Court Presentments in the Isle of Man: Social Control or Salvation for Sinners?’ (unpublished master’s thesis, University of Liverpool, 1999), p. 13; J.R. Roscow, ‘The Development of Women’s Rights in the Isle of Man up to 1777’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 10, no. 2 (1991-92), pp. 45-46.}

Spurr notes that in cases of religious conformity clergy, officials and laity rarely bothered to attend court proceedings in many English dioceses, even as early as 1663.\footnote{Spurr, \textit{Restoration Church}, p. 213 (citing consistory court records in Bristol, Chichester, Exeter and Oxford).} By contrast, the Manx people seem for the most part to have supported the courts’ penitential system, and offenders by and large carried out their punishments. But Barrow was clearly frustrated to see that much offending persisted without any noticeable abatement well into his episcopate.\footnote{The extent to which public acceptance of censures applied in general and specific cases in ecclesiastical and civil courts is considered by Platten in ‘Church Court System’, pp. 48-50.}
Figure 7 – Ecclesiastical court censures
(Some offences incurred more than one censure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases presented/verdicts given</th>
<th>1659</th>
<th>1667</th>
<th>1668</th>
<th>1678</th>
<th>1679</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(includes suspended sentences; excludes non-payments)</td>
<td>136/100</td>
<td>193/186</td>
<td>83/83</td>
<td>106/85</td>
<td>96/91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penances</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>120 (64.5%)</td>
<td>73 (87.6%)</td>
<td>32 (37.6%)</td>
<td>54 (59.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admonitions</td>
<td>2 (2%)</td>
<td>7 (3.8%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11 (12.9%)</td>
<td>7 (7.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines/bonds</td>
<td>94 (94%)</td>
<td>27 (14.5%)</td>
<td>14 (16.9%)</td>
<td>25 (29.4%)</td>
<td>36 (39.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imprisonment (most were commuted to a bond)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>[10]</td>
<td>[17]</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parish work</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6 (3.2%)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2 (2.4%)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stocks/bridle/whip</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
<td>8 (4.3%)</td>
<td>6 (7.2%)</td>
<td>1 (1.2%)</td>
<td>4 (4.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the autumn of 1667 one of the clearest indications of his determination to impose ecclesiastical discipline in the face of intransigence and recurring lapsed morality came in a letter to his clergy: ‘It is high time to use our utmost indeavours to put a stop to these overflowings of ungodliness,’ Barrow wrote, ‘least a generall corruption of manners over spread this people, & bring downe Gods judgements upon us to destroy us, & our nation.’ Censures were to be applied without favour or delay, and he left them in no doubt where the responsibilities for moral regeneration lay:

Supposing noe speedier remedie for our recovery or to prevent our further misery, then the due execution of severe punishments against notorious offenders, & withal knowing yt a just & fitt Discipline cannot be practised till ye officers (to whom ye charge & oversight therof is committed) be made sensible of their obligation imposed by oath to uphold it, & soe brought to an exact performance of their duties.175

When Barrow writes of ‘Gods judgment’ being brought down on ‘this people [. . .] to destroy us, & our nation’, he may well have in mind the ‘ungodliness’ of the whole commonwealth of Britain, exemplified in the moral shallowness of the Restoration court. His letter addresses directly the shortcomings of the Island’s clergy, however, and in this context his use of the word ‘nation’ highlights their duty within the diocese ‘to prevent further misery’ among the people they serve. Barrow’s use of the word ‘nation’ does not imply a political agenda comparable to the aspirations of the Manx in the nineteenth century; Sacheverell used it similarly in his Account, and Comptroller Rowe wrote of ‘this quiet little nation [. . .] not being (God be thancked) infested with Rome’s incendiarys.’176 But it does reflect the Island’s constitutional separateness (the ‘dominion’ to which Thomas Cholmondeley refers in the conditions set down for Barrow’s Academic Master’s Fund), and highlights Barrow’s sense of his special responsibility to every Islander.177 His reference to ‘our nation’ reflects the seriousness of his concern that the ‘overflowings of ungodliness [. . .] and generall corruption of manners’ were a potent threat to the stability and wellbeing of the whole community.

A wider range of punishments was available to the Island’s ecclesiastical courts than was the case in England and Wales.178 For the most extreme and persistent offences in the Isle of

---

175 Lib. Caus., Castletown, 21 September 1667.
177 MNH, MS 01507C, Academic Master’s Fund (1827 compilation); Charities, p. 26.
178 Outhwaite, English Ecclesiastical Courts, p. 82; Spurr, Restoration Church, pp. 215-17.
Man there was excommunication or imprisonment in the crypt of St German’s cathedral. Barrow seems to have ordered excommunication sparingly, but the consistory court records for the 1660s are incomplete and it is likely that some evidence is lost. His reluctance to cut offenders off from the spiritual benefits of the church is well illustrated in the early stages of his attempts to reconcile the Island’s Quakers. By contrast, however, he censured the vicars general with scarcely concealed fury when they commuted the excommunication of Ferdinando Calcott with ‘soe easie an animadversion [of] sins of soe deep a die’; Calcott had escaped public censure by virtue of his office and Barrow condemned any such ‘indulgence or relaxation of the Church Censures’.  

The church in England and Wales had no authority to imprison. By contrast the relative ease with which persistent recalcitrance could be punished by a custodial sentence in the Isle of Man enhanced the power of the bishop and the church courts. The threat of imprisonment was a sufficient deterrent to restrict cases of actual commitment during Barrow’s episcopate, however, and there was scope for discretionary variation according to the circumstances or attitude of a defendant; in the wretched case of Mollinex Moore and Ann Billings, for example, who were imprisoned for incest, Barrow took account of Billings’s ill health and penitential sincerity to commute her sentence.

The shift in the nature of crimes presented to the church courts and the punishments prescribed for offences in the second half of the 1660s seems to show Barrow’s guiding hand. The overall picture is not straightforward, however; it reflects in part the changed perspectives and the social and moral agenda that he wished to promote, but it is also coloured by other influences. He was impatient for change and there is a determined urgency in his reforms, led in part by a compelling compassion, but also driven by a determination to renew the church’s authority, tighten its discipline, strengthen the parishes and their ministers, educate every child, and bring back the moral and spiritual certainties of the old church. Where any obstacle threatened this Barrow countered it head-on and in doing so his naturally authoritarian manner and unassailable belief in his policies inevitably led to

179 Lib. Caus., Castle Rushen, Barrow to Vicars General, 21 September 1667.

180 Convocation, pp. 97-107; Lib. Caus., 20 February 1668.

181 Platten concludes her analysis of presentments and punishments in the ecclesiastical courts in the mid-seventeenth century with a balanced view of the church, as the spiritual guardian of the people in their pursuit of salvation and as the agent of their moral and social improvement and wellbeing: see Platten, ‘Mid-Seventeenth Century Presentments’, pp. 73, 77-8.
confrontation and opposition, from individuals like John Lace, dissenting groups like the Quakers and even at times the deemsters and Keys.\textsuperscript{182}

Barrow has been judged to have been autocratic and ruthless in his dealings with ‘the people called Quakers’. They were first persecuted in 1656 and continued to suffer ‘persecution in this sequestered island, under the arbitrary rule of the lord of the land [Charles Stanley]’.\textsuperscript{183} When Barrow arrived he tried at first to reach an accommodation with them; he addressed them as ‘My good friends, for soe I desire you would bee’, and urged them to return to the church ‘which is ready to embrace you and earnestly invites you’. The leading Manx Quakers, William Callow and Evan Christian, refused all overtures, however, and following the transfer of their cases to the secular authority, Charles Stanley issued an order for their transportation from the Isle of Man.

It is not easy to reach a balanced evaluation of Barrow’s treatment of the Quakers. In John Gough’s view the villain of the affair was the ‘obdurate bishop […] who had power and influence to persecute with cruelty, but pretended want of power to relieve […] He was the principal instrument in promoting all the persecuting measures against them’.\textsuperscript{184} Thomas Hodgkin, however, writing a hundred years later, laid much of the blame on Charles Stanley, ‘a bitter and determined persecutor of the Quakers’. He judged that ‘a larger share of the blame of that persecution should rest upon him than upon the man who is generally held responsible for it [Barrow], and who certainly was the hand to execute the Earl’s orders’.\textsuperscript{185} Barrow was wholly unsympathetic to the Quakers and undoubtedly saw them as a political and ecclesiastical threat to good order and the preservation of the people’s ‘amity, confidence and quiet’; he was an intellectual and a high churchman, espousing a tradition far removed from their spiritual and revelatory fervour. Yet for him, as their bishop, they were ‘part of my charge’, and his assurance that ‘you shall ever find me most loving friend and faithful servant

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{enumerate}
\item Stenning describes Barrow’s expulsion of John Lace from Hango Hill farm, which the Keys opposed three times, as ‘blatant confiscation’: Stenning, ‘Original Lands’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 5, no. 1 (1946), p. 129. Deemsters are the court judges of the Isle of Man.
\item Gough, \textit{Quakers}, II, p. 286.
\end{enumerate}
\end{flushleft}
in our common Lord and Saviour’ reflects the primacy of his priestly calling to the care of their souls.  

The efficient and judicious workings of the ecclesiastical courts in questions of the rights of inheritance, particularly of children, were doubtless far more important to ordinary people in the Isle of Man than more sensational events like Barrow’s long dispute with the Quakers. There is plenty of evidence to show that the regulations he put in place to ensure impartial judgement worked effectively. In a protracted dispute in Braddan, for example, he ordered William Gelling to pay Ann Creer fifteen pounds ‘in charitie [ . . . ] & in justice to ye Children (to whom this money belongeth)’. Where few could read or write it was to the officers of the church and the laws by which they adjudicated that the people turned for justice and redress, and for the most part it seems that they were well served. In particular, by ‘ensuring the activity and earnestness of his Vicars-Generall’, according to John Keble, Barrow secured acceptance and confidence in the best of ‘the old discipline [which] had on the whole in a very remarkable degree kept its hold on this one diocese’.  

Although the extant records are limited (apart from those concerning Barrow’s dealings with the Quakers) it is possible to reach some tentative conclusions about Barrow’s use of the ecclesiastical courts. His status as governor as well as bishop empowered his exploitation of the courts in his drive for moral reform and stronger discipline in family and community life, through which good order in society might be preserved. Three particular features of the court system played to his advantage: the wide range of available sanctions, the consistency of interpretation of ecclesiastical law set down in his reformed ‘Episcopal Causes’, and general public approbation of the role of the courts in regulating behaviour which threatened social cohesion. The processes and judgements of the courts were generally beneficial, and, as Jennifer Platten has shown, they seem to have been readily accepted by the people. 

In some respects Barrow’s policies in respect of the church courts matched those of many English dioceses. Religious offences, particularly failure to attend church, featured widely in  

186 There was no respite for the Quakers after Barrow’s translation to St Asaph; although Charles II’s Declaration of Indulgence in 1672 permitted the Quakers who had been banished to return to the Island, they were still persecuted and it was only at the turn of the century that Bishop Wilson extended a hand of friendship to them.  
187 Lib. Caus., Braddan, 20 February & 30 May 1667. See also Lib. Caus., 24 October 1667 and judgement by Thompson and Parre, 4 November 1669.  
188 Keble, Wilson, I, p. 140.  
many court proceedings in the 1660s and 70s, notably in Chichester (where Barrow’s friend Peter Gunning was bishop from 1670 to 1675) and Worcester, and penances increasingly became the most common form of censure for most offences in England.\footnote{Outhwaite, \textit{English Ecclesiastical Courts}, p. 81; Platten, ‘Church Court System’, pp. 57-58.} As Outhwaite has noted, however, the church courts in England ‘had few teeth’. The decline in the authority and use of the courts after 1660 in part reflects the limitations of the sanctions available to them, and, in contrast to rural areas like north Lancashire, in many cities (for example, York, Coventry and Lichfield) and other growing urbanising areas, markedly fewer cases were brought to the courts.\footnote{See Lancelot Addison, \textit{A modest plea for the clergy wherein is briefly considered, the original, antiquity, necessity: together with the spurious and genuine occasions of their present contempt} (London: William Crook, 1677), pp. 130-31.} Excommunication, increasingly viewed in England as a licence not to attend church, ceased to be a deterrent. For the Manx people, however, the accepted spiritual implications of all the church court censures ensured that the authority of the courts was upheld well into the eighteenth century.\footnote{Outhwaite, \textit{English Ecclesiastical Courts}, pp. 80, 82, 84, 103.}

**Social welfare**

Much of the civil legislation enacted during Barrow’s governorship regulated employment, at prescribed rates, for the able-bodied. It is difficult to assess how effectively the reforms addressed particular social issues, not least in preventing destitution and vagrancy, but a glimpse of how the processes worked in dealing with a dispute between master and servant may be found in the case of Henry Clarke of Marown, whose master Gilbert Cubon was presented in January 1668 for 5\,s\,6\,d ‘due to his servant Henry Clarke for wages’.\footnote{Lib. Scacc. (10071/3/11), 1668, p. 34, Lupi (Marown), presentment, 28 January 1667/8. This case illustrates a central principle of Manx law, that in issues of social welfare ‘both the Church and the Temporal Courts provided impartial justice for men and women [. . .] without regard to their station in life’. See Roscow, ‘Women’s Rights’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 10, no. 2 (1991-92), p. 51.} The church courts and parish ministers, too, played a vital role in preserving order and developing and sustaining social welfare in the family and community. The English Poor Law Acts of 1601 and 1662 required the elderly and infirm to be cared for by their own families ‘at their own charges [to] relieve and maintain every such poor person in that manner, and according to that rate, as by the justices [. . .] shall be assessed’.\footnote{Poor Relief Act 1601 (43 Eliz. 1 c.2); Settlement Act (14 Car. 2 c.12); Pat Thane, ‘Old people and their families in the English past’, in Martin Daunton (ed.), \textit{Charity, self-interest and welfare in the English past}
Thomson argues that this was seldom done; instead the cost had to be borne by a parish rate, which in Cratfield, Suffolk, for example, amounted to an annual charge of £2 7s 9d in the last quarter of the seventeenth century. For the ‘impotent Poor’ in England and Wales churchwardens and parish officials were obliged ‘to make fit and convenient Places of Habitation’.

There were no parish rates and no comparable institutions in the Isle of Man. Instead customary practice regulated by the church courts and endorsed by Barrow provided for the infirm and elderly to be looked after in their own homes by a nominated ‘choice child’. Composite lists of ‘choice’ children were recorded each year in presentments; in 1665, for example, fifteen were entered for exemption from ‘yarding’ in order to care for a family member at home. The system was still working efficiently in 1718, when fourteen ‘choice’ children were entered. This was a practical and effective alternative to the workhouse which seems to have no parallel elsewhere in Britain, as Waldron’s description, written in 1726, testifies. Since the church was the sole agency of such relief in the Island’s parishes, the importance of the ‘choice’ child system cannot be overestimated. If the needy could not be provided for within the unit of the family, however, it fell to ‘the tender care of the Manx ecclesiastical law for the interests of the destitute and of children’ to undertake their support. Financial assistance for this work was made available in England in the form of local bonds of security and rate levies, but in the Isle of Man the parish ministers used tithes, pew rents, commutations, collections and individual charitable gifts to provide the necessary financial assistance at all times.
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197 Waldron, Description, pp. 39, 111-12. There is no reference to a ‘choice child’ or similar system in Joanna Innes’s comprehensive list of institutional and other forms of welfare provision: see Joanna Innes, ‘State, Church and Voluntarism in European Welfare, 1690-1850’, in Hugh Cunningham and Joanna Innes (eds), Charity, Philanthropy and Reform (London: Macmillan, 1998), p. 23. Moore notes that, by an act of June 1694 (proposed by Sacheverell and approved by William Stanley, ninth earl of Derby, but not recorded in Statutes), a public workhouse was to be established, although there is no evidence that the institution was actually set up (as Clamp assumes). See Knowsley, Muniments MS 1719/8; Moore, History, I, pp. 408-09; Clamp, ‘Schooling, 1650-1950’ (1986), p. 61.

198 Moore, Sodor and Man, p. 112.
funds (as they had done since the dissolution of Rushen Abbey). The task was formidable: if the Island’s situation in the second half of the seventeenth century was comparable to that of a rural English county, it can be calculated that one family member in 50% of all families would require relief at some stage.

There can be no doubt that Barrow knew how dependent the poor were on support provided in the parishes and how much that support cost. If he was able, in preparation for his move to the Isle of Man, to acquaint himself with the administration of poor relief in the West Derby hundred of Lancashire (which contained the Stanley estates at Knowsley and Lathom), he would have found an operation, delivered through the agency of the parishes, which Geoffrey Oxley judged to be effective and efficient, particularly in tackling the needs of the rural poor whose condition would be comparable to what he would find in his new diocese. It is interesting to speculate that Barrow could have introduced a Manx Poor Law, since he had become aware early in his episcopate of an old custom in the Island of dissipating ‘legasies [and] the best of the gifts to the poor by eating and drinking them at their funerals’. But he seems to have been satisfied that support for the elderly, infirm, orphaned and widowed, for whom the parishes were ultimately responsible if they could not be cared for in the home, could be provided without legislation, perhaps in ways comparable to the contemporary situation in West Derby.

It is not easy to assess the effectiveness of this system of poor relief in home and parish, not least because the records are patchy, but whereas during his later episcopate in St Asaph Barrow built and endowed almshouses ‘for eight poor widows’, no comparable provision seems to have been needed in the Isle of Man. Sacheverell, who was acquainted with the Island at least as early as 1688, recorded: ‘As there are few that can properly be said to be rich, so neither are there many that can be said to be miserably poor; and, I believe, fewer...”

201 Oxley, ‘Old Poor Law’, pp. 263, 375: ‘in 1640 in the parish of Huyton the overseers were ordered to pay 26s 8d to Thomas Tatlock to maintain a child of a ‘simple’ mother whose father had absconded.
203 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/MISC/919, 28 May 1687.
beggars in proportion than any nation. 204 In England labourers and servants, who constituted nearly half the population, were ‘a continuing bedrock of poverty’, according to Barry Coward, and their vulnerability to economic change rendered many destitute and liable to drift into vagrancy. 205 Sacheverell did not find the conditions that forced so many outside the Island into a desperate mobility in search of work, and his observations testify to a remarkable transformation from the wretched situation described by Barrow just twenty-five years before in 1663.

Apprentices, workers and their wages

Most boys and girls in the Isle of Man, as in rural communities in England and Wales, gained paid employment in agriculture or domestic service. By 1667 wages for labourers and servants in the Island had risen above the statutory rates of 1609; farm labourers were earning between two and four pounds a year and maid servants between thirty shillings and two pounds, rates which prompted farmers to complain that ‘Servants will not of late Yeares hire for double the Wages [of 1609], unless they may receive what Wages they please’. Since servants were consequently reported to be ‘in a better Condition to subsist, by the Cheapness of Cloath, both Woolen and Linnen, and all other comodities they stand in need of’, it may be that this relative improvement discouraged the take-up of apprenticeships in the short term. In an attempt to re-balance the economy new wage rates closer to those of 1609 were imposed during Barrow’s administration in order to ‘be a Restraint of such Exorbitancy in the Servants [and] Moderation made on both Parts [. . .] so [to] continue for some time’. 206 It is also possible that for some a levelling-off of prices in the early 1660s improved their lot, but many conditions remained harsh. 207

Whether Barrow’s new apprenticeship regulations encouraged a larger take-up of training as a means of lifting at least a few out of their poverty is impossible to determine since few

204 Sacheverell, Account, pp. 7, 139; J.G Cumming commented in an editorial note: ‘There is no poor-law in the Isle of Man, and the Manx, generally speaking, think it a disgrace to allow their poor relations to subsist on charity. For the aged and infirm some provision is made by the weekly offering in the churches.’ Sacheverell’s letter describing his voyage was written in the Isle of Man on 7 September 1688. Manx legislation on vagrancy (1665) records ‘the Charity of the respective Parishioners’: see Statutes, I p. 123.
206 Dickinson, Lordship, pp. 170-71; Statutes, I, p. 132.
indenture records from the later seventeenth century have survived.\textsuperscript{208} In Peel in the early 1670s it seems that few, if any, new apprentices were indentured; rents bequeathed by Philip Christian ‘to pay yearly [.] to two poor youthes [.] to put them to be apprenticed’ were not so used, suggesting either that there were no eligible boys or that there were no vacant placements with master craftsmen.\textsuperscript{209} There is no evidence to suggest that orphaned children were set to apprenticeships to avoid the expense of their maintenance, as was commonly the practice in Wales.\textsuperscript{210} Whereas in England mobility between parishes was facilitated by the 1662 Act of Settlement, the essentially static nature of society in the Island must have been a further obstacle to any significant increase in apprentice numbers. It is interesting to note that the strategy to promote and safeguard indentured training came at a time when apprenticeships in England had already begun to decline, although city populations were increasing.\textsuperscript{211} The Island’s situation was essentially rural, however; as Geoffrey Oxley has noted, the cause of poverty outside the urban areas of West Derby hundred was not lack of work or willingness to undertake it, but the incapacity of a significant proportion of the people.\textsuperscript{212}

The court records of the late 1660s and 1670s list very few cases relating to apprenticeship regulation. In 1669 a ‘tradesman’ was ‘fined for taking Apprentices for less than 5 yeares contrary to Law’; and ten years later there is just one isolated record of a broken indenture where the guarantor of ‘one Broddagh’ was held liable for the ten pound bond, ‘the apprentice having run away from his service’.\textsuperscript{213} In 1718 William Killey and William Karran of Marown both forfeited bonds of twenty pounds when their sons, apprenticed in Liverpool, ran away and broke their indentures.\textsuperscript{214} Whether the absence from court records of Island cases indicates that the bond was an effective deterrent to employers and apprentices, however, is difficult to assess. In one notable case where an orphaned apprentice’s indenture

\textsuperscript{208} Dickinson, \textit{Lordship}, pp. 147 n.
\textsuperscript{211} Barry and Brooks, \textit{The Middling Sort}, p. 62.
\textsuperscript{212} Oxley, ‘Old Poor Law’, pp. 358-59.
\textsuperscript{214} Lib. Canc. (10071/5/14), 13 October 1718, pp. 20-21.
bond was at risk through the negligence of his guardian, the ecclesiastical court acted to safeguard the care of the boy and his siblings.  

Infrastructure, land improvement and trade

Although evidence of Barrow’s influence on the day to day working of Island life is patchy, there are notable instances where his contribution is documented. One example was recorded by Anthony Wood: ‘This worthy and godly bishop [gave] 10l. towards the making a bridge over a dangerous water and did many other good works there.’ Wood’s source must be Richard Sherlock, who clearly considered this to be one of Barrow’s most important benefactions, a gift from his own purse and a major contribution to the Island’s poor infrastructure. Barrow was not a wealthy man and ten pounds, which would probably have paid half the cost of the bridge, was a relatively large sum; in comparison the Island’s total customs revenue for 1664 was only £32 19s 4d.

Barrow’s bridge was probably in Douglas, where it replaced a precarious wooden footbridge which Daniel King sketched in 1656. It is most likely that Barrow’s bridge crossed the Douglas river at the head of the tide reach, facilitating growth in the town and harbour, which Chaloner rated the safest and which by 1681, according to Thomas Denton, had overtaken Castletown to become ‘larger and much more populous being a place of ye greatest resort in the whole Island, because the haven is comodious and hath a most easy enterance & safe road for ships, unto wch ye Frenchmen and other Foraigners are use to repair’. When George Waldron arrived as customs inspector in 1710 he described a stone bridge at this point which strategically linked the main route from the south to a taagher (causeway) across the Nunnery Lake. Barrow’s bridge made a significant contribution to communications, although travel remained difficult well into the eighteenth century: in a letter to Governor Horne in 1715

215 Lib. Caus., court judgement ‘that the children might be certainly assured of the returne of their respective portions already deposited into his [Maximillian Bostock, the defaulting guardian] hands’, 22 February 1669/70.

216 Wood, *Athenae Oxonienses*, IV, p. 809. As a graduate and fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Barrow did not qualify for his own named entry in *Athenae Oxonienses*; Wood incorporated his account into that of Richard Parre, the last bishop of Sodor and Man before the interregnum.


218 Chaloner, *Treatise*, facing p. 32.

Bishop Wilson wrote, ‘I am afraid I shall be forc’d to go on foot home [Douglas to Kirk Michael], the ways are so dangerous.’

It is likely that Barrow also played a significant role in a major land improvement project in the north-west of the Isle of Man. In about 1650 work began on an initiative ‘to view and consider of some convenient remedie and redresse for the drayning of the waters from the curraghlands’. This was a major undertaking requiring a considerable labour force and it is probable that James Stanley’s expedition in 1651, which took away three hundred Manxmen, delayed progress. Since the main strategic engineering work was the canalisation of the Lhen Trench from the northern edge of the curragh (wetlands) to the coast, Barrow would have been able to bring his knowledge of fen drainage in Cambridgeshire to the project, which would have created new agricultural land for the benefit of tenants and for himself in his entitlement to holdings of the bishop’s barony in Ballaugh and Jurby. It also provided opportunities for the poorest to farm small ‘intack’ lots. The main work was probably complete by 1688 when Sacheverell arrived; he described ‘a large tract of meadow called the Curragh, which was formerly under water, but of late well drained and greatly improved’. Bishop Wilson made much of the importance of the new land in the mid-eighteenth century: ‘It was formerly a bog, but, since it has been drained, it is one of the richest parts of the island.’

A 1658 order in Tynwald for the erection of new fulling-mills stands out as one of very few initiatives during the interregnum to improve the island’s infrastructure; conditions for
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220 MNH, MS 09309 Diocesan records, Wilson to Governor Horne, 27 December 1715.
Figure 8 – Four-arch packhorse bridge over the Douglas River at the probable location of Barrow’s bridge, looking west (1783), with the *taagher* in the right foreground.²²⁴

²²⁴ A Bridge near Douglas in the Isle of Man: Pubd April 1st 1783, by Richd Godfrey, No. 120 Long Acre.
insular and off-Island trade when Barrow arrived were poor in the extreme. There is no mention of Barrow’s bridge or his possible involvement in draining the *curragh* in contemporary records and if there were other similar interventions to facilitate improved trade they are not readily identifiable. His cloistered academic and ecclesiastical background probably limited his awareness of key drivers of economic expansion, such as the establishment of registries urged by Andrew Yarranton. Yet statistical evidence researched by Dickinson indicates the beginnings of positive economic change after 1664 which must owe something to social legislation enacted under Barrow’s patronage and other benefits of the stability and reforming spirit of his governorship. Yearly customs revenues fluctuated, but from a low point of £32 19s 4d in 1664 the total had risen in five years to £106 11s 0d, and despite the adverse effects of off-Island legislation and the Dutch Wars, trade continued to expand up to the turn of the century.

**Conclusion**

When Barrow came to the Island in 1663 the land and its people were in desperate straits. The consequences of the turmoil of the civil wars and *interregnum* were grave, and the early 1660s was still a period of depression and general hardship, aggravated by a shortage of labour, the result of emigration and disease. Charles Stanley’s sole interest in his domain was as a source of revenue and he had neither the will nor the vision to contribute to its recovery. Barrow tried to understand the causes of what he found and the measures he took to address them, though sometimes flawed, were for the most part well-conceived and practical.

The civil legislation enacted during his governorship was primarily designed to preserve good order in the community. It was additionally beneficial in bringing in significant changes to
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226 Barrow may have condoned the use of John Murrey’s independent coinage as a facilitator of commerce, although his ‘pennies’ were not legalised by Tynwald until 1679: see Moore, *History*, I, p. 414; Dickinson, *Lordship*, p. 161.
228 Dickinson, *Lordship*, appx. ix. See also MNH, MS 09782 (CRP) box 7, (?)1673: transcription of a petition concerning Island poverty and obstacles to trade with England.
229 Coward, *Stanleys*, p. 190.
conditions of domestic service, agricultural practice and the regulation of apprenticeships, labour and wages, which had the potential to improve welfare in the home and at work and increase efficiency and productivity on the farms and in the markets. His ecclesiastical legislation effectively re-wrote the old statutes, restored the church’s independent authority, particularly in its courts, and implemented reforms designed to enhance the capacity of the clergy to carry out their administrative and pastoral responsibilities, not least to the poor and needy. Barrow’s use of the church courts and his preferred choice of penances for those to be censured in particular reflect a pastoral concern to strengthen moral and spiritual values and enrich the harmony of family and community life in his diocese.

These achievements alone justify Sacheverell’s accolade of ‘a man of public spirit, and great designs’, but as Beatrice Webb noted in her withering attack on the English Poor Laws, history cannot be interpreted through legislation alone.230 Without well educated men and women of goodwill and integrity to carry them out new laws and regulations could accomplish little. Barrow had found the clergy ‘very ignorant and wholly illiterate’ and the people ‘rude and barbarous [. . .] and without any true sense of religion’.231 Social reforms designed to remedy these conditions were at the heart of his vision for the Manx people: more than anything else they needed education, and this would be Barrow’s greatest gift to the Isle of Man.
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231 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, p. 304.
Chapter 4

Education and social reform in the episcopate and governorship of Isaac Barrow, 1663-1669

‘The best way of cure’ – Isaac Barrow

Introduction

Barrow’s ‘best way of cure’ was to teach Manx children to read and write English in elementary schools and to provide grammar and academic level education for the most able. The key to the success of these reforms was adequate and sustainable funding and the diligent commitment of well educated, able clergy and lay teachers to provide good teaching. This chapter reviews the provision of schools before Barrow’s episcopate and explores the new measures which he put in place until ill-health forced his departure from the Island.

Education before 1663

The provision of education for the clergy and laity before 1663 was at best fragmentary and it is not easy to determine its quality or availability. Although the Cistercian Rushen Abbey was not founded as a teaching house, it was the Island’s centre of scholarship, and before the dissolution of the monasteries it received one third of the tithe revenue ‘for education of youth, and relief of the poor’. After 1540 the abbey third came into the possession of the crown and thence in 1610 to the Stanleys. In the last quarter of the sixteenth century schools were taught in Castle Rushen and Peel Castle: Peter Farand, schoolmaster, received an annual salary of four pounds in 1578 to teach in the Rushen garrison, and in 1599 the Peel Castle accounts record a payment of 20s (quarterly) for ‘the Sallarie of the Scholm[aste]r’. It seems likely that these schools were primarily for children of the lord’s officers attached to the castles, as William Cubbon believed, but there is some circumstantial evidence that
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232 Records, p. 37.
garrison teachers or unbeneﬁced clergy may have taught more widely: for example, all twenty-four Keys were able to sign their own names to the Statutes of 1610.234

The distinguished Irish scholar Hugh MacCawell, who became archbishop of Armagh, was sent from County Down in 1585 to be educated in the Island. It is most unlikely that his education was entrusted to laymen; he must have been taught by clergy and he may well have received his lessons in St Mary’s Chapel (Castletown), part of which was ‘commonly called the Scholehouse’ in 1584. Four years later Bishop Meryck gave a positive assessment of the education received by the clergy in his letter to Camden: ‘The Manx clergy are generally natives, and have had their whole education in the Island. They are not any ways taxed with ignorance.’235 William Stanley, sixth earl of Derby, dealt the cause of education a blow in 1610, however, when he took possession of all the monastic lands of Rushen and annexed the third of the tithe reserved for education and poor relief into his own coffers. The insular church was starved of funds, and none of the Stanleys followed the example of moneyed laity in England and Wales whose philanthropy accounted for a notable expansion of school foundations in the first half of the seventeenth century.236 William Cubbon’s assessment of the Stanleys’ stewardship is scathing: ‘During three and a half centuries we have no record of any of them enriching the religious or educational side of Manx life.’237

Bishop Foster’s visitation of 1634 took the form of a series of searching questions to the churchwardens of all the Island’s parishes. (Figure 9) Although the manuscripts are in poor condition, the survey gives a useful, if incomplete, picture of how the parishes worked and what services they provided. One of the questions was: ‘Do any schol[maste]r. keep schoole without licence?’ Foster appears to have been more interested in licences than in ascertaining whether a parochial school was operating efﬁciently, and consequently many responses do not say whether a school was actually being taught. The replies of only two parishes are unambiguous and positive. Robert Parre, vicar of Malew, wrote: ‘We declare yt their is noe Schoole keept in o[u]r p[ar]ish but one, ye m[aste]r whereof saies he hath his licence.’ Another response, probably from Lezayre, was ‘that it is well used [. . .] for [. . .] schooles’. Responses from the parishes of German (‘no default’), Marown and Braddan (where Peter
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235 Camden, Britannia, p. 1069.
Figure 9 – Civil and ecclesiastical administrative areas of the Isle of Man in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.
Thompson wrote: ‘neither scholemaster that teacheth without licence’) may indicate that they had licensed masters, but the overall picture is patchy. In Onchan John Otte reported that there was no school nor ‘as for scale master we have non w[i]thin o[u]r parishe’. Other fragments give similar answers.238 Most of the clergy were reported as ‘illiterate men brought up in the island in secular professions’; as for the churchwardens and sidesmen who answered Foster’s questions, all but three of the forty respondents in Arbory, Braddan, Michael, Rushen and Santan were only able to subscribe their marks. Five years later Bishop Parre gave a similarly negative view of education and the quality of the clergy: ‘The island is destitute of means of learned education [and] most of the Ministers [are] of no better ability than to read distinctly divine service’.239

Norman Crampton dismisses Parre’s judgements as ‘liverish after a stormy crossing to the Island’ and suggests that there was some ‘schooling of a fairly high standard’.240 Outside the two garrison towns, however, educational provision was generally poor, not least because funds supposedly reserved for schooling were often unscrupulously raided.241 Earl James sponsored a few young men educated in the castle to study at university: in 1631 ‘Wm Langley sone unto my servant Matthias Langley, Constable of my Castle of Rushen, [received] ye yearly pay or pencoon of six pounds towards his education in ye University of Cambridge’.242 It is unlikely that this was motivated by altruism, however, since it was a limited measure to ensure that there would be educated men to fill lay positions in the insular administration. His seizure of the bishopric in 1643 was a further blow. He was ready with a plausible excuse, that ‘in a few years the leases will be expired, and then the bishopric shall be worth the having’, but it was a cynical exploitation entirely in line with appropriations engineered by his father in 1610 and by John Stanley two centuries before.

A contrasting assessment is given by Blundell, who claimed that James Stanley ‘piously bestowed all [the revenues] for the better maintenance of ye ministers there’. Blundell commended especially his ‘pious uses [. . .] of our abbey lands’ to provide grammar schools: ‘In every one of those 4 towns there is a free school to teach you [. . .] maintained out of the

238 MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, Bishop Foster’s Visitation, 1634; see also JMM, 2 (1931), no. 28, pp. 25-27, 28-29 (docs 8, 10), no. 29, pp. 33-37 (docs 13, 14, 15), (1932) no. 30, pp. 41-42 (doc. 18), no. 31, pp. 54-57 (docs 21, 22), no. 32, pp. 67-69 (docs 31, 33, 34).
239 Moore, History, I, pp. 360-61.
242 Moore, History, I, p. 253 n.
revenues, which belonged to the religious houses at their suppression. According to Moore, however, the revenues were a timely windfall which Earl James spent on his household and garrisons, and, in the absence of corroborative evidence in the records, he doubted whether any schools existed, at least before 1651.

Chaloner recorded in 1653 that part of the sequestered diocesan income was used ‘for the maintaining of Free-Schooles i.e. at Castletown, Peel, Douglas, and Ramsey’, but his claim, too, may in part be suspect; it seems unlikely that there was an effective maintained school in Peel, since in 1652 Philip Christian endowed a schoolmaster and ‘a free schoole mainteyned for ye teaching of children in ye towne of Peele [. . .] and providinge bookes, penn, incke, and paper for poore scholars there’. Chaloner’s service to the Island and his obvious concern for its welfare suggest that he took a closer interest in education, in line with Puritan policy, than the Stanleys had done. Whether his free schools survived to the end of the decade is open to question, however, since some of the revenues by which they were funded were fraudulently misappropriated during Fairfax’s lordship.

The provision of primary schools was left to the initiative of the parishes and for the most part, even on Chaloner’s watch, it was at best haphazard. ‘Few speak the English tongue,’ Chaloner recorded in 1652; but later English was being taught in at least one school: an undated document (probably of 1658) records a grant to William Cottier, ‘now Schoolemayster [of] £2 0s. 0d. yearely for teachinge an English schoole in KK Andreas’, in response to a petition from the parishioners that ‘our children might be educated, & brought up to understand the English tongue’.

The state of education in 1663 is far from clear. A garrison school was still being taught in Castletown by Henry Harrison, who received a grant in 1661 from Charles Stanley for ‘the Schoolmaster place of Castle Rushen together with the yearlie Sallarie of Twelve pounds’. It

244 Moore, Sodor and Man, p.145; Moore, History, I, p. 365 n.
245 Hinton Bird suggests that Chaloner’s choice of the word ‘maintaining’ implies that the schools referred to by Blundell still existed, but this is open to question, since Blundell himself wrote of ‘the setting up and maintaining four free schools’. See Bird, An Island, I, p. 9; Chaloner, Treatise, p. 8; Blundell, History, II, p. 48; J.E. Leece, ‘Philip Christian, Clothworker, of Peel and London’, IMNHAS, 3, no. 1 (1926), pp. 83, 86-87. The first Clothworkers’ School in Peel endowed by Philip Christian’s trust was not built until 1687. ‘Free’ schools were not free of fees, but free from episcopal jurisdiction.
248 Lib. Irrotul. (GR1/4, Warrants), petition to Chaloner and reply (n.d. – probably November/December 1658), end page.
is likely, too, that there were parish schools in Michael, where Hugh Cannell may still have been teaching, Castletown and Ramsey, but there are no records of schools elsewhere in the Island.  

**Welfare and education of the clergy**

Although Barrow’s legislation to facilitate civil and ecclesiastical reform provided new opportunities to counter the years of stagnation and hardship, the statute book alone could not improve the general wellbeing of the people. The key to their welfare was education, and the dynamic on which its provision would depend was the quality of the clergy, through whose agency in the parishes every aspect of social life was administered. Barrow’s vision was to give every parish a well-educated priest capable and worthy of his calling and to provide throughout the Island elementary schools for every child.

There is no doubt that he had the approval and support of Charles Stanley. He was a man of deep and simple faith and there is every reason to suppose that he wished the blessings of what he saw as ‘true religion and virtue’ to be sustained in his Island domain as in Lancashire. Earl Charles’s polemic *The Protestant Religion is a Sure Foundation*, published in 1669, although framed as a vigorous defence of the Church of England against Papists, nevertheless shows glimpses of personal faith; he claims with confidence: ‘And so we Christians are supported in our greatest exigencies, with this Promise of Christ to his Church, that the gates of Hell shall not be able to prevail against it.’ In this assurance of faith Barrow and Charles Stanley would have been wholly at one.

The quality and diligence of the clergy would have been a matter of real concern to most Islanders. In his valuable survey of the church and clergy in the seventeenth century David Craine highlights a distinctive feature of the Manx character: ‘Manx people were, as Bishop Lloyd said, very religious, and believed unquestioningly that their eternal salvation depended on their observance of the teachings of the church.’ If their clergy were ineffective or


negligent, especially in the matter of reading services and officiating at sacraments, the people were greatly disturbed. Some of the clergy serving when Barrow arrived won approbation from their wardens: they commended unreservedly the scholarly and unworldly John Crellin, vicar of Arbory, and Thomas Allen, vicar of Maughold for sixty years, of whom they recorded ‘in that kind we cannot say anything by him but good’. But of others, on whom the people relied for so much, there were frequent complaints. Many wardens, too, had become neglectful of their duties. When Barrow conducted a diocesan survey in 1665, only Ballaugh and Bride provided returns. For their failure to comply with their bishop’s inquest he committed every other warden to St German’s prison: more than sixty hapless citizens were briefly incarcerated. Subsequent returns suggest that Barrow’s exemplary lesson was well learned.

When Barrow arrived he found that most of the clergy were forced to find means of supplementing their meagre salaries of five or six pounds. The Malew parish register records Barrow’s injunction against those who ‘disgrace their Callinge and prostitute yer houses [. . .] to irregular and disorderly meetings by vending ayle and beere and keeping victuallinge Houses’. But the impoverished parishes could do nothing to raise salaries since the church had lost most of its income. Although only the abbey third of the tithes was forfeit in 1540, the bishop’s third, long under threat from the secular power, had been impropriated by James Stanley in 1643, and a significant portion of the tithes due to ‘the Parochial Priests for their subsistence’, which in earlier times had been supplemented by the goodwill of the monks of Rushen Abbey, was by 1663 also in the lord’s hands. The consequence was that only six clergy, those who enjoyed the income of the three rectories and the incumbents of the three next most valuable parishes, had sufficient subsistence income; the remaining eleven were virtually destitute. In his account of the education, social standing and general quality of the clergy in Ireland in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries, Toby Barnard describes the poorest Protestant benefices in the impoverished diocese of Meath (accounting for nearly 50% of the total) as those providing a salary below £30; yet this was up to six times more than the poorest Manx clergy received. Barrow’s entitlement as bishop was
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254 Charities, p. 7. Andreas, Ballaugh and Bride (the three rectories) and the parishes of Malew, Michael and Patrick had incomes of £17.
equally poor, in total amounting to little more than his annual allowance as a fellow of Eton, which he had been permitted to retain in commendam.256

Barrow’s experience at Peterhouse and Eton, particularly during his years as bursar at both institutions, gave him an invaluable understanding of how revenue was generated (mainly through rents and entrance fines) and how it could most efficiently be turned to expenditure. Since most of the equivalent sources of income in the diocese had been impropriated by the secular powers he would have to find alternatives to fund higher salaries for the clergy and education for the Island’s children. It was the abbey tithes which offered the only chance of re-establishing secure finance for the future, and as these were in the lord’s hands he set about devising the means to buy them back.

In the summers of 1665 and 1666 Barrow travelled to England to attend fellows’ meetings at Eton and visit friends. He used these opportunities to commend his plans to support poor clergy and establish schools, and, confident that he could raise the necessary funds, on 1 November 1666 he signed with Charles Stanley an indenture for the purchase of the impropriate tithes. Generous support came from old college friends and senior clergy, among them Nathaniel Ingelo, fellow of Eton, who gave fifteen pounds ‘towards teaching of Schools and instructing poor Children in the Island’.257 Anthony Wood accorded Barrow fulsome praise: ‘A great benefactor to the Island [he] did collect, by his great care and pains, from pious persons, one thousand eighty-one pounds, eight shillings, and four pence.’258

Barrow used these funds to purchase from Charles Stanley former monastic ‘Impropriations, Rectorys, Tythes & Hereditamts’ on a lease of ten thousand years, subject to a yearly rent of sixty-two pounds and an entrance fine of £130 at thirty year intervals.259 The annual income of about one hundred pounds was to be administered by four trustees, the bishop, the archdeacon and two secular nominees. This was carefully judged: it balanced the interests and obligations of church and state; the ecclesiastical trustees would serve as diocesan officials and not as individuals; and although the lord’s nominees were not prescribed it

256 An ecclesiastical benefice could be placed in the trust of a non-resident (in commendam) for a temporary period.
257 Lib. Caus., 1669, fol. 2; an augmented list of benefactors dated 1670 (‘Jurby list’) is recorded in Charities, pp. 2-4.
258 Wood, Athenae, II, p. 1141. By 1669 benefactors had contributed £916 8s 4d. A list compiled in Jurby the following year recorded a total of £1041 8s 4d: see Charities, p. 4. By comparison, according to Denton, the total revenue from Island lands received by the Stanleys in 1681 was £1500: see Denton, ‘Description’, p. 442.
259 The ten impropriated rectories sold to Barrow were Arbory, Lezayre, Lonan, Onchan, Malew, Marown, Maughold, Michael, Rushen and Santan.
would be advantageous to choose two serving officers, one of whom would probably be the governor.\textsuperscript{260} It will be seen later that the status of the trustees, together with the detailed prescriptions in the trust deed, guaranteed that the fund would be effectively managed and its purpose pursued with integrity, in striking contrast to the failure of many similar endowments in England.

The income was assigned ‘towards the further Encrease & Augmentation of the Maintenance of the Ministers of the Gospel resident & exercising their ministerial function within the said Island’ and ‘for or towards the erection of a Free School within the same Isle, or the maintenance of some Schoolmaster or Schoolmasters there’. If the clergy were to be encouraged to become the parochial school teachers, however, and if their academic standing and the effectiveness of their teaching were to be assured, Barrow realised that still more money would be needed. It was a commonplace at the time that schoolmasters in England were poorly valued; in his \textit{Discourse Concerning Schools}, published in 1663, the political observer and pamphleteer Marchamont Needham complained that, compared to schoolmasters, ‘no one [was] more sleighted even to reproach, no one less rewarded or regarded’.\textsuperscript{261} To secure additional funding, in 1667 Barrow obtained from Charles II an annuity of one hundred pounds raised from ‘His Majesty’s Rents from Abbey Lands in the Island’.\textsuperscript{262} This at first proved an unreliable source, but by 1670 the addition of more benefactors and three years’ arrears of the king’s gift brought the combined funds raised to £1,341 8s 4d.\textsuperscript{263}

The lease income which constituted the Impropriate Fund did not reach its full potential until the turn of the century, but the investment was secure and, with the augmentation of the Royal Bounty, Barrow was able to give financial support to all but the three richest parishes and raise every minister’s stipend, initially to ten pounds, and by 1675 to seventeen pounds.\textsuperscript{264} Entitlement to the higher salary was conditional on each minister taking

\textsuperscript{260} Lib. Caus., 1669, fol. 2; MNH, MS 00524/1C, fols (a) 3\textsuperscript{v}, (b) 1\textsuperscript{r}; Charities, p. 11.

\textsuperscript{261} Marchamont Needham, \textit{A Discourse Concerning Schools and School-Masters} (London, 1663), p. 4.

\textsuperscript{262} Charities, pp. 2, 11; MNH, MS 09609, William Fitzsimmons, ‘History of the Isle of Man’ (unpublished manuscript), 1805, pp. 173-74. This was the rent reserved by James I when he returned the crown’s leases on the former monastic properties to William Stanley, sixth earl of Derby, in 1609/10.

\textsuperscript{263} Lib. Caus., 1669, fol. 2; Charities, pp. 2-4.

\textsuperscript{264} For the first few years it seems that the income of the two funds was not separately accounted, probably because the Royal Bounty could not be relied upon. Bishop Wilson described the distinct provenance of the Royal Bounty, but in his list of ‘the Benefactors, and the sums by their charity contributed to the Isle of Man [. . .] Anno 1670’ he did not differentiate between the king’s gift and those of other benefactors. See Cruttwell, \textit{Wilson}, I, pp. 368-69.
responsibility for teaching the children of his parish, and this was later endorsed by Bishop Levinz in a convocation regulation of 1685. It was an imaginative and effective way to address what Barrow had identified as the main obstacle to the improvement of the quality of clergy and the welfare of the people.

**English petty schools**

When Barrow arrived in 1663 he found the provision for education woefully inadequate. The Arbory wardens’ responses to his 1665 diocesan inquest reveal a haphazard state of affairs: ‘The Minister instructs the Children diligently & prepares them to be Confirmed by the B[ish]opp,’ they reported, but ‘some of the householders in the parish causes their Children & servants to learne their Catechisme & some others doe not as yet.’ As for formal schooling, the wardens appear unconcerned and dismissive of what was available in their parish: ‘Wee have neither publice nor private schoole kept, but a woman schoolmistris for little children & whether shee have licence or not wee know nothing.’

Barrow’s strategy for reform was simple and bold: ‘I suppose the best way of Cure would be to acquaint the people with the English tongue [. . .] and for this purpose to set up an English school in every parish.’ Manx Gaelic-speaking children would learn English in new primary schools accessible to all and free to those who could not afford to pay a fee. The parish clergy were to be responsible for teaching the schools and each would be required to hold the bishop’s licence. It was a plan of extraordinary vision, much more in line with Puritan thought than with that of royalists like William Cavendish, who claimed in a letter to Charles II: ‘The Bible in English under every weaver and chambermaid’s arm hath done us much hurt.’ Barrow’s views echoed the radical proposals of William Overton, who advocated government financed free schools in every county so that ‘few or none of the free men of England may for the future be ignorant of reading and writing’. He wanted nothing less than that every child should have an elementary education; the majority would be children of

---
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the poor, described by Cressy as ‘the unskilled and property-less labouring classes’, who had no prospect of benefiting from educational advancement.\textsuperscript{269} The imperative was moral and spiritual, designed to redress the scourge of illiteracy which Richard Baxter described as ‘an unspeakable loss that befalls the church and the souls of men’.\textsuperscript{270} By giving each priest this duty Barrow intended that the teaching would be of the highest quality, undertaken by the most academically capable men in the Island, and although at first the standard and efficiency of the schools would inevitably vary his strategies for the encouragement and better education of the clergy themselves would in due time lead to progress.

Barrow may have been encouraged to set up elementary schools by the unusually advanced state of education and literacy in a number of rural communities ringing the Fens around his Cambridgeshire home at Wicken. Margaret Spufford found that two villages, Haslingfield and Willingham, had continuing and effective schools from the 1660s well into the eighteenth century, and 74% of Willingham commoners were able to sign their names in a management document of 1677-78.\textsuperscript{271} As for the disposition and ability of Island children, there is no reason to suppose that they were any less capable and receptive than those described a hundred years later by Bishop Hildesley in a letter to Robert Hay-Drummond, archbishop of York: ‘The Manks people, in general, are naturally shrewd, of quick apprehension, and very apt to learn.’\textsuperscript{272}

Barrow’s new petty schools would be English schools, their purpose ‘to acquaint the people with the English tongue’. The seeds of lively debate about the wisdom of this strategy can be said to begin with Hildesley’s letter to Hay-Drummond.\textsuperscript{273} Hildesley was thoroughly sceptical of the value of teaching English to Manx children, who ‘were taught to read [. . .] the English Bibles; which numbers can do very roundly, whilst they scarce understand the meaning of a single sentence; nay, I might say, I believe, of some, a single word!’ If this was indeed the case, then it may reflect more on the effectiveness of the teaching than on the validity of the strategy, since accomplished scholars like William Walker and Philip Moore were well served by the English schools which Barrow established. Hildesley acquired a

\textsuperscript{272} Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 422.
working knowledge of Manx Gaelic and championed its formal use in church and school, urging his clergy ‘to use their best endeavours to improve the use and practice of the Manx tongue’, and not to resort to extemporary translation. He undertook to co-ordinate the completion by the most able of the Island’s clergy (notably Philip Moore and John Kelly) of Bishop Wilson’s project to translate the Bible and Prayer Book into Manx Gaelic, and he secured hard-won funding from the SPCK and other supporters to ensure that the translations were duly published. It is therefore not surprising that Hildesley advocated primary education in Manx Gaelic, based on the new translations, which had never before been a practical option, and whereas only three parish schools were using Manx Gaelic in 1757, by 1766 pupils in all but one were taught in the vernacular.274 Moore expressed surprise that Hildesley should have come to this conclusion nearly a century after Barrow’s episcopate, yet he was inclined to accept it: ‘If he [Hildesley] was right, as seems probable, it is clear that Bishop Barrow would have done more good by providing the people, a larger proportion of whom must have spoken Manx only in 1660 than in 1760, with sacred literature in their own tongue.’275

When Hildesley chose Manx Gaelic as his preferred language in schools he had the benefit of the translations and scholarship which had been undertaken since the arrival of Bishop Wilson. There was nothing comparable for Barrow to build on, and Moore’s endorsement of Hildesley fails to take this into account. Whatever work Bishop Phillips had done was lost by 1663; his translations were not much used even during his episcopate, partly because of widespread opposition by most of the clergy, which, as Nigel Yates has commented, may have reflected general conservatism in the Island or Puritan dislike of any set form of litany.276 But there was also an obvious practical constraint: the people could not read their common language. Since their understanding of English was limited the clergy inevitably continued to use extemporary translation; Chaloner confirmed this in his Treatise:

Out of zeal to the propagating of the Gospel, [Phillips] attained the Manks Tongue, and did not onely preach in it, but translated the Bible into it [. . .] which by his death

275 Moore, History, I, p. 465 n.
never came to the Presse, so that the Ministers read the Scriptures to the people in the Manks, out of the English. It is unlikely that Chaloner had actually seen Phillips’s manuscript, however; the fact that he attributed to him a translation of the Bible rather than the Prayer Book suggests that he was reporting information that he had not himself confirmed. The conditions of Chaloner’s grant to Hugh Cannell, who he claimed had assisted Phillips and completed his work after his death, add to the confusion about the existence of a Bible, or parts of it, in Manx Gaelic. Ten years later, as Barrow’s report testifies, all traces of Phillips’s Prayer Book had vanished, as had any parts of the Bible translated by Phillips or Cannell, which, if they had ever existed, would have been in manuscript form. By the turn of the century a late manuscript copy of Phillips’s Prayer Book had reappeared, according to Sacheverell, but Wilson was already embarking on his own translations, having judged that Phillips’s work ‘although still extant [is] of no use to the present generation’. Barrow was faced with two alternatives: to commission Manx Gaelic translations of the Bible and Prayer Book or make the English texts accessible to the people by teaching them English. Manx Gaelic was almost exclusively an oral language, however: ‘There is nothing either written or printed in their language, which is peculiar to themselves,’ Barrow reported, ‘neither can they who speak it best write to one another in it, having no character or letter of it among them.’ Before any translations could begin, a form of phonetic transcription would have to be devised, and since Phillips’s work was lost such an undertaking would require a lengthy commitment by able scholars. Phillips, a Welshman, had the advantage of familiarity with his own Celtic language and plenty of time to learn the Island’s vernacular, yet even with the assistance of Hugh Cannell it took him the whole of his long episcopate to complete his translation of the Prayer Book; and it would subsequently take Wilson and Hildesley and their colleagues nearly seventy years to translate the entire Bible and Prayer
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279 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, p. 305.
Time was not on Barrow’s side; for him there was only one practical choice: receptive children could be taught English relatively quickly in school, and they in turn would teach the language to their parents. Gwladys Jones argues that the relative scarcity of printed books in Welsh may have prompted Thomas Gouge to make the same choice for his Welsh Trust schools in 1674. The linguistic problem and solution were the same in Ireland, where in the early eighteenth century William Hamilton, archdeacon of Armagh, sought to justify his unfashionable wish to ‘evangelize among the Irish in their own language’ on the grounds that few clergy understood the Irish language and ‘ministers and people are barbarians to each other’.

Hildesley’s misgivings about the wisdom of Barrow’s strategy were taken up by Norman Crampton: ‘Bishop Barrow started elementary education along completely wrong lines. Without a doubt he acted with the best intention, but his policy, viewed in retrospect, would appear to have aimed at the obliteration of the Manx language.’

Hinton Bird does not question the rationale of Barrow’s choice of English for the Island’s schools. It is Peter Clamp who takes Crampton’s assessment a step further, arguing that Charles Stanley was so deeply suspicious of Manx Gaelic and all who spoke it as the language ‘associated with rebellion and treachery against [the Island’s] English-speaking overlords’ that he was determined to eliminate it by a programme of ‘linguistic re-alignment, with the Church working closely with the temporal power to effect the change’.

---


Restoration of the lordship’s power and authority which James Stanley had fostered and exploited before 1651 was to be accomplished by the destruction of the Island’s dangerously subversive vernacular, and the people were to be cured of any latent desire for independence by an educational strategy wholly political in design, to be set up at the lord’s command by his willing lieutenant, the Island’s bishop and governor.

While Barrow was at Lathom in the late spring of 1663 Charles Stanley must have spoken of his future hopes for his domain, that it should be primarily an efficient source of income. Since every aspect of policy and administration would have to conform to this agenda, Barrow would have been in no doubt that what was required of him above all was to foster and sustain political and social stability throughout the Island. If Charles Stanley had continuing concerns about the security of his claim and his acceptance by the leading men of power in the Island as the rightfully restored lord then these, too, he would surely have communicated to Barrow. All this is inevitably speculative since there are no records of correspondence from Lathom (the Knowsley archive) or the Isle of Man between lord and bishop at this time. Since Barrow’s appointment came shortly after the execution of William Christian, his patron may have represented to him a view that the currency of a vernacular language in the Isle of Man posed a potential threat to his lordship, but if he did there is no record of it. The wider problems of the Irish rebellions during the civil wars and interregnum may have generated suspicions that the Celtic languages were all inherently subversive, but there is no mention of this in anything written by Barrow or recorded of him as a driving motive for his decision to make English the means whereby the people of his new diocese might be ‘bettered [and] acquainted with the very principles of Christianity’. Furthermore, far from representing a threat to the old order, the Celtic Welsh and Cornish had been allied with the king in the Civil Wars. Barrow’s report of 1663 does not offer any political, moral or aesthetic observations on Manx Gaelic, but simply makes the case that it was wholly impractical as a means of Christian education, formal communication or the keeping of records.

Clamp follows up his assertion that ‘the Manx language had been associated with rebellion and treachery’ in 1651 with a wider judgement on every vernacular speaker: ‘Those who
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spoke Manx Gaelic were therefore suspect. If loyalty to the Stanley family was to be desired, then something had to be done about bringing in the English language to greater effect.’

But it was not those who spoke only Manx Gaelic who conspired to rebel in 1651. When Chaloner recorded in 1652 that ‘Few speak the English tongue’ he was describing the ordinary people, whereas Manx Gaelic was not the preferred language of ‘their gentry’, who, according to Blundell, ‘more willingly will discourse with you in English than in their own language’. William Christian and his associates were senior officials appointed to authority by the lord of the Isle who conducted all their business and the affairs of the state, legislative, judicial and administrative, in English, and all records and official communications were in English (or Latin, where required). Written messages sent out from Ronaldsway following the gathering there on the night of 18 October 1651 would also have been in English, since there was no means of writing Manx Gaelic. In his deposition given at Peel on 4 October 1662, Samuel Radcliffe gave evidence ‘that there was severall Noates in writing yt past betwixt him & ye sai[d] Receiver Xtin [Christian] after ye rising for his care in maniginge ye same designe, & yt Sr Robt. Norris his hand was to some Noates’. If there was a language of rebellion in 1651 it was English, not Manx Gaelic. To argue that Barrow’s plan to set up English schools was conceived solely to counter a putative political threat takes no account of other spiritual and social motives. In fact there is no evidence to suggest that the restoration of Charles Stanley was opposed. Furthermore, there is no evidence that Manx Gaelic was viewed with anything comparable to the suspicion with which Irish Protestants regarded the vernacular as the language of political sedition and religious dissent in the seventeenth century. The uncertainties of the last few months of parliamentary rule, compounded by Chaloner’s imprisonment and untimely death, inevitably generated some anxieties for the Island’s future, but although major issues for reform, such as the question of land tenure, had still to be addressed, the return of the Stanleys to all the rights of lordship was for the most part, in Moore’s judgement, readily accepted.
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Compelling as these practical considerations are, there is much more to Barrow’s vision for the advancement of the Manx church and the welfare of his people. If he could ‘acquaint the people with the English tongue’ they would be brought within the orthodoxy of the wider Anglican church; and if they could read English for themselves ‘they might be in a Capacity of reading Catechisms, and books of devotion’. Furthermore, there was now a new version of the Book of Common Prayer, the 1662 revision, which would have commended itself to Barrow as a powerful aid in advancing the promulgation of the Gospel and encouraging Christian living, not least because he knew well a number of the contributors to the new Prayer Book, among them his long-standing friend Peter Gunning and men like Robert Sanderson, bishop of Lincoln, who he met at New College in 1645 and with whom he would have been able to keep up some association while he was at Eton. It is inconceivable that he would not have discussed with them their work on what was the most important theological work in hand at the time and he may well have seen some of the proposed revisions. What greater incentive could there be than this to convince him that he must set up English schools in every Island parish.

The key to Barrow’s vision and the strategies he proposed to achieve it lies in his choice of the word ‘cure’. The ‘best way of cure’ is not a plan to remedy an ill, ecclesiastical, political or social, but a programme of pastoral guidance and support, as of a bishop leading and sustaining his flock; it is the ‘cure’ of cura pastoralis, the care of souls, the calling and duty of a priest: the parishes, wherein ‘the ministers of the gospel exercise their functions’, are its ‘cures’. Barrow’s vision shows that he believed, like Gilbert Burnet, that ‘man [is] improvable to a more exact resemblance to God.’ Barrow’s reforms were not political fixes devised to counter a notional inclination to rebellion in the Manx people; they were far-reaching reforms rooted in spiritual and moral imperatives, wholly beneficial in intent and rigorously practical in design, all qualities which would stand the tests of time and circumstance and contribute to the building of secure foundations for the Island’s future needs and aspirations. What Barrow planned and established may reflect something of the agenda proposed by Clamp, but it was not, as he implies, merely a political scheme of almost
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cynical dimension devised simply to do the bidding of Charles Stanley. Whereas there are a number of instances when Barrow speaks or writes of his pastoral care for the spiritual welfare of his people, not once does he promote or allude to any political agenda. Even in his dealings with the Quakers, his arguments, though uncompromising, are expressed in terms of pastoral concern: ‘My good friends, for soe I desire you would bee [. . .] beeing called upon by God’s providence to the care of His Church, I must look upon you as a part of my charge, and [. . .] have [. . .] not ceased to pray dayly for you.’ He speaks as their priest, urging them to return to the church ‘which [. . .] is ready to embrace you and earnestly invites you. And believe, though I have been forced to use rigour with you [. . .] yet you shall ever find me most loving friend and faithful servant in our common Lord and Saviour’.299

Barrow’s design for a petty school in every parish followed proposals for educational reform advanced by Charles Hoole in 1660.300 Hoole, a royalist like Barrow, took up the revolutionary ideas of Richard Mulcaster, master of St Paul’s in the late sixteenth century, and advocated the establishment nationwide of petty schools where ‘all such poor boyes as can conveniently frequent it may be taught gratis, but the more able sort of neighbours may pay for their children’s teaching’. He envisaged no problem in requiring the payment of a fee by those who could afford it, since ‘they will find it no small advantage to have such a school amongst them’. Barrow’s plan, too, was that only those who could afford it would pay a fee. Hoole recommended a salary of twenty pounds and the provision of a house for the master, which ‘yearly stipend and convenient dwelling [. . .] will invite a man of good parts to undertake the charge, and excite him to the diligent and constant performance of his duty’. Barrow came close to this: since his teachers would be his parish priests, each would have a ‘convenient dwelling’, and by fulfilling his obligation to teach each would receive a salary of seventeen pounds. Since Barrow’s primary purpose in establishing his schools was pastoral, he would also have been drawn to Hoole’s enlightened description of the qualities to be sought in a good teacher: ‘I would have him to be a Person of pious, sober, comely and discreet behaviour, and tenderly affectionate towards children.’ Hoole intended above all that such a teacher should ‘shew a way to teach little children to read English with delight and
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profit’. 301 His aim was both practical and aesthetic, and if Barrow’s people, too, could learn to read ‘books of devotion’ and the new Book of Common Prayer ‘with delight and profit’, then his vision for his diocese would be the more readily and quickly accomplished. What is more, it was a vision for everyone in his diocese; like Richard Mulcaster, Barrow wanted girls as well as boys to benefit from primary education.

In his chapter advocating education for girls, Mulcaster argued that the first advantage of learning to read was that it should be the means to foster spiritual wellbeing and secure good Christian living: ‘Reading if for nothing else it were [. . .] is verie needefull for religion [. . .] Here I may not omit many and great contentmentes [. . .] which those wymen that haue skill and time to reade [. . .] do continually receive.’ 302 Barrow’s primary purpose was the same: to teach every child to read ‘that they might be in a Capacity of reading Catechisms, and books of devotion’. Within the context of domestic life in the Isle of Man Barrow’s provision of education for girls had an additional significance: Manx women were not only the custodians of custom and lore within the family, to whom the responsibility of keeping and passing on the repository of knowledge traditionally fell; they also enjoyed equality before the law with full rights of inheritance, key facets of the Island’s old Norse laws and Celtic social customs. Barrow’s inclusion of girls in his schools suggests that he understood the importance of these features of Manx life and wanted to facilitate their continuation as a means of preserving social harmony and cohesion.

Barrow’s plan for parish schools was practical and straightforward. Whether it was readily accepted at the time is impossible to assess, but it may be that it was generally approved, since there is no evidence that he took time to promote or defend it in public debate, and it would have been quite contrary to the picture we have of his character and conduct in public office if he had sought a platform to offer his views for scrutiny in polemical argument. 303 Instead, his energies went into careful and detailed planning and, most important of all, workable methods of financing the salaries of the clergy who would teach and the establishment of sustainable endowments to secure the future of the schools.

301 Charles Hoole, A New Discovery of the Old Art of Teaching Schoole (1660), ed. Thiselton Mark (Manchester: University of Manchester, 1912), pp. 60, 61.
303 MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/1/8 (Harrison), Bishop Wilson to James Wilks, February 1744: ‘Bp Barrow publishd no sermons’.
In 1666 the first petty schools were set up. They were to be taught by the parish clergy, who would receive in return an augmentation of their salaries, paid out of the combined funds of the Royal Bounty and the Impropriate Fund. ‘Every Minister is obliged to teach an English School in his parish, by the increase of his stipend’ was the condition set down in the ‘Jurby list’ of benefactions; similarly the Royal Bounty was to be ‘distributed to the Ministers for teaching an English school in their respective parishes’.\(^{304}\) In May 1667 the ecclesiastical court reported that the clergy were teaching schools in nine parishes.\(^{305}\)

Two years later, on 15 July 1669, in what was one of his last orders as he prepared to leave the Island, Barrow instructed his vicars general to ‘Have a speciall Care to see that ye severall schools of this Island bee diligently kept and observed’.\(^{306}\) (Figure 10) The reports were encouraging. The Santan churchwardens submitted: ‘The minister of the parish keeps a constant schoole and teaches the children of the parish [. . .] According to our honorable lords order lately sett up in the parish church of kk St Anne.’ At Ballaugh the chapter quest reported: ‘A schoole [is] kept all the year through not only for our own parish but as for such as come from Kk Michael and Kk Christ Lezer.’ There was a ‘Schoole kept & observed by ye minister’ in Onchan, and a note on the reverse of a presentment judgement for Lezayre records: ‘The chapter-quest of Jourby hath deposed that there is Schoole kept there constantly.’ Where reports make no mention of a school it is likely that children were being taught according to ‘our honorable lords order lately sett up’, since any failure in this regard would have been specifically recorded.\(^{307}\)

All was not well in every parish, however; Barrow had foreseen that problems would arise, and where no schooling was being given there was to be an uncompromising response. The situation in Lonan was unsatisfactory as early as 1666, when the chapter-quest reported: ‘School hath been kept till now lately but people doe keepe their children for hearding, and pretend they cannot spare them till winter.’ Three years later there was no improvement; the quest was told:

Ye minister [. . .] doth each Sunday admonish his parishioners to send their children to him to be [. . .] diligently taught [. . .] yett none send him any to Schoole for that

\(^{304}\) Charities, p. 4.
\(^{305}\) Lib. Caus., 29 May 1667.
\(^{306}\) Lib. Caus., 15 July 1669.
Figure 10 – Barrow’s instructions to the clergy, written shortly before he left the Island in the late summer of 1669.
Barrow would have no truck with any who refused to comply with his orders and both minister and parishioners were to be held to account: ‘The minister [shall be] enjoined to teach [. . .] the Schoole daily for ye future and if any saying or further complaint bee against him in this behalfe, a considerable p[ar]t of ye augmentacon shall be given to another Schoolmr.’ As for recalcitrant parents, Barrow’s instructions were equally uncompromising: ‘Parishioners who are able and will not send their children to Schoole, shall be made lyable to a certain allowance to ye maintaineance of ye s[ai]d Schoolm[aste]r as well as if they did send their child to Schoole.’

The arrangements for the parish schools were practical and clearly defined. This was not the case in three of the four towns. Peel had a parish school (German), but Castletown (Malew), Douglas (Braddan) and Ramsey (Maughold) had chapels of ease and required some additional provision. Barrow left it to the parish ministers to provide town schools and they had to cover the cost of paying a teacher. It was an uncharacteristically haphazard arrangement which may be accounted for by Barrow’s failing health; yet it seems likely that some provision was being made for children in all the towns before Barrow left the Island. Castletown, where the English influence was strongest, still had its garrison school and an elementary school taught by Samuel Robinson; in Douglas Robert Fletcher may have been teaching a town school as early as 1668; and in Ramsey Edward Nelson was receiving twenty shillings from the vicar of Maughold for teaching ‘Schoole in the Chapple of Ramsey’s’.

By the summer of 1669 Barrow had successfully established for his diocese the principle of primary education for all. There were difficulties in some parishes, and schools were not taught throughout the year, but many children were receiving elementary education in English from their ministers or lay teachers. It was a remarkable achievement.

308 Lib. Caus., Lonan, July 1666 & 30 August 1669.
309 Lib. Caus., Lonan, 30 May 1669. The situation in Lonan was still no better in 1670: see Lib. Caus., Lonan (probably December 1670).
A grammar school

It is almost certain that as a boy Barrow attended the Perse School in Cambridge where he would have been taught ‘as well in good manners as in all other instruction and learning fit to be learned in a Grammar School’. In the Isle of Man he planned to complement his ‘English school in every parish’ with a grammar school ‘to fit the children for higher learning’. There had been grammar schools before 1663, notably the four ‘free’ schools maintained from the income of the vacant bishopric recorded by Chaloner, but by the time Barrow arrived they had gone: ‘A Grammar School,’ he recorded, ‘was also wanting.’

W.K. Jordan has shown that charitable endowments, compelled by a belief in education as the one sure way to escape poverty and ignorance, resulted in the foundation of an extraordinary number of new schools, together with associated scholarships, during the reigns of the first two Stuarts and in the interregnum. They were primarily the vision of evangelical Protestants and Puritans and, since ‘popery’ was associated with ignorance, schools would assure escape from the threat, religious and political, of Catholicism. Nowhere was this more apparent than in Lancashire, where the strong Catholic presence was, over time, effectively countered by new grammar schools endowed by private charity.

The Puritan preacher Edward Reynolds declared in 1657: ‘All good learning and wisdom is [. . .] as a part of that truth whereof God is the author [. . .] all secular learning is the knowledge of Gods works [. . .] a small emanation from eternal verity.’ Parliamentary educational policy reflected this belief and during the interregnum state investment rivalled that of private charity in establishing grammar schools. Furthermore, through the Commissioners of Charitable Uses, many existing schools were made more efficient and their endowments strengthened; W.A.L. Vincent notes that up to sixteen of the grammar schools founded or re-founded in Lancashire and Cheshire between 1600 and 1660 probably date from the interregnum. Barrow would certainly have known about two of the Lancashire grammar schools, at Ormskirk and Winwick; Charles Stanley was a feoffee (trustee) of Ormskirk

312 References to properties ‘*juxta capellam [and ] De Camera Beate Mariee vocata scolehouse*’ suggest that the old Cistercian chapel of St Mary in Castletown was being used as a school in 1570; Lib. Assed., Rushen, 1570; MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, *Hildesley*, p. 305.
School, and the Winwick endowment had been given by the family of Peter Legh of Lyme, who Barrow later used as a trustee of his academic funds. Wales also benefited from parliamentary endowments through the Commissioners for the Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, who founded more than sixty schools in just four years from 1650 to 1653; many of these were elementary schools, but at least thirteen, having both master and usher, were grammar schools. Scholarship endowments linked the grammar schools to the universities, and the stipends awarded to teachers were, for the most part, adequate and sustainable.

Private philanthropy continued to endow new grammar schools after 1660, but the state lost interest and educational opportunities, particularly at secondary and higher levels, rapidly declined. Wales provides the most striking evidence of wholesale indifference to the cause of education, elementary and secondary, after 1660: of fifty-nine Commissioners’ schools only a third remained, with just one free grammar school, no longer endowed by the state, in Cardigan. Frivolity had replaced the seriousness of the Puritan social conscience and the mood of Restoration society reflected what J.R. Jones characterises as the ‘cynicism and opportunism [and] debased political morality’ of Charles II’s court. Furthermore grammar schools and the classical curriculum were now regarded as potential tools for the encouragement of opposition to the restored government. The new establishment was suspicious of state intervention which had been advocated by Puritan scholars like William Dell, master of Caius and trustee of the Perse, who proposed ‘that the civil power [. . .] should take great care of the education of youth [. . .] that schools [. . .] be erected through the whole nation [. . .] and that godly men especially have the charge of [. . .] schools’. Since the many grammar schools established during the interregnum reflected this policy, however, they were inevitably viewed with suspicion after 1660 as the creatures of Puritan ideology. Reactionary polemicists like Edward Chamberlayne warned against the expansion of educational opportunities; he argued that ‘England is overstockd with Scholars for the

---

316 William Farrer and J. Brownbill (eds), The History of the County of Lancaster (Victoria County series), (London: Street, 1907-14), II, pp. 603, 610.
319 Vincent, State and School Education, pp. 112, 135.
proportion of its Preferments and for its Employments for letterd persons’. The failure of the Commonwealth ended all chance of the establishment of a national system of education such as John Comenius, John Dury and Samuel Hartlib, the three most influential advocates of educational reform in England, had proposed, which had so nearly been achieved before the outbreak of the first civil war. The year of Restoration was the year that began a century of educational depression; Lawrence Stone concludes, ‘In the church and the universities, Laudianism and scholasticism triumphed once more [and] educational reform, educational expansion and Puritanism all went down together.’

Yet there were a number of enlightened bishops and senior clergy in the Restoration church whose views ran strikingly counter to this contemporary decline in public engagement with the promotion of education. If Barrow had any inclination to distrust an interventionist policy to foster good schooling, as Laudians had been in opposing reform of the universities, it was countered not only by his pragmatism, but also by the certainty of a vision shared with like-minded churchmen who saw education as one of the surest means to achieve spiritual and moral regeneration. Among these were three of his closest friends, John Barwick, Peter Gunning and Seth Ward. Barrow’s relationship with them and other leading churchmen of the day is considered in chapter 6.

Barrow left no documentary clues as to what kind of grammar school he wanted, but his vision reflected that of Christopher Wase, who vigorously defended them as promoters of civil responsibility and good governance: ‘Right and well grounded submission to Civil and Ecclesiastical Government is the Genuine issue of knowledge to sobriety.’ These were compelling arguments; far from threatening social order a grammar school education would secure the bedrock of good government, as Wase claimed: ‘When truth and civil beatitude are intended [. . .] the Bands of such Government become indissoluble.’

Barrow, royalist, but pragmatist, too, might well have used Wase’s words to describe what he believed his Island grammar school would achieve through the better education of its brightest young men and the provision of learned clergy to guide the people and undertake
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their pastoral care. His practical good sense led him to endow just such a school as the Puritans had founded across England, not another Eton, but, perhaps with George Griffith’s Perse in mind, a grammar school like the Lancashire foundations at Ormskirk and Warrington.326

If Eton could not be replicated in the Isle of Man as a collegiate foundation, its curriculum, which Barrow knew well, could be a model. Many of the seventeenth-century’s new schools took Eton’s curriculum, the structure of its school day and its teaching methods as their pattern, and in some cases this was a condition of a founding endowment.327 Barrow would certainly have been aware of the advocacy by Hartlib and his associates of the merits of a much broader curriculum, but his primary aim was to provide a supply of appropriately educated young men to serve the church in his diocese, and the old forms would do this best. Hoole, too, passed over the ideas of curriculum reformers like Comenius, advocating instead retention of the classics.

No less important than a new school’s curriculum was the sufficiency of its endowment and the effectiveness of its trustees. In his history of the Perse John Milner Gray commends the care with which Stephen Perse set down his plans, but he notes a significant weakness: the terms of Perse’s will failed to ensure robust management of the investments, and in consequence unscrupulous or incompetent trustees put the endowment at risk in the mid-seventeenth century.328 Failure of endowments similarly threatened the survival of the Lancashire grammar schools at Kirkham and Ormskirk. One of the subscribers to Isabell Birley’s ‘free schole for pore children, to be taught gratis’ at Kirkham in 1621 was ‘one of the earl of Derbie’s gentlemen [who] forwarded it very much’; this was John Parker of Bredkirk, and through this connection with the Stanleys Barrow may well have known of the failure of the Kirkham endowment in 1660, which ‘was not well and godly used, according to the foundation and true intent of the founders of it’.329 There were problems, too, at Ormskirk, despite the benevolent interest of Charles Stanley as the school’s principal governor.330

---

326 George Griffith was master of the Perse School from 1652 to 1687; a distinguished and successful teacher, Barrow would have known him.
327 The endowment at Cuckfield, Sussex, prescribed Eton as its model: see WSCRO, Par/301/25/1.
328 Gray, Perse School, pp. 16-19.
329 Farrer and Brownbill (eds.), County of Lancaster, pp. 604-05.
Barrow took great care to avoid the financial problems of schools like the Perse and Kirkham. Three conditions of his plan to ensure that the Impropriate Fund endowment would be well resourced and effectively managed stand out. First, by assigning as trustees the bishop, archdeacon and two nominees of the lord of Man he ensured that the trustees would always be accountable to the lord. Second, the impropriations constituted more than 60% of the parishes, and, since all were insular, management and productivity of the land and collection of tithes and rents could be controlled with relative ease; furthermore, although the value of the ten impropriations varied, some of the Island’s best agricultural land was to be found in the parishes of Lezayre, in the north, and Arbory, Malew and Rushen in the south. Barrow’s third condition, and perhaps the most far-sighted, was his provision of collateral security, in the form of ‘lands and hereditaments within the county of Lancashire, of the value of £2,000’, in case the church’s entitlement to the Island impropriations negotiated with Charles Stanley should fail. This is exactly what happened in 1736 when James Murray, second duke of Atholl, to whom the lordship had passed, rejected the 1668 agreement, thereby threatening, as Bishop Wilson warned, ‘the free school in Castletown and thirteen petty schools in several parishes: which schools must be utterly laid down, there being no other provision for them’. In the event Barrow’s collateral did not solve the crisis immediately, since Edward Stanley contested the agreement, precipitating a long legal dispute of which Wilson despaired. But Barrow had done all he could to try to safeguard his endowment.

Schools like the Perse were designed to offer free tuition to those who could not afford to pay fees, although fee-paying students could also be accepted at the discretion of the master. Barrow assigned income from the Impropriate Fund to two distinct functions: one was ‘for the encrease and augmentation of the maintenance, and better support and livelihood of the Ministers of the Gospel settled and exercising their functions within the said Isle of Man’; the second was ‘for or towards the erection of a Free School within the same Isle, or to the maintenance of some Schoolmasters there’. Foreseeing that there would consequently be pressures on the fund, Barrow ensured that the grammar school master would be adequately remunerated by designating the tithes of Rushen for this specific purpose and appointing

331 MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/17/4 (Harrison), ‘Tripartite Indenture: Collateral Security’, 24 January 1675/6; Charities, p. 11. See also MNH, MS 09707 (AP) X/67-5, Bishop Wilson to duke of Athol, 30 April 1736: ‘it is hoped that Bispham and Northop [Methop] are sufficient security for it [the impropriate tithes]’.
332 Convocation, p. 193, Bishop Wilson and Archdeacon John Kippax to Governor James Murray, 4 August 1736.
333 Gray, Perse School, pp. 28-29.
334 Charities, p. 11.
‘undertakers’ (trustees) to administer this. Barrow had become proficient in accounting practice during his bursarial years at Peterhouse and Eton, and knew that the only sure way of safeguarding funds for key projects was to assign to them specific income (as in the Peterhouse computus roll of 1641-42).\textsuperscript{335} The ‘undertakers’ carried out their duties efficiently, ensuring that the master received a salary of thirty pounds, nearly a third of the endowment income and a comparatively generous amount at the time.\textsuperscript{336} Hoole advocated a salary of one hundred pounds for a grammar school master, but much of this was to be made up from fees charged to parents who could pay.\textsuperscript{337} At the Perse salaries of forty pounds for the master and twenty pounds for the usher were unusually high, but Stephen Perse’s original capital was a remarkable £5,000, producing an annual income of £250, far higher than the Impropriate Fund’s income of about one hundred pounds. By contrast the total subscribed by William Gamull and his associates to establish a grammar school at Audlem in 1655 was £962 9s 9d, which produced an income of forty pounds, from which the master’s salary and all other expenses had to be met.\textsuperscript{338}

Barrow intended his grammar school to serve the whole Island. By choosing to locate it in Castletown ‘for the benefit of the s[ai]d town and adjacent parishes in Espetial’ he inevitably limited its constituency, but Castletown was the obvious choice, since it was not only the political and administrative capital, but also in Barrow’s time the diocesan centre.\textsuperscript{339} Since the funds were in place, there is every reason to suppose that Barrow was able to set up his grammar school before ill-health forced him to leave the Island.\textsuperscript{340}

\textbf{An academic school and reader in ‘logick, philosophy, and history’}

Once the arrangements for the petty schools, the grammar school and the augmentation of clergy salaries had been completed, Barrow turned to the third stage of his plan, the education of young men who would in due time become the Island’s clergy. This was crucial to Barrow’s design for improving and sustaining the moral and spiritual wellbeing of his

\textsuperscript{335} See figure 14.
\textsuperscript{336} MNH, MS 09707 (AP) 136/2, 8 February 1667/8.
\textsuperscript{337} Hoole, \textit{New Discovery}, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{338} Harris, et al. (eds.), \textit{A History of the County of Chester}, III, pp. 224-25.
\textsuperscript{339} MNH, MS 09707 (AP) 136/2, 8 February 1667/8.
\textsuperscript{340} In the revised secretarial copy (c. 1668) of his 1663 report, Barrow recorded that ‘the Grammar Schoole […] is alsoe there allready settled with a stipend of 30l. p. annum’: see MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014), and figure 3.
diocese, for on these educated men would fall the responsibility for teaching the English petty schools as well as the efficient care of the parishes. Barrow had found in 1663 that too many ministers had neither knowledge of the classics nor biblical scholarship beyond the most rudimentary and his experience at Peterhouse convinced him that only a university education could provide men of the calibre he required. A few of the Island’s clergy were university trained; during the interregnum Fairfax and Chaloner had authorised grants to students ‘towards Maynteynance in the University’ and, following Sherlock’s commission in 1660, John Thompson and John Christian received grants to support their studies at Trinity College, Dublin. But the process of awarding grants was cumbersome and ill-suited to the pressing need to train capable men who would take up pastoral leadership in the Island.

To pay for Manx students to study at university Barrow set up a fund for academic students, established ‘by his own private charity’, according to Bishop Wilson. In an act of notable philanthropy he acquired possession of two farms, Ballagilley and Hango Hill, the best of the former Rushen abbey lands in Malew; his childhood experience on a rich farm in the Cambridgeshire Fens had made him a good judge of the land, and he chose with an expert eye.

The beneficial aims of this trust and Barrow’s skill in securing the funds to sustain it won approbation, but the circumstances of his acquisition of Hango Hill farm were controversial. There was no problem with Ballagilley, which was vacant, but in his pursuit of Hango Hill, the smaller farm, he was fishing in murky waters. Hango Hill had a tenant, John Lace, whose claim on the lease was upheld on appeal by the deemster and Keys, whereupon Barrow swiftly overruled them. He set up an unprecedented clandestine ‘abbey court’ from which Lace, the deemster and Keys were excluded, and, sitting as governor, bishop, clerk of the rolls, plaintiff and judge, he awarded Hango Hill to himself. The judgement was cynical; no summons was served on Lace, his right of possession was ignored, no document of conveyance was drawn up, and he was offered no compensation or alternative tenancy.

342 Barrow signed his Academic Students’ Fund trust deed on 7 July 1668. The original deed, transcribed in Charities (pp. 32-34), is lodged in MNH archives but cannot be located. See also Cruttwell, Wilson, 1, p. 369; MNH, MS 00482C (QBHP): Richard Wilson’s survey of 1768 recorded ‘the Gross contents of the sd Estate of Ballagilley & Hango Hill is in English Statute measure 211a. 2r. 29p.’.
As soon as the judgement was given Barrow, John Norris (constable of Castle Rushen), and a company of militia attempted to seize the estate while Lace was in England. When Lace’s wife refused to leave, Barrow’s response was intemperate and excessive: he ordered the house and outbuildings to be stripped of roofs and doors and the stock driven out onto Castletown beach; Ellen Lace, with a young child at breast, was imprisoned in Castle Rushen, where she remained without food until Barrow sent her ‘4d. of bread’. He signed her release four days later, by which time Lace, on his return to the Island, had been thrown into the dungeons in Peel Castle. Lace sued for redress from his prison cell, and when his claim was again upheld Barrow referred the case to Charles Stanley, who was infuriated. He left the Keys in no doubt that they were on very dangerous ground: ‘Having too great an evidence of iniquity and factious humour in several of my 24 Keys [. . .] in their partial proceedings concerning Lacy’s title to Hango Hill Farm [. . .] I cannot but think it is time to obviate and suppress such insolent and exorbitant behaviour.’\(^343\) This intervention was exactly what Barrow needed. The Keys were bullied into submission and Lace was dispossessed, although Barrow showed some modest response to the second judgement by granting Lace the right to continue grazing cattle on Hango Hill.\(^344\)

Barrow was fifty when he arrived in the Island in 1663. The episcopate was his first public office and it is clear from the outset that, having diagnosed the pressing ecclesiastical, political and social needs of his diocese, he was most anxious to press ahead with decisive action. The views he expressed in his report on the state of the diocese and his aspirations for the good of all the Manx people show how determined he was that nothing should stand in the way of his agenda for reform. He was a man in a hurry, impatient and not always scrupulous in the face of opposition, and for those like John and Ellen Lace who crossed him he was a formidable opponent. His actions were high-handed and of doubtful probity, yet he no doubt viewed his seizure of Hango Hill as a necessary means to achieve an endowment, paid for out of his own purse, which would be for the greater benefit of the whole community. What is more, he was following the laws of land tenure imposed by James Stanley, who had left his son Charles in no doubt about his authority: ‘Men think that their dwellings are their own inheritance and that they may pass the same to any, and dispose

\(^343\) Lib. Scacc. (10071/3/11), 1668, pp. 27-28, Derby to the Governor [Barrow], 2 October 1668.

\(^344\) Charities, p. 36. After Lace’s death, his family continued to seek restoration until 1728, when poverty finally forced Singen Lace to abandon the claim by an agreement of release for £161.
thereof, without license of the Lord, wherein they are much deceived.\textsuperscript{345} The failure of Lace’s claim may in part be laid at the door of the deemster and Keys, who tried to use the case as part of their ongoing campaign to re-instate the old ‘tenure of straw’.\textsuperscript{346} Their politicking played into Barrow’s hands, but his actions, judged later by E.H. Stenning to be ‘blatant confiscation’, antagonised the Keys in a matter in which he might well have been wiser to solicit their approbation.\textsuperscript{347}

Barrow leased these estates to John Norris, and in his trust deed of 7 July 1668 he assigned the annual income of twenty pounds ‘towards the maintenance and education of two Scholars at the University or Colledge of Dublin’. These scholars were to be appointed ‘from the Free School of Castletown, or wheresoever it shall be in the Island, who I resolve shall be of the ablest Scholars, and most capable of the service of the Ministry’. Each scholar would receive ten pounds per annum for five years, ‘supposing they continue civill, and studious, and industrious to fitt themselves for the service intended and not otherwise’, and would be obliged to return ‘if required by the Bishop or trustees, to serve their own country till the supply be thought sufficient for the Island, and then to what other publicke work or charity shall by my trustees be thought most profitable for the Island’. Any student who failed to fulfil his obligation was to forfeit a promissory bond lodged on his behalf. Just as he had done with the Impropriate Fund, Barrow took pains to ensure that the administration of the endowment would remain efficient and secure: he retained a ‘liberty [to dispose] of the said yearly rent of twenty pounds’ during his life, and after his death the six highest civil and ecclesiastical officers were to be trustees.\textsuperscript{348}

Barrow required for his academic students a classical education such as he had known at Peterhouse, with a theological school firmly rooted in Anglicanism. It was to Dublin, however, and not to Cambridge that Barrow intended to send his ‘ablest Scholars [ . . . ] most capable of the service of the Ministry’. With a favourable sea passage Dublin could be reached far more quickly than Cambridge, and it had been the usual destination for the few young Manxmen who had gone to university before 1660. But there were more telling

\textsuperscript{345} Stanley, History, p. 47.
\textsuperscript{346} Moore, History, II, pp. 879-83.
\textsuperscript{348} Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3); Lib. Canc. (10071/5/12), p. 50, a complaint against ‘Wm Thompson an Academick Scholar [ . . . ] now he is about to depart the isle after receiving ye Stipend of 5l. per annum which ye Complainant will be obliged to refund by his Bond’, 18 September 1695 (cited in Quayle, Precedents, p. 137).
reasons why Barrow chose Trinity; in marked contrast to Peterhouse, where the imposition in 1644 of Lazarus Seaman as master provoked considerable strife, Cromwell’s choice of provost for Trinity was the scholarly and tolerant Samuel Winter, under whose leadership the college survived the exigencies of the times without acrimonious dissent and provocative political intrusion. When Thomas Seele succeeded him in 1661 additional disciplines introduced by Winter were largely retained, although students were still taught and examined in ‘Logics, Natural Philosophy, Moral Philosophy, Greek, Latin, and Theme’ and exercised proficiency in written argument and public disputation, all framed by Aristotelian authority, as prescribed in Laud’s constitution. Only in theological scholarship was there a marked change after the Restoration.

If Trinity was to be the destination for Barrow’s students it is reasonable to assume that he took steps to find out what kind of education they would receive there, which he would have been able to do through a long-standing friendship with Jeremy Taylor, bishop of Down, Connor and Dromore, who became vice-chancellor in Dublin in 1660. Taylor’s first impressions of Trinity were gloomy in the extreme, but they reflected political and administrative disarray in the college rather than a criticism of Winter’s scholarship and teaching, and he set about strengthening the weaknesses by bringing in new regulations and appointing new fellows. Barrow would have been encouraged by Taylor’s reforms and by Seele’s success in re-establishing the orthodoxy of the old church; newly elected fellows like Henry Dodwell, one of the most distinguished scholars of classical history and ecclesiastical politics of his day, quickly enhanced its academic standing, and matriculations increased from a relatively low base to thirty-five by 1665.

Throughout the seventeenth century Oxford and Cambridge preserved the traditional content and method of the universities, doggedly defended by Laudians against every call for reform by Comenius and his associates. Barrow’s long experience at Peterhouse, New College and Eton was rooted in scholasticism, but, as so much of his reforming agenda in the Isle of Man shows, his mind was far from closed to new ideas, and a capacity for intelligent discrimination no doubt led him to an awareness of the shortcomings of the old ways. Whether he came to sympathise with the ‘new philosophy’ of the Royal Society, espoused by

his nephew Isaac, one of its founding members, with its focus on mathematics and experimental and investigative science in the spirit of Bacon, is an interesting speculation, but since his main purpose was to train young men for the church, Trinity under Seele was the obvious choice.\footnote{Charles Webster, *The Great Instauration: Science, Medicine and Reform, 1626-1660* (London: Duckworth, 1975), pp. 132, 152, 178.}

The provision of grants to support two Manx scholars at Trinity was not the whole extent of Barrow’s plan; it was to be far more comprehensive and imaginative. He wanted nothing less than to establish an academic school or university college in the Island. Twenty years earlier James Stanley had expressed a similar aspiration to his son Charles: ‘I had a design, and God may enable me, to set up a university, without much charge (as I have contrived it) which may much oblig[e] the nations round about us [. . .] and enrich the land.’\footnote{Stanley, *History*, p. 19: letter of 1643 to Charles Stanley.} Whether he could have established such an academic institution, however, was never brought to the test.

Barrow’s plan was to appoint an academic master skilled in ‘logick, philosophy, and history’, who would teach Island students at the third level above the grammar school. To pay the salary he set up a separate academic reader’s trust, funded with the surplus left over from the original subscriptions after the establishment of the Impropriate Fund (amounting to £241 8s 4d), together ‘with what shall be given by others, whose charitable minds God shall raise up to so good a work’.\footnote{Charities, p. 4; MNH, MS 01507C, Academic Master’s Fund (1827 compilation), p. 1’.} By 1669 he was ready to put this final part of his educational reforms into effect, but the breakdown of his health in the late summer of that year imposed a delay. It would be a further five years before the funds could be sufficiently augmented and invested, trustees commissioned and an academic master appointed. If there was no prospect of setting up an academic school for the time being, however, Barrow was determined to do something more to support the most able scholars, and in 1669 he instructed his trustees to assign £4 8s 8½d to establish an academic library for them. He also made the castle library available to the academic students and the public.\footnote{Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668; MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3. Barrow may have been influenced by John Cosin’s establishment of an extensive academic library for the use of clergy, students and the public at Durham: see Anthony Milton, ‘Cosin, John (1595-1672), *ODNB*, 2004.}

When Comenius, Dury and Hartlib met in London in 1641 Comenius wrote of parliamentarian plans for radical change in state educational policy: ‘They are eagerly debating on the reform of schools in the whole kingdom [. . .] namely that all young people
should be instructed, none neglected.' The outbreak of the first civil war intervened before this could be implemented, however, and although the Commissioners for Charitable Uses effectively monitored and supported existing schools during the *interregnum*, the initiative for wholesale reform was lost. Vincent concluded: ‘If the Puritan government had survived, the ideas of Comenius, Hartlib and Dury would have been put into practice and a national system of education realised.' In England it was not to be; two centuries would elapse before William Forster introduced his first Elementary Education Act in 1870. Yet Isaac Barrow established just such a national system of education in the Isle of Man in 1668.

**Conclusion**

It is difficult to reconcile the different assessments of the provision of education before 1663. James Stanley made much of his aspiration to set up a university; and both Blundell’s report of 1648, that each of the four towns had ‘a free school [. . .] maintained out of the revenues’, and Chaloner’s statement five years later, that there were ‘Free-Schooles [. . .] at Castletown, Peel, Douglas and Ramsey’, show that education at secondary level, at least for the sons of high-ranking officials, was available. But these schools were gone when Barrow arrived and the haphazard provision of primary education, too, had, for the most part, failed.

Barrow was not the first to propose the establishment of an academic college and a library for its students, nor was he the first to give the Island a grammar school. But his enlightened new policy was to make primary education available to every boy and girl in his diocese, and he was the first to ensure through shrewd investment and planning that the Island’s clergy would at last be properly educated, fit for their calling, adequately paid and capable of providing good teaching in the schools. For Hinton Bird, Barrow’s schools mark the beginning of an Island story of alternating innovation and retrenchment: Barrow was the first of those ‘that led’. Although the schools he had put in place were subsequently threatened, not least by the changing policies of bishops Wilson and Hildesley in the eighteenth century, the provision of free elementary education for every boy and girl, sustained in substantial part by Barrow’s

---

357 The Elementary Education Act (the Forster Act), 1870 (33 and 34 Vict., c. 75).
endowments, continued successfully well into the nineteenth century. Barrow’s educational reforms, consolidated thirty years later in Wilson’s Education Act of 1703, were much admired as ‘remarkable’ in the Moseley report of 1847, evidence which Peter Clamp cites without acknowledging the policy’s insular provenance.\(^{359}\)

Much new ground which adds considerably to our knowledge of Barrow’s reforms is explored in this chapter. The widely-sourced funding which Barrow secured and the judicious instruments of governance which he put in place to ensure that his endowments would be effectively managed have not been examined previously, and they are factors of special significance in evaluating the potential and success of these reforms, not least as Earl Charles, while endorsing Barrow’s principle of compulsory schooling for every child, failed to contribute a single penny to Island education.\(^{360}\) Barrow’s skill in establishing effective practical strategies to implement his social reforms ensured that education at elementary, secondary and higher levels would be effectively organised and maintained.

His motives for choosing English as the language of instruction in the schools, the means whereby ‘the best way of cure’ could be assured, were both pastoral and practical. He did not have a resource of scholars ready to undertake Manx Gaelic translations and the advantages of the newly revised Book of Common Prayer of 1662 were a powerful incentive in the drive to give Manx children the means to read.

By the late summer of 1669 two of his three endowment trusts had been set up and their respective trustees appointed. His inquests of 1668 and 1669 demonstrate how anxious he was to monitor the primary schools and hold to account parishes that were failing to carry out his orders. Most parishes, together with the three chaplaincy towns, were providing elementary schooling for at least part of the year, and where there were problems they were attributable for the most part to the exigencies of everyday life, rather than a notional political or cultural antipathy to the English language as suggested by Clamp.\(^{361}\) The first extant reference to the grammar school is in a record of 1671, but there is every reason to suppose that Barrow was able to appoint a master in 1668 or 1669, since the tithes of Rushen had


\(^{360}\) Hinton Bird lists the funds and trusts, and notes their continuance through subsequent challenges, but he does not consider in any detail the long-term importance of Barrow’s skill in setting up the instruments of management: see An Island, pp. 11, 21, 29.

already been allocated for the stipend. The Academic Students’ Fund to pay for two students at Trinity College, Dublin, was also in place.\textsuperscript{362} The successful establishment of a fully-funded, comprehensive system of education from primary to university levels was a landmark achievement unparalleled elsewhere in the British Isles.

It was at this stage that the burden of his work as bishop and governor began to take its toll on Barrow’s health. Whether the physical exigencies of Island life contributed to this decline is not clear, nor is the nature of his illness recorded, but he resigned the governorship and made arrangements to cross to Lancashire ‘for his health’s sake’, according to Anthony Wood.\textsuperscript{363} He was invited by Charles Stanley to stay at Cross Hall, part of the Derby estate at Lathom, where he could take the spa waters and seek the attendance of physicians. At this stage he clearly intended to return to the Island, probably in the following spring; in a letter of 15 July 1669 he instructed his vicars general to provide a salary to replace a negligent schoolmaster ‘until my returne into the Country’. He was still at Castle Rushen on 2 August, but shortly after this, well before autumn gales made the sea crossing hazardous, he sailed from Derbyhaven, never to return.\textsuperscript{364}

Since the whole fabric of social reform and most notably the new system of education depended so closely on Barrow’s energy and vision, the breakdown of his health could not have happened at a less auspicious time. As Hinton Bird notes, this ‘remarkable experiment in education’ needed above all the support and direction of a resident bishop.\textsuperscript{365} Barrow’s absence was potentially disastrous, but he retained overall responsibility for the church as bishop \textit{in commendam} until 1671, an arrangement readily endorsed by Charles Stanley, and subsequently he continued to direct educational policy in the Isle of Man through the 1670s during his episcopate at St Asaph.

\textsuperscript{362} Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3).
\textsuperscript{363} Wood \textit{Athenæ}, IV, p. 809.
\textsuperscript{364} Lib. Caus., Castletown, 15 July 1669 & 2 August 1669.
\textsuperscript{365} Bird, \textit{An Island}, I, p. 37.
Chapter 5

Sodor and Man and St Asaph, 1669-1680

‘You shall ever find me most loving friend and faithful servant’ – Isaac Barrow

Introduction

During his time at Cross Hall and subsequently through much of the 1670s Barrow continued to influence ecclesiastical affairs, particularly in education, in the Isle of Man. He was able to do so first because his association with Charles Stanley had developed into a friendship which he had ample opportunity to exploit during his six months’ stay at Lathom. Barrow’s report for the Privy Council, commissioned on 15 April and 20 August 1670 to consider petitions brought by five aggrieved Manxmen against Earl Charles, shows beyond doubt the closeness of their relationship. This new evidence is of special significance since no correspondence between Barrow and Charles Stanley has survived. The facility with which Barrow conducted this enquiry no doubt led Earl Charles to encourage his further involvement in the Island’s affairs, which continued during the early years of William Stanley’s lordship when James Butler, first duke of Ormonde, held the stewardship of the Stanley affairs.

This chapter reviews the extent of Barrow’s continuing commitment to the Manx people, facilitated by the proximity in Chester of his successor Henry Bridgeman, with whom he was able to work closely. It assesses the importance of his interventions in assuring the success of his primary and grammar schools and his provision for the Island’s academic students. It also evaluates his work as bishop of St Asaph and considers why his contribution to the diocese, not least in education, was far less successful.

366 Michael Hoy, ‘Bishop Isaac Barrow’s Privy Council report: a review of five Privy Council records held in the National Archives’, IMNHAS (The Antiquarian), no. 6 (Spring 2012), pp. 21-28; TNA, PC 2/62, vol. ix, pp. 155, 273, 396-97. Barrow’s report demonstrates his grasp of the complexities of post-Restoration political manoeuvring in the Isle of Man, and his character assassination of Ewan Curghey displays the same ruthlessness that he had shown in evicting John and Ellen Lace from Hango Hill farm.

367 William Stanley lived quietly in Lancashire; his disengagement from Manx affairs gave Barrow a free hand to intervene, particularly in the development of education.
**Sodor and Man in commendam and during the episcopate of Henry Bridgeman**

By 1670 many of Barrow’s Peterhouse contemporaries had attained high office in Cambridge, in the court and in the episcopal ranks: John Bargrave was now a canon of Canterbury, Joseph Beaumont was master of Peterhouse and Regius Professor of Divinity, and his closest Cambridge friend, Peter Gunning, formerly master of St John’s, had just been appointed bishop of Chichester. Having served in the see of Sodor and Man with notable distinction but little financial reward, it might have been expected that Barrow, too, would be elevated to one of the richer dioceses, but the breakdown of his health intervened and for a time there seemed little chance that he would be able to take any other appointment. Removal from the burden of ecclesiastical and civil responsibilities gave some respite, however, and while he was convalescing at Cross Hall he received a commission from Charles II to become bishop of St Asaph. He was duly inducted into his new diocese on 21 March 1670. He retained his entitlement to the income of Sodor and Man in commendam during the ensuing vacancy, but relinquished it in October 1671 on the appointment of Henry Bridgeman, dean of Chester, as his successor.368

Barrow directed diocesan administration in the Isle of Man during his commendam period and subsequently through much of the 1670s through the offices of successive vicars general, Thomas Parre, John Harrison and Patrick Thompson, and his friend Richard Fox, the diocesan registrar. The ecclesiastical records of the 1660s and 70s, though patchy, show sufficient evidence to suggest that they were efficient stewards of the diocese.369 Barrow appointed Richard Fox, one of Charles Stanley’s chaplains, as his registrar in 1665; he appears to have developed a warm relationship with Fox and his wife and his confidence in Fox would have served him well when he left the Island.370 By contrast William Urquhart, who succeeded Jonathan Fletcher as archdeacon in 1667, seems to have played little part in the Island’s ecclesiastical affairs.371 If support from civil officials was needed, Barrow also had the advantage of having worked with his successor as governor, Henry Nowell, since

---

368 Bridgeman was bishop of Sodor and Man from 1671 to 1682.
369 See A.W. Moore, *Manx Worthies* (Douglas: S.K. Broadbent, 1901), pp. 46-8; G.H. Wood, ‘A description of an ancient legal document relating to the Isle of Man’, *YLM*, 1 (1891-92), pp. 332-33; EW, 1671-72, passim; MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/17/2 (Harrison); MNH, MS 06448, MD 335 (Lib. Testam.), Barrow’s commission to vicars general John Harrison, Thomas Parre and Patrick Thompson, 3 July 1668.
1663. A third advantage was that Bridgeman was at Chester, just twenty-five miles from St Asaph, and although he seldom visited the Island this proximity enabled Barrow to work with him in a constructive partnership to take forward the measures that were already in process.372

When Barrow left for Lathom in the early autumn of 1669, elementary schools were being taught in English in at least eight parishes and probably also in the three chaplaincy towns.373 Consolidation of what had already been achieved and the success of further efforts to set up schools where no provision had yet been made depended on five conditions: Barrow needed Charles Stanley’s support; his plans required his continuing guidance; nothing could be guaranteed without adequate financial provision; consistently effective teaching could only be provided by well-educated and committed teachers, clerical and lay; and, perhaps most elusive of all, hard-pressed Islanders would have to be convinced of the value of that education for their children.

By 1672 all the parishes had a school. But concern that their effectiveness was at best patchy prompted Barrow to enlist from Charles Stanley an endorsement to ensure that the established schools were not lost by default. He ordered:

> All farmers and other tenants in my Isle of Mann of what degree or quality soever doe and shall send their eldest sonnes and all other their children to such pettie schools as they are capable wherin if any doe faile or be remiss [they] shall not onely be fined severely, but their children made incapable of bearing any office or place of trust [. . .] for want of such literature and education.374

The severity of the threat of exclusion from ‘any office or place of trust’ is particularly notable; it helped to ensure that schools were being taught, but there is no evidence to show whether it improved attendance and the sanction of exclusion from public office was unlikely to concern the majority. As for financial support, in marked contrast to the philanthropy of

---

372 Lib. Canc. (10071/5/10), 1675, 3 fols facing p. 70: indenture, 4 November 1675; MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), vicar general’s exhibits; Ecclesiastical records, doc. 48, 1677, JMM. 2 (1933), no. 34, pp. 98-99. Bridgeman was in the Isle of Man in the summer of 1675 (when he signed deeds for the purchase of Rushen Abbey) and on four other occasions.

373 Lib. Caus., November 1669; MNH, MS 09767/1/2, Malew register, p. 20, 6 August 1668. Schools were being taught in Andreas, Braddan, Bride, Jurby, Onchan, Lezayre, Lonan and Santan.

374 MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, Impropriate Fund, box 1 of 2, doc. 23, [Charles] Derby to Henry Nowell (Deputy Governor), 2 January 1671/2.
his bishop, and true to the example of the Stanleys before him, Charles Stanley did not
contribute a single penny from the Derby coffers towards the provision of education.

Such measures and the support of diocesan officials would have had little effect without the
financial framework that Barrow had put in place. It was well conceived, but problems soon
arose with both funds. The first call on the Impropriate Fund was to provide a minimum
annual salary of seventeen pounds for the clergy, eleven of whom required increases up to
three times greater than the incomes they had received seven years earlier. The funds were
further depleted by the addition of annual allowances of three pounds for the vicars general to
recompense their additional responsibilities in the ‘diligent, conscientious and impartial
executing of the ecclesiastical laws’, although at first, in a show of support for Barrow’s
reforms, they waived the entitlement he had promised them: ‘Notwithstanding such we
thought it meet that such schoolmasters as did canonically and diligently teach youth in every
respective parish should be first paid their respective salaries.’

Inevitably there was less for education than Barrow had planned. The pressure on the fund is well illustrated by the case of
Edward Nelson, lay teacher in Ramsey, who in 1670 petitioned Barrow for an increase to his
annual salary of 20s. Barrow raised Nelson’s stipend to 30s, but tasked Richard Fox, who
held the chaplaincy of Ramsey, to find the money, which was not to be drawn from the
Impropriate Fund or the Royal Bounty.

The Impropriate Fund seems to have been well managed and Barrow maintained a close
interest in the trustees’ stewardship through the 1670s. The annuity of one hundred pounds
from the Royal Bounty, however, was a precarious source from the outset: for the first three
years the money failed to materialise. Eventually in 1670 three years’ arrears (less
unspecified charges) amounting to £260 was secured, which, with the Impropriate Fund,
raised the combined total investment to £1,341 8s 4d.

Barrow continued to be exercised by the unreliability of the Royal Bounty. Fearing that the
schools might be squeezed out he intervened directly in 1675, presumably with Bridgeman’s
agreement, by issuing an instruction to safeguard his original intention ‘that the moneys still
remaining should go to the maintaining severall schools to teach to write and read in such

375 MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/17/3 (Harrison), order of Henry Bridgeman, 4 June 1675.
376 Lib. Caus., 17 June & 19 July 1670; Radcliffe, Ramsey, p. 93. In the event Fox taught the school himself.
377 Charities, p. 2; MNH, MS 09609 (Fitzsimmons), 173-74.
places of the Island as should be judged most convenient'. At the same time, following his request to the king to make the funding more secure, the rental income was replaced with a royal grant ‘by way of a charge upon the excise of beer, ale, and other excisable liquors [ . . . ] towards the maintenance of such poor ministers in the Isle of Man as shall be found to stand most in need thereof’. These orders still failed to make any provision for the three chaplaincy town schools, however, and also risked removing any incentive for the ministers of the six relatively well endowed parishes to maintain schools. A year later a new directive from Charles II prescribed a more efficient and discrete application of income and expenditure from the Royal Bounty: £18 (£3 each) was assigned to the schools in the rectories (Andreas, Ballaugh and Bride) and the town schools in Castletown, Douglas and Ramsey; the remaining £82 was divided in varying amounts to supplement clergy stipends in the eleven poorest parishes (excluding the relatively well endowed parishes of Malew, Michael and Patrick). The impropriations (amounting to £45) were to be distributed in varying amounts to thirteen parish schools and the town school in Castletown.

Barrow’s intervention in 1675 ensured that every parish and the three towns had a school. Samuel Wattleworth, rector of Andreas, confirmed to Bridgeman that ‘such schoolmasters [parish priests] as did canonically and diligently teach youth in every respective parish [ . . . ] according to the intention of the Benefactors’ received a salary of £18; any minister who failed to teach not only forfeited the augmentation but was also fined. But the income due to the teachers in the town schools and the rectories continued to be unreliable. In September 1680 Bridgeman accepted a petition from Hannah Bennett claiming ‘the full and just Sume of Fourty shill[ing]s during her diligent Continuance [ . . . ] of a petty Schoole in Ramsey’; and in the summer of 1683 John Harrison, rector of Bride, and Jon Christian, curate of Andreas, ‘made complaint that they have caused a constant and diligent Schoole to be kept in their respective parishe Churches for the space of five years last past, and have had noe allowance [ . . . ] for the same out of the King’s Annuity unto the Clergy’. In both cases the impropriations were used to pay the arrears. Furthermore, there was no additional money to
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378 MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, ‘Subscription Book’, order of 1675; Charities, p. 18.
379 Charities, pp. 5-7. Although the king’s letters patent were addressed to the secular trustees, Charles Stanley, Thomas Cholmondeley and William Banks, he was responding ‘upon former and late representations made unto us, by the Right Rev. Father in God, Isaac Barrow, Bishop of St Asaph, and late Bishop of the Isle of Man, of the mean provision of the Clergy in that Isle, and the ill effects which necessarily attend upon the same’.
380 Convocation, pp. 146-47.
381 There were additional rental incomes in ten parishes. It is not clear whether Castletown received double the amount allocated to Douglas and Ramsey.
provide books or maintain the church buildings in which classes were taught; that remained
the responsibility of the wardens, an obligation that frequently went by default, as in Ballaugh
in 1675, where they were presented for their neglect, ‘the bookes and surplices [being] much
abused and cutt with mice’. The directives of 1675 and 1676 regularised the distribution of
the Royal Bounty, but income from the excise duties remained haphazard for many years to
come. It was the steady growth of the Impropriate Fund investments that secured the
development of the elementary schools, for which Barrow laid the foundations a generation
before Bishop Wilson’s first Education Act in 1704.

It is difficult to assess the diligence and competence of those who taught the petty schools.
The main weakness of the system was that some were not taught throughout the year, as the
vicars general reported in 1675: ‘It is too manifest that several of the s[ai]d schoolmasters
have not taught [schools] diligently and entirely the whole year, but some only an half year
and some but a quarter.’ The quality of teaching may be reflected in the willingness or
otherwise of parents to send their children to school, but where there is evidence it suggests
other motives. Reluctant parents did not need to look far for an excuse if a school was taught
for only a few months of the year. At harvest time most children were required in the fields,
as a 1669 presentment for Lonan records; ten years after Barrow set up his first schools the
same problems were evident in at least three parishes: in Lonan ‘School [is] observed but few
sende their children’; in Malew Thomas Parre complained that very few young people
attended evening prayer: ‘they that have catechism books to answ[er] the minister will not
com with their bookes but my selfe propoundinge the question and givinge the answer and
very very few doth com to heare or learne’; and in Rushen the wardens reported: ‘We do
hereby certifie that the minister keeps schoole but the parishioners sends but a few children to
be instructed’. Yet in this respect the Island was no different from England and Wales;
attendance where schools were provided was erratic, as W.B. Stephens has shown, with
children often attending for only a few hours or weeks.

of 1704).
384 MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/17/3 (Harrison), order of Henry Bridgeman, 4 June 1675.
386 W.B. Stephens, ‘Literacy in England, Scotland and Wales, 1540-1900’, History of Education Quarterly, 30,
In contrast there is also evidence that many parents valued the schools and the teaching their children received. In 1679 the wardens of Santan reported with some satisfaction the continuing operation of their school: ‘We doe certifie under our hands that the minister of the parish keeps a constant scoole and teacheth the youth of the parish there catechism as formerly.’ There was similar compliance in Marown, where the wardens confirmed: ‘We doe certifie that there is a constant schoole kept in the p[ar]ish.’\textsuperscript{387} When William Crowe, vicar of Jurby, met with friends for convivial conversation at the home of John Teare of Loughcroute in 1672 they expressed great appreciation of Barrow’s educational achievements; Gilbert Skally of Kerroo Croie particularly admired his visionary policy in giving the opportunity of schooling to children of all social levels, rich and poor alike. Other indications that secular teaching was valued may be found in complaints when schools were not being taught; when the church failed to provide a school in Ballaugh in 1680 twenty parishioners, who had repeatedly requested teaching for their children, paid the master’s costs themselves.\textsuperscript{388}

There was clearly much variation in the quality of teaching, which did not necessarily correlate with possession of the bishop’s licence. Samuel Robinson, who taught the Castletown school in 1668, was unsatisfactory because neither the children he taught nor his Arbory parishioners could understand what he said; they complained that he spoke neither English nor Manx Gaelic, but an incomprehensible Scots dialect, which may have discouraged any effort he put into his teaching, since in 1674 the Arbory wardens presented him ‘for not keeping school for a long season’. Robinson was replaced by Isabel Quiggin, who must have been more acceptable and successful, since she continued at the Castletown school until 1714.\textsuperscript{389} Some teachers did not hold a licence, but this was dealt with pragmatically by the vicars general, presumably with Barrow’s and Bridgeman’s acquiescence.

The earliest record of Barrow’s grammar school is documented in the Malew parish records of March 1672, but Barrow’s revision of his 1663 report (c. 1668) suggests that grammar school boys were already being taught before he left the Island in 1669.\textsuperscript{390} The location of the school in its early years is not certain: William Cubbon asserts that in 1666 it was held in a

\textsuperscript{387} Lib. Caus., Marown, 1679 (n.d.) & 29 October 1679.
\textsuperscript{390} MNH, MS 09767/1/2, Malew register, p. 23, 7 March 1671: baptism of ‘daughter to Mr. Henry Lowcay; Mr. Of the free school of Castletown, baptized March 7\textsuperscript{th} 1671’. See also note 340 and figure 3.
building in the Parade and that it was transferred to the old thirteenth-century chapel of St Mary some time later. The chapel had been referred to as a school house in the late sixteenth century, however, and a summary account of the ‘free grammar school of Castletown’ compiled by Thomas Stowell, Clerk of the Rolls, in 1819 asserts ‘neither history nor tradition gives any reason to think that it ever was kept elsewhere’. It seems most likely that, as the bishop’s foundation, it was located in St Mary’s Chapel, since there is no record of payment of rent and there was no money to fund a new building, which would have cost more than the master’s salary. The feoffees of Warrington Grammar School, for example, at the request of the master, Samuel Shaw, laid out an investment of £40 to build a new schoolhouse in 1668.

Since the Castletown premises were rent free, Barrow’s allocation of one third of the impropriate tithes made possible a relatively generous annual salary of thirty pounds, an incentive designed to attract a well-qualified teacher from one of the universities. In the event Barrow was unable to entice an off-Island scholar as master. In Ireland, too, high salaries rarely brought English scholars to take posts in grammar schools: in 1679, for example, even the offer of a salary of £66 13s 4d could not tempt an English applicant. Barrow had to make do with Henry Lowcay, an Islander incumbent with multiple responsibilities; it was far from ideal, but at least the school was under way and its reserved income from the tithes of Rushen was secure.

Barrow intended the grammar school at Castletown to serve the most able youths of Douglas (and probably Peel, too), but since from the north of the Island the distance was wholly impractical there is evidence that he planned to provide a second grammar school, or at least secondary level teaching in an expanded petty school, in Ramsey. He left before this could be done, but assigned two hundred pounds to Thomas Cholmondeley to be held in trust, which Bishop Levinz believed he intended for Ramsey.
Figure 11 – St Mary’s Chapel, Castletown. Grammar school boys were taught here from c. 1668 to 1931.
Barrow’s design would have been incomplete without the tertiary level of an academic school giving university education to young men destined to fill the Island’s livings and thus ensure that, as priests and teachers, they would play a major role in enhancing the spiritual and social welfare of the people. The funds as they stood in 1669 were adequate to provide student scholarships and a very generous salary, but they were far too small to build or rent premises for a school.\(^{397}\) One consequence of this was that at times the academic students were taught with the grammar school boys; Henry Lowcay may have carried out both tasks at the beginning of the 1670s. But Peter Clamp is mistaken in concluding that the grammar and academic schools were the same institution.\(^{398}\) Barrow intended them to be two separate schools with distinct functions, funded by discrete endowments each with their own trustees; while part of the Impropriate Fund was to be used for the grammar school, the Academic Students’ and Master’s Funds would finance tertiary education.

When Barrow left the Island in 1669 the Academic Master’s Fund consisted only of a surplus of £260 left over from the original subscriptions after the establishment of the Impropriate Fund, which was insufficient to generate a workable endowment. Barrow increased it by seeking other gifts from friends ‘whose charitable minds God shall raise up to so good a work’ and later contributed part of his \textit{in commendam} entitlement, which amounted to more than £350, to his Academic Master’s Fund.\(^{399}\) Charles Stanley’s endorsement of this gift confirms the extent to which Barrow was continuing to direct the Island’s diocesan affairs through Bridgeman:

> There being a full accord between the B[i]sh[op]ps of St Asaph \& Mann concerning the profits of the Bishoprick of Mann in its vacancy and all other matters. His Lo[rdship]po orders his Gov[erno]r to collect ye profits for 1671 and return them to Mr Bancks to England till they can meet with a purchase for Erecting an Academick Schoole.\(^{400}\)

These combined funds, which amounted to £600 according to Bishop Wilson, were used to set up this second trust.\(^{401}\)

\(^{397}\) Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3).


\(^{399}\) MNH, MS 01507C, Academic Master’s Fund (1827 compilation); \textit{Charities}, pp. 24-26.

\(^{400}\) Lib. Canc. (MS 10071/5/10), 1673, p. 19; MNH, MS 00482C (QBHP), Charles Stanley to Governor Henry Nowell, 8 June 1672.

\(^{401}\) \textit{Charities}, p. 24.
Barrow chose William Banks of Winstanley, Lancashire, and Thomas Cholmondeley of Vale Royal, Cheshire, staunch royalists and close associates of Charles Stanley, to be undertakers (trustees) for his Academic Master’s Fund. He knew them well and was confident that they would fulfil their charge to ‘Maintaine & provide [. . .] a person of Sufficient Learning and Abilities to exercise and discharge the place Employment and duty of a publick Reader of Logick philosophy and History within the Isle and Dominion of Man’ and administer the fund ‘till we can meet with convenient purchase for the erection of a public school for academical learning’. 402 Barrow kept in close touch with them and in May 1674 he and Banks entrusted £500 to Ormonde to be invested in Ireland to generate an annual income of £50, which was described in Ormonde’s document of receipt as ‘intended for the Academic Schoole in the Isle of Man’. 403 Barrow’s knowledge of investment strategies and his determination to nurture his endowments to the best advantage, skills in which he had become expert at Peterhouse and Eton, can be seen in a later commission of 1676 which varied the agreement with Ormonde to secure a revised yearly income of £60. The rigorous conditions of this indenture reflect the lengths to which Barrow went to ensure that the original deed would be watertight and fit for purpose. 404

Anticipating that the initial projected income from the Ormonde investments would be sufficient to establish an academic school in the form of an Island university college, Bridgeman, again almost certainly prompted by Barrow, petitioned governor Nowell and the Keys in 1674 to grant an order:

For the diligent and effectual labour of all and every men of this Isle in the [. . .] work [. . .] of erecting an Illustrious School for the instruction of [. . .] youth (especially such as are [. . .] designed for the sacred function of the Ministeriall offices) [. . .] for the space of one and thirty days alternately. 405

Barrow had a site in mind: he and Bridgeman used the first year’s income from the Irish investments to purchase from Deemster Charles Moore at a cost of £60 ‘all the decayed & demolished Buildings of St Mary of Rushen with all the Ground whereon ye same stands [. .}
. and this purchase is intended & designed to Erect a Colledge or Academick Schoole’.

Moore’s estate at Ballasalla, a little over a mile from Castletown, may have been suitable, but the enterprise required considerably greater investment than the initial purchase price, since the contract also committed Bridgeman ‘to build Moor a House in another place’. Nowell and the Keys refused to contribute to the project, and since Barrow could no longer rely on support from Knowsley after Charles Stanley’s death in 1672, the project was abandoned. The estate was sold back to Moore and Barrow had to accept that the money he had raised was insufficient to fund a university college.

If Bridgeman had been wholly committed to the project he could perhaps have rescued it by contributing some or all of two monetary awards from the courts which he received in 1675. Later evidence seems to confirm that the purchase of Moore’s estate was not Bridgeman’s idea at all; after his death in 1682 his widow pursued Charles Moore in the courts to recover the £60 ‘lent or depositted’ for the purchase ‘of Ballasalla Abbey to build a Colledge’. Further evidence of Bridgeman’s evident lack of commitment to the diocese may be found in an order of 1683 from William Stanley to Governor Robert Heywood ‘that the executors of the late Bishop [Bridgeman] should not be suffered to depart the country until full satisfaction with respect to the dilapidations [of St German’s Cathedral] would be made’.

The failure of the Rushen Abbey project was probably inevitable. It confirmed that the establishment of a university college far exceeded the practical requirements of the academic students: ‘They needed a lodging,’ Robert Curphey concluded, ‘a tutor to stimulate and to guide their reading, books to read and a place in which to read and work.’ The key to making adequate, affordable and sustainable provision for them was just as Charles Hoole had advocated, not a prestigious building, but a library and a good teacher.
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Barrow had already established an academic library before he left the Island and he also made the castle library available to the academic students. According to Curphey, Bridgeman added to this in 1675 by giving his own library, although it is not clear what these books were or where they came from, since Bridgeman’s visits to the island were so infrequent that it seems unlikely that he kept a separate library in the diocese; nor is it known whether the library Barrow set up contained any of his own books.413

All that now remained was to provide the academic students with a tutor. In March 1676 Barrow and Bridgeman, ‘with joint consent elected, approved, and appointed William Gostwicke, M[aste]r of Arts and fellow of Trinity College at Cambridge, to be our first reader in the academical school aforesaid’.414 Since the affairs of the diocese were very much peripheral for Bridgeman, his willingness to support his predecessor’s wishes must reflect Barrow’s commitment to secure ‘an able reader of academical learning in the Isle of Man, where a College or Gymnasium is intended by the present Bishop of Mann [Bridgeman] (and he is already in some forwardness to that purpose)’.415 Gostwicke was educated at Merchant Taylors’ and Westminster Schools and graduated from Trinity, Cambridge, in 1672, where he was subsequently elected to a fellowship. His salary was to be £60, a sum commensurate with his impressive qualifications; in comparison with the £17 payable to the parish clergy who taught the petty schools or even the grammar school master’s salary of £30 this was remarkably generous and reflected Barrow’s high expectations of the academic reader.

By September 1676, however, Gostwicke, who held ‘the Bishop of Mann’s licence for his instructing and teaching of youth in the academical scholl’ and had been ‘at a great expense of payne and time and money in pursuance of the said undertaking’, had received nothing; six months salary was due to him. The terms of Barrow’s Academic Master’s Fund required the income from the Irish investments ‘to be paid half yearly’, but since Cholmondeley had ‘not yet assumed the said trust upon him’ Barrow and Bridgeman had to apply directly to Ormonde for the money before Gostwicke’s claim could be met.416 The long delay was

413 Curphey, ‘Bishop Barrow’s Trusts’, p. 8.
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415 ibid.
416 I.R. Venn (ed.), Alumni cantabrigienses, 10 vols (Cambridge: CUP, 1922-54), pt 1, II, p. 86; Historical Manuscripts, pt 1, p. 776, Barrow and Bridgeman to Ormond, 23 September 1676; Charities, p. 24; CUL, EDR A/5/3 (Subscription Book), 21 September, 1678; Bodl. MS Rawl.d.340 (Subscription Book), 7 October 1681. Gostwicke went on to a distinguished ecclesiastical career in Cambridge.
symptomatic of problems which beset the fund. Gostwicke stayed no longer than two years and may well have resigned his post because of uncertainty over his remuneration.

The students taught by Gostwicke in Castletown were not the only ‘Academick Scollars’ funded by Barrow’s endowments and intended to serve as clergy; there were also the Dublin students: Barrow’s deed of 7 July 1668 assigned the annual income of his Academic Students’ Fund ‘towards the maintenance and education of two Scholars at the University or Colledge of Dublin [. . .] who [. . .] shall be of the ablest Scholars, and most capable of the service of the Ministry’. The problems that became plain in the second half of the 1670s were not just practical. The whole academic plan was flawed since the two trusts were, in effect, in competition. Barrow addressed this weakness by varying the conditions of his Academic Students’ Trust in his will:

I give my Lease of twenty pounds per annum [. . .] towards the maintenance of three Boys at the Academical School, when it shall be there settled; and in case there be no such School within twelve months after my death, then to go towards the maintenance of two boys of the most pregnant parts at some University abroad; in the meantime to be employed as it is.

There were three significant changes: three scholars (not two) would be supported in the Island school; Trinity College, Dublin, was no longer specified for those who went off-Island; and, ever the pragmatist, Barrow imposed a time limit to safeguard the fund, which the failed enterprise at Rushen Abbey had shown was only sufficient, as it currently stood, to pay the salary of the reader. Apart from these changes, as Robert Curphey noted, neither Barrow’s original deed nor his will made prescriptions for the governance or teaching of the academic school, an omission which is the more surprising in view of reforms instituted in Oxford and Cambridge after the Restoration to strengthen the independence of the colleges, with which Barrow would have been fully conversant.

It is interesting to consider why Barrow changed the conditions of his Academic Students’ Fund. By 1670 Thomas Seele’s provostship had successfully re-established Anglican orthodoxy and brought stability and an enhanced reputation to Trinity. The college’s
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prosperity strengthened steadily through the 1670s and when Seele died in 1675 the number of matriculations had grown to fifty (from thirty-five ten years earlier).\textsuperscript{421} His successor, Michael Ward, was an equally distinguished biblical scholar who maintained Seele’s positive stewardship; furthermore, when Thomas Denton visited Dublin sometime in the early 1680s he recorded that Trinity was ‘furnished with a large library [and] it consists of a Provost 17 Fellows 70 Schollars of the foundation 1 D[octo]r. 2 Chaplains 2 Clerks Several Professors of Several learnings’.\textsuperscript{422} Evidence cited by Toby Barnard also suggests that it was better governed than the Oxford and Cambridge colleges.\textsuperscript{423} It does not appear that any decline or change of direction in ecclesiastical or political affiliation at Trinity influenced Barrow. Perhaps he simply hoped by removing the former restriction to encourage more able students to take up university places at Oxford or Cambridge.\textsuperscript{424} For the academic students continuing their studies in Castletown Barrow expanded the library he had set up in 1669 by gifting in his will ‘one hundred pounds per annum to buy such Books yearly as should be more Convenient for the Clergy’. It was a generous and significant gift, reflecting Christopher Wase’s judgement that ‘The greatest benefit to Learners after the Master, is a good Library’.\textsuperscript{425}

Barrow’s last direct intervention in the Island’s affairs seems to have been the recovery of Gostwicke’s salary in 1676. Bridgeman’s episcopate continued until 1682, but after 1676 no other significant initiatives to enhance the Island’s social and spiritual welfare, particularly through education, are recorded.

\textbf{St Asaph, 1670-80}

The population of the diocese of St Asaph in the 1670s was about 86,000, at least six times larger than Sodor and Man, and it comprised 131 benefices in 1712; the land area of its three
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  \item \textsuperscript{423} Barnard, \textit{New Anatomy}, pp. 107, 371 (n. 186).
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counties (Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery) is more than five times larger than the Isle of Man. In their geography and demography, however, the two dioceses were similar and, apart from the developing industrial and mining belt in the north-east corner, socio-economic conditions in St Asaph were comparable to those in the Isle of Man; there were far fewer ‘middling’ and professional people than in much of England and the majority in the rural economy were small tenant farmers and landless labourers. It is difficult to find statistical evidence from the late seventeenth century, but figures collected later give some indication of the similarities between the two dioceses. Their market towns were significantly smaller, and only 17% of the population in the Isle of Man and 14.1% in Wales lived in the towns, compared to 30% in England; Denbigh, comparable to Douglas in size and demography, had 209 ‘principal inhabitants’, of whom 176 were ‘traders’, towards the end of the eighteenth century. At the same time in the Montgomeryshire parish of Llanfechain Walter Davies found that 18.9% were farmers (mostly tenants), 14.2% were artificers and 66.9% (men and women) were husbandmen or servants’. Much of the land was poorly managed since tenants tied to short leases were afraid to make improvements; rural incomes were low and comparable to those in the Isle of Man through the eighteenth century: 58% of farmers in Denbighshire had annual incomes of less than two hundred pounds in 1706 and in 1743 Robert Edwards, a husbandman at Mostyn, Flintshire, earned just five pounds. (Figure 12)

The old established church in Wales was strongest in the north in the seventeenth century. Although the diocese of St Asaph suffered severely during the civil wars and interregnum, the consequence in part of its support for the king and close association with the royalist
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Figure 12 – The diocese of St Asaph.
stronghold of Denbigh, its condition was generally more fortunate than that of the southern
Welsh dioceses. George Griffith, appointed bishop in 1660, restored the administrative
framework of the diocese and began work on the cathedral, but his successor Henry
Glenham, dismissed by Samuel Pepys as ‘a drunken swearing rascal and a scandal to the
Church’, was singularly ineffective.\(^{430}\) When Barrow arrived in 1670 he faced pressing
challenges which were much the same as he had found in the Isle of Man: communications
were difficult, the common language was not English, regulation and welfare of the clergy
had been neglected, the cathedral and bishop’s palace were in urgent need of repair, the
diocese was impoverished and its records and accounts were in a state of disarray.\(^{431}\) Browne
Willis noted that the diocesan revenues were wholly inadequate and the obstructive alienation
of parochial endowments, which was endemic across Wales, had reduced many clergy to
penury.\(^{432}\) Pluralism and absenteeism were rife and diocesan support for the parish ministers
was compromised by the barrier of language.\(^{433}\)

Repairs to the cathedral and palace could not wait. Although Bishop Griffith had restored
parts of the cathedral interior, all this work was at risk from damaged masonry in the nave
and choir and leaking aisle roofs. When the dean and chapter refused to pay for the
restoration, Barrow pressed on with the work, using part of his \textit{commendam} income to repair
‘several parts of the Cathedral, especially the north and south isles, which he now covered
with lead; and [he] caused the east part of the choir to be wainscoted’.\(^{434}\) Despite a long-
running dispute about the cathedral finances, Barrow’s relations with the dean and chapter
were cordial and together they subscribed to legislation to appropriate the most valuable of
the sinecure rectories for the future maintenance of the cathedral and its choir. To repair the
bishop’s palace, too, he ‘laid out a considerable sum of money in building and repairs about
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defiled the churches there’.

\(^{432}\) Browne Willis, \textit{A Survey of St Asaph enlarged}, 2 vols, ed. Edward Edwards (Wrexham: John Painter, 1801, 1,
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63-74.
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1672 to 1678.
his palace’, and purchased the lease of Argoed Hall farm, near Mold, to serve as a more practical residence while the palace reparations were in progress.\footnote{Bodl, Tanner MS 146.38, Barrow to William Sancroft, 16 January 1677/8; Act 39, anno 29 & 30 Car. II (preamble), cited in Willis, \textit{St Asaph}, II, p. 151: ‘The Cathedral Church of St Asaph, by reason of the high and bleak situation thereof, near the sea, is much exposed to storms, and requireth great and frequent repairs, for defraying the charge whereof there is not at present any competent maintenance’. The act appropriated the rectory of Llanrhaeadr-ym-Mochnant for future maintenance of the cathedral; Wood, \textit{Athenae}, IV, p. 837. It is interesting to reflect that Barrow may have been influenced by the example of John Cosin, who carried out extensive repairs to his cathedral and palaces at Durham in the late 1660s: see Milton, ‘Cosin’, \textit{ODNB}.} Barrow’s experience in the management of investments and estates furnished him with resourceful methods of raising money and setting up endowments for capital projects, maintenance and depreciation; in addition to the rectory income, for example, he arranged for the lease of all the mines and lead ore belonging to the see to be let for twenty shillings per annum for twenty-one years to provide revenue exclusively for the repair and upkeep of the cathedral fabric, together with its organ and music.

It was not only the cathedral and palace that required substantial work. Faced with a backlog of repairs, disputed endowments and widespread non-residence across the diocese, Barrow set about re-structuring many of the rectories to encourage competent clergy to serve in residence; in the summer of 1678 he wrote to Archbishop William Sancroft of his wish to compensate clergy in poor incumbencies, as he had done in the Isle of Man, by improving their income and welfare and providing them with books and better education.\footnote{Bodl, Tanner MS 146.39, Barrow to William Sancroft, 14 June 1678. Sancroft was in Cambridge at Emmanuel when Barrow was at Peterhouse.} He found himself under considerable pressure to accept nominations for some of the sinecures, one of which was urged by Sancroft and Charles II, but he stood firm and the 1678 legislation brought significant benefits, not just in small rural parishes, but also to some of the most important towns in the diocese, including Denbigh, Llanrwst and Machynlleth.\footnote{‘St. Asaph, for the Repairs of the Church of St. Asaph, and the Maintenance of the Choir there, and for uniting several Rectories and Vicarages within the Diocese of St. Asaph’, 1678 (29 & 30 Car. 2).} In the decade of his episcopate he succeeded in improving the academic standing of incumbents across the diocese: thirty-three of fifty new vicars and curates were university graduates.\footnote{D.R. Thomas, \textit{St Asaph}, passim.} He was conscious, too, of his obligations to his successors and took steps to consolidate future income by forfeiting his claim as bishop on the lease of Meliden, valued at £700, an act of generosity which earned him fulsome commendation from the king.\footnote{Willis, \textit{St Asaph}, II, pp. 159-60: Charles II to Barrow, 1 April 1679.}
Barrow’s close supervision of parochial affairs in the Isle of Man suggests that he would have tried to exercise similar oversight in his new diocese. Poor health prevented him from travelling far in the difficult Welsh terrain, but he commissioned several visitations to find out as much as possible about his clergy and the people they served; in April 1675, for example, the deanery of Rhos came under scrutiny to report non-residence and ‘irregular practices of several ministers and of the people under their charge’.

There were several issues in the diocese, not least associated with the predominance of the Welsh language and the large number of dissenters, which taxed him. He arrived in St Asaph at a time when political interference from England was deliberately trying to drive the Welsh Bible and prayer book from the churches: ‘It is the duty of the bishops to endeavour to promote the English’ was the official argument against the use of Welsh in church services. No records of Barrow’s views on the use of Welsh have come to light, but, as his predecessor George Griffith had done, he appointed Welsh-speaking ministers, who (unlike Manx clergy) had at their disposal a vernacular Bible. In his dealings with Welsh dissenters he took a pragmatic line. Whereas there had been few nonconformists in the Isle of Man, the situation Barrow found in Wales was quite different, and his dilemma may have been complicated by the extreme views of his fellow bishop in Bangor, Humphrey Lloyd, one of the most vigorous opponents of dissent in Wales. There is evidence that Barrow’s approach was practical, taking each case according to its particular circumstances; he avoided confrontation with Richard Jones, a Puritan schoolmaster who taught a ‘seminary of a Dissenting party’ in Denbigh, but where there was a more deliberate threat to stability and orthodoxy, as in the case of John Evans, leader of ‘schismatics many’ in Oswestry and Wrexham, he was quick to take decisive action.

He had been most exercised in the Isle of Man by Quakers. Joseph Besse records a number of civil actions against Quakers in the diocese of St Asaph during the
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1670s, but there is no mention of Barrow or his office associated with them in court records. It is interesting to speculate that Barrow’s inclination may have been to avoid confrontation and seek accommodation with them as he had done in the early stages of his episcopate in the Isle of Man.444

Whereas Barrow had found, despite the shortcomings of the clergy and the ignorance of the people, that the best of ‘the old discipline had on the whole in a very remarkable degree kept its hold on this one diocese’, there is evidence that some of the Welsh were less straightforward to deal with; furthermore, although the ecclesiastical court system in Wales had been restored in 1660, he was frustrated to find that he lacked effective jurisdiction over lay issues.445 He was an impatient and forceful man, but ‘having but few friends in a strange countrie’, he could no longer rely on the civil authority he had wielding in the Isle of Man.446 Humphrey Lloyd, Barrow’s secretary, related an incident when his temper was frayed by intemperate behaviour in the city: ‘B[isho]p Barrow being cross’t in his endeavour to put down an Ale-house, declared he would never do anything more for the People of St Asaph.’ Yet he went on to do a great deal for the people who had so incensed him: ‘He might say those words in a Passion (which was incident to his infirmities),’ Lloyd explained, ‘but he never tyed himself up with any such resolution.’447 No doubt there were other confrontations, not all attributable to the state of Barrow’s health, but despite his impatience and at times high-handedness, the overwhelming impression of his motives and actions in St Asaph, as in the Isle of Man, is of genuine concern for his people and of practical and resourceful means taken, often at his own expense, to improve their spiritual and social condition. Foremost among his contributions to social welfare, for example, was the provision of almshouses in St Asaph for eight poor widows, paid for out of his own pocket and secured with an annual endowment of £12; he made a similar endowment to assist the poor of Mold.448

When Barrow arrived in St Asaph his priorities were to restore the cathedral, sort out the administrative problems of the diocese and pursue lost and alienated income. By 1672 he
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448 With the help of Mutton Davies of Llanerch, Barrow settled the lease of his *commendam* rectory at Ysceifiog on the poor of Mold (November 1676).
should have been able to turn his attention to pastoral issues, particularly education, which
needed urgent action since north Wales had attracted relatively few endowments for schools
in the mid-seventeenth century, while those still existing after the Restoration were fast
disappearing. Barrow made no attempt to set up a network of elementary schools, however,
and it was the initiative of the Presbyterian Thomas Gouge which supplied the first English
schools to address the needs of ‘those parts of Wales, which were distressed with ignorance,
and wanted means of knowledge’. 449 By 1675 fifty-one of Gouge’s Welsh Trust schools were
operating across Wales ‘so that about 1,850 in all are already put to school to learn to read
English’. 450 Fifteen of these schools were in the market towns of the diocese of St Asaph and
more than five hundred children were being taught in them, but there was no attempt to reach
out to the rural poor. It may be that Barrow was content to rely on these English schools, yet
few could take advantage of them since 90% of people in Wales spoke only Welsh in
1700. 451 Perhaps he was less inclined to replicate the strategies he had used in the Isle of Man
because Welsh, unlike Manx Gaelic, was not solely an oral language; William Morgan’s
Welsh Bible and other published moral and devotional texts were widely available to those
who wanted to read them. But again, few Welsh speakers were literate in 1670. It is difficult
to come to any other conclusion than that Barrow was overwhelmed by the problem of
educating so many children across a diocese far larger than the Isle of Man, not least because
there were no resources comparable to the Manx impropriate tithes by which schools might
be financed.

Although he did not try to extend the provision of elementary schools, he planned one further
educational project for St Asaph. There had been a grammar school connected with the
cathedral in the mid-sixteenth century, but this endowment failed and there is no evidence
that a school still existed in 1670. 452 Barrow must have been dismayed by the lack of
educational opportunities at secondary level for the brightest boys in his diocese, not least
because his rationale for establishing a grammar school in Castletown had been to provide the
first educational stage in raising the academic standing of his ministers; in St Asaph the need
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was at least as great. Barrow planned to build and endow a grammar school for the city and engage a scholar of distinction as master. He set up or re-established a diocesan school, held at first in the chapter house and later in the cathedral close, which was probably funded by his gift of the income of Pentre-uchaf, a farm he purchased for one hundred pounds, yielding an annual income of five pounds; but it is unlikely that this modest salary attracted a master capable of teaching grammar school lessons. Increasingly poor health frustrated his plans and he was unable to endow additional funds because, as his successor William Lloyd explained, he ‘was near half a year in treaty with Mr Parry of Pwllallog about a Mortgage of Lands upon which he w[oul]d have placed the money which he design’d to have given; But that the Title to Lands was p[er]plexed, and he could not make it clear in all that time’. Barrow was fifty-eight when he took on St Asaph. Like all the impoverished Welsh dioceses it would have benefited from the ambition and energy of a younger incumbent, but for the most part such men avoided them. It was inevitable that his failing health frustrated much that he wanted to do and the quest for a cure, or at least relief, frequently took him away from St Asaph; as early as the summer of 1674 he wrote to his friend Mutton Davies: ‘I am still drinking Tunbridge Waters in Kent, but with little success as to my health.’ By January 1678 he was wholly incapacitated: ‘I am utterly disable to performe the great Duties that lie upon me,’ he wrote to Sancroft, ‘and therefore should in conscience most willingly resign my Bishopricke […] I am not able to get to bed or rise from it without Some to helpe me, being in Continuall and vehement paine.’

According to Thomas Richards, from the late summer of 1678 Barrow was ‘seldom heard’ at St Asaph and spent lengthy periods away from the city at Park Hall (Oswestry), where he was the guest of his friends Robert (chancellor of St Asaph) and Mary Powell, and at Argoed Hall with his sister Martha. He continued to work on diocesan affairs with the assistance of his secretary, Humphrey Lloyd, but delays in sending and receiving letters were a constant

454 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/MISC/919, William Lloyd, deposition, 28 May 1687.
456 FCRO, MS D/GW/2123 (Gwysaney), Barrow to Mutton Davies, 1 August 1674. See also H.D. Emanuel, ‘The Gwysaney manuscripts’, *National Library of Wales Journal*, 7, no. 4 (1952), pp. 326-43.
frustration.459 On 14 December 1679 Barrow drew up his will. The significant changes he made to his Academic Students’ Trust deed show that his mind was still focused on the best means of spiritual and pastoral provision for the Isle of Man and this suggests that it was the Manx people, however ‘loose and vicious in their lives, [and] rude and barbarous in their behaviour’, who remained closest to his heart.460 He died at Shrewsbury on 24 June 1680, aged sixty-seven.461

Conclusion

In effect Barrow’s episcopate in the Isle of Man spanned nearly sixteen years, not six. The people of his tiny diocese had secured a place in his affections despite, or perhaps because of, the wretched condition in which he found them in 1663, and he did all that he could to better their lives and souls, above all in providing them with a comprehensive system of education, with schooling for every child as its foundation.

In St Asaph he achieved much less and his episcopate was not of the order of his celebrated predecessor William Morgan, yet he contributed much to the diocese in regularising its administration and finances, saving the fabric of the cathedral and palace, and improving the lot of some of the clergy. Many of the poor and needy, too, benefited from his generosity and care. He could no longer rely on the support of Charles Stanley and the civil powers he had exercised as governor in the Isle of Man to expedite his plans, however, and his resources were dissipated by ongoing problems of language, dissent, geography and the financial insecurity of the diocese. Although he managed to re-establish a diocesan school in the cathedral, the foundation of his grammar school was long delayed; and in marked contrast to his success in the Isle of Man, for the majority of poor children across the diocese who lacked schools of any kind he did nothing. His declining health more than any other factor increasingly limited his service in St Asaph, but it is difficult to conclude otherwise than that the pastoral and social benefits of his episcopate in Wales were a pale shadow of all that he achieved in the Isle of Man.

459 Bodl, Tanner MS 146.40, Barrow to Henry Compton, 18 March 1679.
460 MNH MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, p. 304.
461 Hoy, Isaac Barrow, pp. 80-82.
Chapter 6

Isaac Barrow and the royalist circles in Cambridge and Oxford

‘A fellow sufferer with [. . .] many of the brightest lights of the English church’ – John Keble

Introduction

This chapter explores Isaac Barrow’s upbringing, education and academic life before 1663. It examines the influences that informed his royalist outlook and unwavering support for the beliefs and practices of the old church, and then suggests how he came to adopt radical strategies in addressing the problems he found in the Isle of Man. His close friendship with a number of the more enlightened Restoration bishops and senior churchmen, most notably John Barwick, Peter Gunning and Seth Ward, may well have played a significant part in helping to shape his reforming ideas, particularly in the provision of schools, and this is explored in some depth.

This chapter also considers how the tension between his reserved, autocratic personality and conservative values on the one hand, and his compassionate understanding of the needs of the people he served on the other, may have helped to force the pace and pragmatism of his programme for change and assured its success. Much of the evidence considered is inferential, since none of Barrow’s private correspondence in the period has come to light.

Spinney Abbey, Cambridgeshire (c.1613-29)

Isaac Barrow was born in c.1613 in St Sepulchre’s parish in the city of Cambridge.462 His father, who was educated at Trinity, Cambridge, and Middle Temple, pursued a successful career of forty years as a lawyer and justice of the peace for Cambridgeshire; his godfather was Stephen Perse, fellow of Gonville and Caius, and a surgeon licensed by the university.463 His childhood was spent in the family home at Spinney Abbey, a substantial farm on well

462 BL, Harl. MS 7047 (Thomas Baker), p. 269r. There is no record of Barrow’s baptism.
463 TNA, Wills PROB 11/126/538, 29 November 1615, fol. 244r: ‘to Isaac Barrowe my godson £20’.
drained land between Soham and Wicken Meres. Here he would have learned at first hand the value of land resources, experience which would stand him in good stead forty years later when he chose the best farms of south Malew for his endowments in the Isle of Man.

Although Spinney Abbey is ten miles from Cambridge, his father’s responsibilities as justice of the peace and his professional work in the law ensured that the family in which Barrow grew up was not narrow or parochial in outlook and interests, nor was it isolated from the wider affairs of county and state. His father was a man of considerable standing; the farm at Spinney Abbey reflected his financial security, and since the key to his success was the good education he had received he doubtless wished the same for his children. It is most likely that young Isaac attended the Perse in Cambridge, a ‘grammar free school’ endowed by Stephen Perse and established in 1618 by Barrow senior, with ‘three University esquire bedels’ and three aldermen. The school’s trustees were fellows of Gonville and Caius and, in accordance with Perse’s will, free and fee-paying scholars were accepted. From the outset the school appears to have been well administered and under Thomas Lovering it gained a good reputation. Barrow’s name does not appear in the school’s records, which are incomplete, but since his father and Perse had been close friends it is not unreasonable to speculate that he was probably one of the Perse’s early boarding scholars. When in later life he planned to establish new grammar schools successively in his two dioceses his vision may well have reflected his experience as a boy sitting at Lovering’s feet.

Although evidence of Barrow’s early life remains sparse, a picture emerges of some of the influences that helped to mould his character and shape his attitudes and beliefs. The Barrows held strong high church and royalist convictions which were increasingly at odds with contemporary opinion in Cambridgeshire and East Anglia. Yet there are intriguing clues to other dimensions which in due time were reflected in Barrow’s life and achievements. Most significant is evidence in the lives of some members of the Barrow family of strong independence of mind and a willingness to venture beyond the cautious boundaries of accepted convention in politics and society. Barrow’s father demonstrated such high-

---


principled determination in a confrontation with royal agents commissioned to make
enclosures in the southern reaches of the Fens in the late 1630s; when a group of Wicken
commoners broke down new works in 1638 he dealt leniently with them in court: ‘Mr
Barrowe Justice if the Peace [. . .] did not commit them, nor bind them over to answere their misdemeaners’. 466 It is interesting to reflect that in resisting the royal prerogative exercised
by the ‘Gentlemen Adventurers’, Barrow senior found himself on the same side as another
opponent of the enclosures: ‘Mr Cromwell of Ely had undertaken [. . .] to hold the drainers in
suit of law for five years, and that in the meantime they [the commoners] should enjoy every
foot of their common’. 467

Two of Barrow’s brothers showed similar independence and resourcefulness in their
willingness to break the mould of expectation. Thomas left Wicken to seek his fortune in
London, where he led a colourful life as linen-draper at the court of Charles I, and the
prospect of advancement drew Philip away to the naval dockyard in Chatham, where he
became a close friend of Samuel Pepys. 468 It seems likely that Barrow’s nephew Thomas also
sought out an adventurous life abroad and settled in Barbados in about 1680 (taking with him
a bequest he received in his uncle’s will). 469

The Barrows of Spinney Abbey were well-educated, hard-working, resilient and resourceful,
and there is good evidence, too, that they were men of high principle and independent mind.
Isaac Barrow shared these qualities, invaluable strengths when he came to tackle the
challenges of public office and institute his reforms.

Peterhouse and the royalist circle in Cambridge (1629-44)

In the summer of 1629 Barrow left Wicken for Cambridge where, on 6 July, at the age of
sixteen, he was admitted to Peterhouse as a commoner. The ethos and expectations of his
family and education, wherever it was received, had prepared him well. He was from the

466 TNA, SP dom. 16/375 and 16/395: cited in Keith Lindley, *Fenland Riots and the English Revolution*
467 Sir William Dugdale, *A Short View of the Late Troubles in England, etc.* (London & Oxford: Moses Pitt,
1681), p. 460.
468 Thomas Barrow’s son Isaac became the first Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, Master of Trinity College,
Cambridge, and tutor to Isaac Newton.
469 Francis W. Cheesman, *Isaac Newton’s Teacher* (Victoria, B.C., Canada: Trafford, 2005), p. 115; TNA, Wills
PROB 11/363/622, fol. 413⁷.
outset a diligent and discerning scholar: he became a Bible-clerk and Blithe Scholar in 1630; a year later he won a Perne Scholarship and was appointed college librarian. Barrow spent fifteen years at Peterhouse, a small college with a membership of about eighty when he matriculated. His choice of college is no surprise; the master and fellows, Laudians vigorously opposed to Puritanism, espoused the royalist cause in the growing political struggles of the day. East Anglia, the city of Cambridge and much of the university was for Oliver Cromwell, but Barrow, like his father and family at Spinney Abbey, was firmly loyal to the king, and his high churchmanship complemented his political inclinations. Cambridge was an uneasy place for a man of the king’s party, but at Peterhouse Barrow was among like-minded colleagues and friends, some of whom influenced his thinking in formulating ideas which would come to play an important part in his later life.

Matthew Wren was Master of Peterhouse when Barrow arrived. He was ‘active, indefatigable, and clear-headed’, according to Thomas Walker, and ‘the College enjoyed under his direction an era of marked prosperity’. He extended the Perne Library, and built new chambers and a chapel, which for the society’s young royalists was the jewel in their college’s crown. Barrow undoubtedly benefited from his association with Wren, who combined high academic standards with practical administrative skills. Wren’s building programme could not have been achieved without sufficient funds. When Barrow faced similar challenges in later years he was no less successful in finding the money to finance his plans, expertise which he gained at Peterhouse. As Perne librarian, too, he developed an appreciation of the value of a well-ordered library, which he later provided for his academic students in the Isle of Man. (Figure 13)

In 1634 Wren was succeeded as master by John Cosin, a high churchman who had earlier been the target of a notable attack by William Prynne. Financial constraints frustrated
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470 Barrow matriculated as a Peterhouse pensioner in 1631 and graduated the following year. He was ordained in Peterborough cathedral on 18 December 1641.
471 Thomas A. Walker, Admissions to Peterhouse (Cambridge: CUP, 1906/12), p. 103; Peterhouse Library, Old Register.
472 Wren’s chapel was dedicated on 17 March 1632.
473 See Peterhouse archives, Old Register: Wren ‘excited the Scholars to Constancy and Diligence in their studies […] rescued their writings and ancient records from dust and worms and by indefatigable industry digested them into good method and order’.
474 Forty years later Barrow became a generous benefactor of the Perne Library.
475 Wren became successively bishop of Hereford, Norwich and Ely. See William Prynne, A Brief Survey and Censure of Mr Cozens His Couzening Devotions (London: 1628), pp. 3-4, 10-11, 98-104.
Figure 13 – Peterhouse, Cambridge, with Wren’s new chapel (centre), by David Loggan, c. 1690.
Cosin’s hopes of continuing Wren’s building plans, but he was able to complete improvements to the new chapel which incorporated provocative Arminian features. The style of his chapel services aroused Puritan hostility: ‘In Peterhouse Chappel there was a glorious new Altar set up [. . .] Divers Schollers of other houses usually resorted thither [. . .] to leare and practise the Popish ceremonies and orders used in the Chappell’.

Cosin cared little that Peterhouse had become so out of step with the Puritan majority in the city and university, and it seems that he and the members of the college were happy to flout expectations of conformity, provoking Lucy Hutchinson to describe the college as ‘noted above all the Towne for popish superstitious practices’.

Barrow was elected to a fellowship at Peterhouse in 1635. Cosin insisted on the highest standards of discipline among undergraduates and fellows alike, and the emphasis on scholarship and study espoused by both Wren and Cosin clearly struck a chord with Barrow; collegiate life in the small society at Peterhouse, far removed from the bustle and distractions of the city, was convivial and secure.

In the political arena the rift between Charles I and parliament gathered pace, however, and the overwhelming victory of the Scottish Covenanters in 1638, the intemperate adventures of the ‘Bishops Wars’, and the impeachment of Strafford and Laud severely weakened the king’s party. As the consequences reached out across the kingdom Peterhouse, already a Puritan target, became irrevocably embroiled in the growing turmoil. Cosin was impeached early in 1641, and the fellows faced a hostile civic administration in the city and university, where colleges with royalist sympathies increasingly suffered the consequences of their minority.

On Michaelmas Day 1641 Barrow took on for a year the responsibility of ordering the college’s income and expenditure. The computus roll of 1641 to 1642 records the accounts in three divisions, college, library and chapel, and differentiates between ‘certain’ (annually recurring) and ‘uncertain’ (for example, repairs to buildings) income and expenditure; it is especially significant that income from a specific source was designated for a particular expenditure, not subsumed into one general account. Barrow used the procedure again when he acted as bursar of Eton during his fellowship in the early 1660s. This accounting method was not new, but it was efficient and its straightforward logic must have appealed to him.

476 BL, Harley MS 7019, fol. 71; Walker, Admissions to Peterhouse, pp. 104-05.
478 Walker, Admissions to Peterhouse, p. 106.
may have known of influential contemporary accounting publications like Dafforne’s *The merchant’s mirrour* (1635) and Collins’s *An introduction to merchants accounts* (1653 and 1664), but it was the old principles of accounting which he would use successfully in funding his diocesan endowments in the Isle of Man and, to a lesser extent, in St Asaph.479 (Figure 14)

The Peterhouse *computus* roll is a formulaic document giving no hint of the events that unfolded during Barrow’s year as bursar, which began with the king’s flight to York. From there he wrote to Richard Holdsworth, vice-chancellor of Cambridge, to request ‘the assistance of our good subjects for our necessary defence’.480 The university gave nothing, but a handful of colleges with royalist sympathies, including Peterhouse, responded; a loose paper found in the Peterhouse treasury records:

July 2, 1642. – It was ordered this day by ye M[aste]r and all ye fellowes then att home yt ye M[aste]r lending one hundred pound for his M[ajes]tyes use, and ye College chest fourty, yt threescore pound borrowed for ye same use, in ye name of ye fellowes, for w[hi]ch ye fellowes have given security, shall be payed by all ye fellowes out of their next dividend.481

The king wrote again from Leicester on 24 July requesting the colleges to send him their silver, supposedly for safekeeping.482 In mid-August the Peterhouse fellows duly despatched their silver and plate, with that of Jesus, Queens’ and St John’s, escorted by John Barwick, one of Isaac Barrow’s friends, and Barnabas Oley.483

The confusion surrounding subsequent events is matched by conflicting versions in royalist and parliamentary records. A footnote to a St John’s inventory records: ‘This moneys and Plate, together with that from other Colleges, was sent to the King at Nottingham, guarded by

---

479 See M.F. Bywater and B.S. Yamey (eds), *Historic Accounting Literature* (London: Scolar Press, 1982), pp. 96-98, 105-07. None of the new publications on accounting methods were acceded to the Peterhouse or Eton libraries in the seventeenth century: Roger Lovatt (Peterhouse, emeritus fellow and college archivist), pers. comm., 7 August 2013; Lucy Gwynn (Eton College, acting librarian), pers. comm., 9 August 2013.


Figure 14 – Peterhouse *computus* roll for Barrow’s year as bursar (1641-42).
[...] Barnaby Oley [...], who passing thro’ by paths in the night, escap’d Oliver Cromwell, who [...] lay in wait to have intercepted it. According to John Varley, who rejects the accounts of Barwick and Clarendon as royalist propaganda, Cromwell’s musketeers successfully intercepted the fugitives and confiscated everything, but Antonia Fraser writes of ‘a furious foray in the quiet lanes of East Anglia’, and Clive Holmes cites ‘parliamentarian’ accounts which suggest that Oley and Barwick found unguarded by-roads and delivered their cargo safely to the king.

For Cromwell and Walton the issue of the royalist colleges’ response to the king’s request was straightforward: by sending their plate the fellows were openly defying parliament and betraying the duty placed in them as trustees to preserve the integrity of their college’s foundation and inheritance. In the event the affair sparked far more controversy than might have been expected, as the romance with which posterity has coloured the chase through the Cambridgeshire countryside reflects. There is no reference to these adventures in Barrow’s computus roll, nor elsewhere in the Peterhouse archives, but it was a spectacular act of defiance which must have given much satisfaction to the Peterhouse fellows, who would have approved Barwick’s triumphalist claim that they had acted justly, ‘Lest our Plate should become a bait to have our Libraries rifled, our Colledges pulled down, and perhaps our throats cut’. Barrow was a central player in this dangerous affair and it no doubt brought his name to the watchful attention of parliamentary agents.

The safe arrival of the college plate in Nottingham aroused fury in parliament. Cromwell was empowered to seize control of Cambridge and in the spring of the following year ejections began. Cosin was the first victim; John Walker recorded his ejection ‘by a Warrant from the E[arl]. of Manchester, Dated Mar. 13, 1643; and was the very first Person of this University that I find Turned out’. A month later Lazarus Seaman, a London Presbyterian,

484 BL, Harl. MS 7047 (Thomas Baker), p. 207.  
487 John Barwick, *Querela*, pp. 3-4.  
was installed as master, seven fellows were ejected, and Barrow and the remaining royalist minority suffered the imposition of new fellows intruded by parliament.

Peterhouse had been Barrow’s home for fourteen years and he would have found the loss of his friends and the changes imposed on his college hard to bear. He might have found some kinship with Seaman, who was an able scholar, but, according to Thomas Walker, ‘he was unmannerly, crafty, avaricious, and a thorough-going petty tyrant’. His high-handed conduct of college affairs incurred the wrath of Charles Hotham, who claimed that he treated the fellows ‘like School-boyes’ in pursuing his own political agenda with ‘a constant tenor of close dissimulation and greedy inventiveness’. Furthermore his implacable opposition to high churchmanship flew in the face of all Barrow stood for. The outlook was increasingly gloomy: the city was fortified, bridges were demolished, university and college property was damaged, academic activities were disrupted and student numbers fell. The townsfolk took advantage of the university’s weakness to try to break its dominance in the city and the whole sorry situation was aggravated by a severe outbreak of typhus.

In September 1643 the Solemn League and Covenant was signed for parliament by John Pym. The consequences of its rejection of the authority and tradition of the episcopal church were quickly apparent in Cambridge, where reform of the university began in earnest. One of its most implacable opponents was Barrow’s close friend, Peter Gunning, fellow of Clare and curate of Little St Mary’s. Gunning used his pulpit to urge the university to publish a condemnation of the Covenant, but when the convocation refused he convened a secret meeting of a small group of Cambridge friends to prepare an independent challenge to the Covenanters. Peter Barwick’s account of the way the treatise was written is taken from his brother’s description of the proceedings:

They who joined in the writing of this Paper, besides Mr Barwick, and Mr William Lacy of St John’s College, were Mr Isaac Barrow of Peter House; Mr Seth Ward of Sidney College; Mr Edmund Baldero, and Mr William Quarles of Pembroke Hall, and

---

that incomparable Disputant against the Schismaticks Mr Peter Gunning of Clare-Hall, each of whom undertook his particular Share of this wicked Covenant to confute, and bringing his Part of the Work to Mr Gunning’s Chamber, there they all conferr’d and agreed upon the whole.493

Barwick does not describe how Gunning organised the collaboration and no individual attribution is given, but the treatise is of interest since it contains the only public writing from Barrow’s pen before 1663 that has come to light. The language is, for the most part, moderate, and the arguments, often citing scriptural references, are logical and measured.494 It contrasts markedly with Barwick’s Querela, which stridently lambasts the Cambridge sequestrators and their leader, ‘a decay’d Hatter [Stephen Fortune], Plunder-Master Generall, who (together with a Conventicling Barber and a Confiding Taylor) hath full Commission [. . .] to Lord over us, and dispose of our goods as they please’.495

The title page claims that the treatise was ‘published by command’ and printed by the university printer, Leonard Lichfield, but it was not authorised by the convocation.496 It was far too provocative even for Richard Holdsworth, the royalist vice-chancellor, to allow the university ‘to give their publique Approbation to this Writing, by confirming it in a general Congregation of the whole Body’.497 Barrow and Gunning arranged the first print-run, presumably by Lichfield, but parliamentary agents got wind of it, raided the press and burned most of the copies. Before a second print could be organised Gunning was ‘expelled from the University of Cambridge for preaching a Sermon in St Mary’s against the Covenant, as well as for the refusing the Covenant’.498

Barrow was still at Peterhouse on 15 December 1643 when his nephew Isaac was admitted as a pensioner. It was clear by now, however, that the final evictions could not be far off, and in this uneasy state the college suffered what must have seemed to Cosin’s men its greatest indignity when the chapel, ‘so dressed up and ordered so ceremoniously, that it hath become

493 Peter Barwick, John Barwick, pp. 36-40.
494 John Barwick, Disquisitions, p. 2.
496 John Barwick et al., Certain Disquisitions and Considerations Representing to the conscience the Unlawfulness of the Oath (Oxford: 1644). The cover of the British Library copy has a handwritten annotation, ‘said to be written by ye universitie of Cambridge’, and giving the date ‘Aprill 17th’.
497 John Barwick, Querela, p. 7.
498 Peter Barwick, John Barwick, pp. 34-36 n., quoting from Gunning’s Journal, ‘not yet lodged in the Library of St John’s College’. There is no record that this journal was deposited in St John’s College Library and there is no trace of it in the Thomas Baker transcripts.
the gaze of the University’, became the first target of William ‘Basher’ Dowsing’s iconoclastic zeal.\textsuperscript{499} Less than a fortnight later, on 3 January 1644, Barrow was expelled. He was almost the last to go of the twenty-two royalist fellows, ‘all of [whom], except Dr. Francis, a Physician, were turned out’.\textsuperscript{500} Five days later Barrow’s nephew won a scholarship to Peterhouse, but with the loss of his uncle’s patronage he withdrew and was later admitted to Trinity.\textsuperscript{501}

Barrow and Gunning managed to smuggle a copy of the treatise out of Cambridge to London, where a second print-run was completed. Its impact was immediate; it polarised opinion and prompted vigorous debate, in which one of the most forceful participants was Lazarus Seaman.\textsuperscript{502} No doubt the provenance, in part, of the treatise in Peterhouse gave extra urgency to his determination to denounce it. By the time it was published, however, its contributors were scattered across the country; Barrow and Gunning had reached Oxford, Barwick, Boldero and Ward were in London (Boldero detained as a prisoner), Quarles was in Cambridge and Lacy was with Prince Rupert’s army. The anonymity of the treatise was no more than a token. Their identity could not be long concealed and they were marked men.

**New College and the royalist circle in Oxford (1644-46)**

On 22 January 1644, after a year of shifting fortunes in the first civil war, Charles I summoned a parliament in his Oxford headquarters. He had high hopes that it would turn the course of events, but it was compromised, according to Sir Edward Dering, ‘by a secret Juncto of Popishe lie affected counsels, who continually crossed the designes of the moderate partie about the King’. Within two weeks Dering had had enough of Oxford and its ‘Mongrel’ parliament and, ‘fully convinced that the Enemie seeks all possible waies to destroy the libertie of the Subject involved in Parliaments’, he returned to London.\textsuperscript{503} Shortly before Dering’s departure, Barrow and Gunning, ‘his great companion and fellow-sufferer’,

\textsuperscript{499} BL, Harl. MS 7019, fol. 71.
\textsuperscript{501} Isaac Barrow (1630-77), Barrow’s nephew, became Cambridge University’s first Lucasian Professor of Mathematics, Master of Trinity, a founding member of the Royal Society and tutor to Isaac Newton. See Hoy, *Isaac Barrow*, pp. 24-26, 75.
\textsuperscript{502} See, for example, Richard Overton (‘Martin Mar-Priest’), *Divine observations upon the London ministers’ letter against toleration* (London: 1646), p. 3; Lazarus Seaman, *Solomon’s choice: or a president for kings and princes, and all that are in authority* (London: 25 September 1644), p. 45.
made their escape from Cambridge.\textsuperscript{504} The journey was not without hazard; Barrow’s involvement in smuggling the Peterhouse treasure to the king and Gunning’s public hostility to parliament put both men at risk from Cromwell’s agents. Furthermore, the subversive treatise against the Covenant was hidden in their panniers as they made their way to London, and thence to Oxford. But they reached Oxford safely, and were appointed college chaplains by Robert Pinke, warden of New College, where they were provided with board and lodging. There, with other ejected scholars, they were given a convivial sanctuary for the next two years.\textsuperscript{505}

Barrow and Gunning found themselves in a city increasingly under siege. The academic life of the university had to a great extent been suspended: the number of undergraduates fell, few lectures were given, degrees were awarded without ceremony, and colleges saw their incomes fall as it became impossible to collect rents. New College was by reputation ‘for the most part easy-going and indolent’. Anthony Wood reflected later in a scathing retrospect that it was long overdue for reform, its fellows ‘much given to drinking and gaming and vain brutish pleasure. They degenerate in learning’.\textsuperscript{506} If this was what Barrow experienced when he took up residence he would have found it an unwelcome contrast to the scholarly tone of Peterhouse. New College did not escape the exigencies of the time, however; it was commandeered as the king’s arsenal, and its plate was coined in the royal mint at New Hall Inn.

Gunning was awarded an Oxford degree not long after his arrival, but, according to Anthony Wood, ‘whether Mr Barrow was, or took any other degree, it appears not in the public Register’. No records of Barrow’s time at New College have survived. What happened to Gunning, however, is well documented and Barrow may have had similar adventures. While continuing as chaplain at New College, Gunning served for two years as curate of Cassington, four miles outside Oxford near Woodstock, where ‘he endured several affronts and abuses by the Parliamentarian Soldiers [. . .] either by interrupting him with base Language, or by pulling him out of the Church’.\textsuperscript{507}

\textsuperscript{504} Wood, \textit{Athenae}, IV, p. 140.
\textsuperscript{505} Keble, \textit{Wilson}, I, p. 133.
\textsuperscript{507} Wood, \textit{Athenae}, IV, p. 140.
As royalist fortunes ebbed and flowed, conditions in Oxford became increasingly wretched until, on 24 June 1646, the remnants of the king’s armies surrendered to parliament. The implacable hostility towards Cromwell that the university had shown inevitably led to a purge of royalist sympathisers, and a parliamentary visitation of New College in May 1648 resulted in the expulsion of almost the entire society. Among those listed was Richard Sherlock, who had become one of Barrow’s closest friends, but of Barrow and Gunning the register makes no mention. Both had pre-empted the parliamentary purge, making their escape from Oxford shortly after the fall of the royal garrison.

‘From place to place’ (1646-60)

For Barrow, ‘a fellow-sufferer’, according to Keble, ‘with [...] many other of the brightest lights in the English Church’, there was little choice but to seek out a quiet retirement in Cambridgeshire.\(^{508}\) On 23 July 1646 Barrow took the lease of the rectory of Burwell St Andrew not far from his childhood home, but, with his friends from Oxford and Cambridge dispersed across the country, Spinney Abbey lost and his parents dead, the future must have seemed gloomy.\(^{509}\) Barrow would have found solace through the first difficult years of the *interregnum* in the companionship of his extended family and friends in Wicken and Burwell, but in June 1651 shadows were cast again when the university re-possessed the Burwell rectories, the forfeiture leaving Barrow once again without a home.\(^{510}\) Since he had come prominently to the notice of the parliamentarians for his ostentatious support for the king, especially as co-author of the treatise against the Covenant, he had no choice but to live quietly and keep out of the public eye. According to Anthony Wood, when ‘the garrison of Oxford was surrendred [Barrow] shifted afterwards from place to place, and suffered with the rest of the loyal and orthodox Clergy, till the most blessed Return of King Charles II’.\(^{511}\)

If, as this enigmatic reference hints, Barrow was not willing or able to remain in Cambridgeshire, it is interesting to speculate where he might have gone. Some of his contemporaries went abroad; John Bargrave travelled to Italy where he met four ‘revolters to...
the Roman Church’ who had been fellows at Peterhouse, while other Cambridge exiles were
drawn to Hyde’s royalist faction in Paris.\textsuperscript{512} Perhaps Barrow crossed the Channel to join or at
least visit some of these kindred spirits, and if he did so he may have met up with his brother
Thomas and nephew Isaac. Others remained quietly in England, where there were
opportunities for private employment for those who lacked independent means. Barrow may
have been among those, described by his contemporary Thomas Fuller, who ‘betook
themselves to the painfull profession of School-Master; no calling, which is honest, being
disgracefull, especially to such, who for their conscience sake, have deserted a better
condition’.\textsuperscript{513} Barrow was thirty-eight in 1651 when he lost Burwell. Of his fortunes for the
next nine years, until he was recalled to favour in 1660, no records have come to light.

\textbf{Eton College (1660-63)}

Richard Cromwell’s resignation in May 1659 signalled the end of the Protectorate. By
November Lazarus Seaman, the intruded master of Peterhouse, had gone. According to
Thomas Walker, ‘[he] showed himself an arbitrary, avaricious and nepotistic tyrant’, and the
foundation had not fared well under him.\textsuperscript{514} After some months of confusion the earl of
Manchester restored to their fellowships the college’s four surviving members, Isaac Barrow
(the first to return on 20 June), John Bargrave, Robert Tyrringham and finally John Cosin,
who was re-instated as master on 3 August.\textsuperscript{515} Two months later Cosin became bishop of
Durham and was succeeded by Bernard Hale, a former scholar and fellow of Peterhouse.
With the return to England of Charles II as king in May 1660 came the promise of better
things for all who had remained loyal to the royalist cause. The Peterhouse records in the
months immediately following the Restoration are incomplete, but within a short time the
fellows imposed on the college had gone, and Barrow took up residence again sixteen years
after his expulsion.

He was one of the first of the king’s loyal subjects to receive a reward. In July 1660,
following a royal request to Nicholas Monck, provost of Eton, Barrow, a man ‘of learning

\textsuperscript{513} Thomas Fuller, \textit{The History of the University of Cambridge, since the Conquest} (London: 1655).
\textsuperscript{514} Walker, \textit{Admissions to Peterhouse}, p.75.
and good deserts’, was appointed to a fellowship. This entitled him to a number of benefits, including residence, statutory allowances, a share of fines (premiums) paid by tenants renewing their leases, the gift of one of the richer college livings, and the opportunity to exercise patronage. But the post was not a sinecure. The seven fellows were responsible for administering the college’s extensive estates and overseeing its finances, they kept a weather eye on the work of the schoolmaster, usher and scholars, and they were required to preach regularly in the chapel. An Order Book minuting fellows’ meetings shows that Barrow was diligent in his attendance. Furthermore, he duly took his turn as bursar, just as he had done twenty years before at Peterhouse, and from the spring of 1662 until his appointment to the see of Sodor and Man in the summer of the following year he was vice-provost.

Apart from two short absences, when he may have been in Cambridge, Barrow spent much of his time from 1660 to 1663 at Eton. There he was able to observe at first hand the conduct and regulation of the college, and, although the fellows’ main duties lay in the administration of the estates, there were occasions when they intervened directly in the workings of the school. He was present at a meeting on 21 June 1661 when the fellows issued an instruction to the master and usher that ‘in writing times [they] shall take care that the Scholars do not wander about’. The years at Eton would have been formative in confirming Barrow’s conviction that a good education in a well ordered school was of the highest value.

In March 1663 the fellows of Peterhouse proposed Barrow as their preferred candidate to succeed Bernard Hale as master. Matthew Wren, now bishop of Ely and the college Visitor, disregarded their nomination, however, and installed Joseph Beaumont, an unexpected rejection of the fellows’ choice, not least as Barrow knew Wren well. In the event, Beaumont went on to serve as master with considerable distinction for thirty-six years.

516 Eton, MS 60/5/1/4, Charles II to Nicholas Monck, Provost, 4 July 1660; Eton, MS 60/3/4, Register 1577-1666.
517 Eton, MS 60/6/1/2, Order Book, p. 12.
518 Wren’s preference probably reflects the fact that Beaumont was his son-in-law. Barrow retained his Eton fellowship and associated sinecures until his appointment to the see of St Asaph in 1670; see Eton, MS 60/6/1/2, Order Book, p. 39; Eton, MS 60/5/1/10, Charles II to Richard Alvestree, Provost, 17 February 1669/70.
The restored episcopacy and a diocese for Barrow

The protracted campaign to abolish the episcopacy, begun in 1641, reached its conclusion in the autumn of 1646. It was a signal victory for the Covenanters which effectively consigned the episcopal church to the pages of history: it is ‘abolished, and gone’, wrote William Sheppard, ‘and not owned by our law at this day’. 519 But although no new bishops were appointed after 1644, some were still there when the Commonwealth crumbled away, and so was the old church. Henry Hammond wrote: ‘The Church of England is not invisible; it is still preserved in bishops and presbyters rightly ordained, and multitudes rightly baptized, none of which have fallen off from their profession.’ 520

One of the central pillars of Hyde’s policies during the years of exile on the continent was the preservation of the episcopacy as the key to eventual restoration of the old church, and, despite his exasperation at the weakness of the bishops who remained in office, he could still write in 1658: ‘I hope it will not be said I seek to justify a church which is not, for the truth and righteousness whereby it was a church, are the same as they ever were.’ 521 Two years later his endeavours came to fruition, and in the process of filling all the vacant bishoprics leading Presbyterians like Lazarus Seaman played into Hyde’s hands by standing aloof from the negotiations: ‘Dr Seaman’s party meddled not with them’, wrote Richard Baxter. 522 Seaman and others of his party failed to foresee how swiftly their aspirations would be foiled, with the consequence, as Richard Bosher notes, that ‘Without exception, the vacant bishoprics of importance were bestowed on leaders of the Laudian party’. 523 By the end of 1661 all had been filled and, with the first Convocations, the Savoy Conference and the Act of Uniformity long past, Hyde had the satisfaction of bringing to a successful conclusion the re-establishment of the old church in its entirety.

A number of Barrow’s friends gained high advancement in the church or universities after the Restoration, but for a time it seemed that his modest Eton fellowship would be Barrow’s lot.

519 William Sheppard, An Epitome of all the Laws and Statutes of this Nation concerning the Service of God or Religion (1655), p. 78.
In the event a higher call came two years later with Charles Stanley’s offer of the see of Sodor and Man.

Friends and factions – Peter Gunning and the Cambridge circle

Some insight into influences which may have helped to frame Barrow’s values and ideas may be found in his relationship with friends and associates during his time at Cambridge. Most notable among these are Peter Gunning, John Barwick and Seth Ward.

Gunning was Barrow’s exact contemporary and became his closest friend at Cambridge. His college, Clare, was, like Peterhouse, a royalist society, and when Cosin appointed Gunning curate of Little St Mary’s in 1635 it was serving as the pro-chapel for Peterhouse. Gunning was a determined opponent of the parliamentarians and used his pulpit to denounce all who rejected episcopal authority; his friend Humphrey Gower recorded: ‘In a Sermon preach’d before the University in St Maries Church in Cambridge, He urged them vehemently and convincingly [. . .] to publish a formal Protestation against the Rebellious League’. He failed to carry the convocation, but continued his campaign until the university expelled him in May 1643. He managed to remain in Cambridge for some months after his expulsion, however, and it was his initiative to invite Barrow, John Barwick and the other conspirators to secret meetings during the summer of 1643 to prepare their attack on the Covenant.

After the adventure of their flight from Cambridge, Gunning remained in Oxford with Barrow at New College until the summer of 1646. It is not difficult to follow his subsequent movements. From 1656 he was at Exeter House Chapel in the Strand with Jeremy Taylor (who had been a scholar at the Perse, probably with Barrow), where their ‘Popular Assembly’ maintained the proscribed traditions of the old church. They were often harassed; John Evelyn recorded an incident on Christmas Day in 1657 when the eucharist was disrupted by Edward Whalley and William Goffe, ‘men of high flight [who] held their muskets against us, as if they would have shot us at the Altar’. Gunning bore every trial and would not be turned aside from his ‘pious and restless endeavours for the benefit of the

525 Peter Barwick, John Barwick p. 40.
526 Wood, Athenae, IV, p. 140.
Gunning acquired the reputation of one of the foremost defenders of church and monarchy, and his advancement after the Restoration was rapid. He was chosen by Charles II as one of the non-episcopal delegates to the Savoy Conference, where his opponent Richard Baxter described him as ‘their forwardest and greatest Speaker; understanding well what belonged to a Disputant; a Man of greater Study and Industry than any of them [. . .] and of a ready Tongue; (and I hear and believe, of a very temperate life)’. In the 1660s Gunning successively held two Cambridge divinity professorships (Lady Margaret and Regius) and the masterships of Corpus Christi and St John’s. He was a consummate scholar, and his reputation as a formidable debater, preacher and teacher is reflected in Anthony Wood’s claim that he was ‘the fittest man [. . .] to settle the university right in their principles again’.

In 1670 he became bishop of Chichester, and in 1675 bishop of Ely, where he remained until his death in 1684.

Anthony Wood commended Gunning’s generosity to the poor, his support for needy clergy and scholars, and his augmentation of impoverished impropriations. His beneficence, and the practical measures he took to improve endowments and support education, had much in common with Barrow’s endeavours in the Isle of Man. Already the strongest of friends, the circumstances of their time in Oxford threw them together even more, and after the Restoration it is reasonable to suppose that they met again at Chichester and Ely. It is unfortunate that none of their private correspondence seems to have survived.

John Barwick’s life is documented by his brother Peter, and his political and religious views, often expressed in combative language, are well represented in his Querela. A Westmorland man and exact contemporary of Barrow, he made his high church and royalist sympathies well known throughout his time at Cambridge, and his role in provocative adventures like the conveyance of college treasures to the king made him an obvious target for parliamentary reprisal. Barwick pre-empted any action against him by leaving Cambridge for London towards the end of 1643 before the visitations. He ‘long conceal’d himself in that great City’.

---

528 Gower, Discourse in Two Sermons, p.18.
530 Wood, Athenae, IV, p. 142.
531 There are no records of correspondence between Barrow and Gunning in the archives of Ely Cathedral or Lambeth Palace.
according to his brother, and there ‘he had the Management of the King’s Affairs, and as a secret Spy, carried on a private Correspondence betwixt London and Oxford’. After the fall of Oxford he ran messages to the government in exile, until his luck ran out when ‘one Bostock, a poor-spirited artificial Fellow, [. . .] treacherously delivered up both the Brothers [. . .] into the hands of the Rebels’. Following a period of imprisonment he stayed with his biographer brother in London, and from there resumed correspondence with Hyde in Paris, much of which concerned plans to preserve the old church. After the resignation of Richard Cromwell, Barwick played a key role in negotiations for the king’s return, travelling to Breda on behalf of the surviving bishops to inform the waiting government of the current state of the church.

Barwick’s first reward for his loyal service came late in 1660 when he was appointed dean of Durham. The king wanted to raise him to the see of Carlisle, but Peter Barwick makes much of his brother’s reluctance to accept advancement ‘lest he should seem to some (such was his great Modesty) to have a little gratified his own Ambition [. . .] in his Endeavours to preserve the Episcopal Succession among us’. Furthermore, Barwick had already acceded to a request from the Countess of Derby to decline the diocese of Sodor and Man. Late in 1661 he was appointed dean of St Paul’s, but his health, seriously impaired in the weeks leading up to his betrayal in 1650, broke down, and his effective tenure in the city lasted little more than a year. Barwick maintained a close friendship with Gunning throughout his life; he made a bequest to him in his will (as Barrow did), and Gunning gave the sermon at Barwick’s funeral in October 1664. Even allowing for some excess in Peter Barwick’s biography, the picture of John Barwick that emerges is one of a bold and resourceful champion of royalist politics and the old church, a scholarly yet pragmatic academic, and a determined advocate of the benefits of education. In his will he made substantial gifts to his old school, Sedbergh, ‘to buy good useful Schoole bookes’, and to St John’s, Cambridge, ‘for buying bookes to their library’. During his short time at Durham he established a grammar school and acted ‘with a most holy Zeal, both to bring all the Officers of the Church under good Discipline, and to a regular Life, and to augment the Stipends and salaries of the poorer Sort, not only of the

533 ibid, p. 301.
534 LCRO, DDCA 19/13, Will of John Barwick (21 October 1664)
Mother Church, but of all the Churches which depended upon it. The list reads remarkably like Barrow’s achievements in the Isle of Man.

Evidence of Barrow’s friendship with Seth Ward after the flight from Cambridge is largely circumstantial. Ward’s contemporary biographer, Walter Pope, has little to say about his Cambridge years at Sidney Sussex (Cromwell’s college), other than to commend his accomplishment in mathematics. He refused the Covenant in the Spring of 1644, but five years later he signed, and became Astronomy Professor of Oxford. Pope makes no mention of Ward’s contribution to the treatise against the Covenant, but he undoubtedly knew about it and the omission must have been deliberate. It is surprising that Ward was not compromised by the affair, but at Oxford he carefully avoided politics. Pope never doubts Ward’s continuing loyalty to the king; Anthony Wood had other views, but Pope would have none of it: ‘The summ of what he [Wood] objects against him is, in short, this; That he was a Complyer during the Kings Exile; That he put in, and put out [...] but he was far removd from any base compliance’. The truth no doubt lies somewhere between.

While the dioceses of Exeter and Salisbury benefitted from Ward’s skills as an ecclesiastical administrator, there is also much evidence to show that he did not lose sight of the pastoral and social needs of his dioceses, and his contributions to a number of academic charitable schemes at Oxford and Cambridge (he endowed four scholarships at Christ’s, Cambridge) demonstrate a lifelong interest in university research and education, both at the universities and as a member of the Royal Society. He valued the opportunities of education and training for young people no less at the parochial level: in his will he bequeathed an endowment to his native parish of Aspenden for apprenticing poor boys. Ward arrived in Oxford two years after Barrow had left. There is no evidence that they ever met again, but they shared an interest in and advocacy of academic education, and they may well have corresponded. There is in addition one very significant link between them: Barrow’s mathematician nephew was, according to Pope, one of Ward’s closest friends.

---

536 ibid, p. 37 n.
John Keble highlighted the special significance of the situation that developed in Oxford during the later 1640s, and named in particular Henry Hammond, Robert Sanderson, Richard Sherlock and Jeremy Taylor among many ‘fellow-sufferers’ with whom Barrow spent much time: ‘It was a time which brought such men together in a way hardly possible otherwise, and [. . .] they had singular opportunities of profiting by such intercourse; of which [. . .] we reap the benefit in the revised English Prayer-book’.

Richard Sherlock, a Cheshire man, was the same age as Barrow and Gunning. He was already resident as a chaplain in New College when they arrived, and he remained there until 1648, when he followed Gunning to Cassington. There he lodged in the home of Anthony Wood, and provided Wood with valuable information about ejected members of New College, whose stories Wood later chronicled. In 1652 Sherlock became chaplain to Sir Robert Bindloss of Borwick Hall, Warton (Lancashire). Six years later Bindloss recommended him to his friend Charles Stanley, who appointed him as a chaplain at Lathom. So began Sherlock’s association with the Isle of Man; Thomas Wilson, who became bishop of Sodor and Man in 1697, was Sherlock’s nephew.

Henry Hammond, a fellow of Magdalen, made his first contribution to the debate about the authority of church and state in 1643 in a tract of which Barrow and the contributors to the treatise against the Covenant would have approved. When Barrow arrived in Oxford, Hammond was preparing for publication a pastoral work for young people. He was ‘a great releiver of the poore [and] a carefull instructor and chatechizer of youth’, and his educational ideas may have influenced Barrow. From 1650, when Puritan ascendancy appeared to signal the end of the episcopal church, Hammond kept it alive; according to Gilbert Burnet he was ‘the person that, during the bad times, had maintained the cause of the church in a very

---

541 Sherlock was educated at Magdalen and Trinity College, Dublin; he served as chaplain to a Cavalier regiment and to the Oxford garrison before Pinke invited him to take a chaplaincy at New College in 1644.
542 Bodl, Wood MS 44. 216, 218-19, Richard Sherlock, correspondence with Anthony Wood.
Hammond met Robert Sanderson and Brian Duppa at Richmond in August 1653 to discuss the preservation and use of the old Prayer Book, and he was active in consultations with Hyde, but his contribution to the settlement of the church was cut short by his death in 1660, on the first day of the Convention Parliament. Richard Baxter, though a vigorous opponent, wrote of ‘a very great loss: for his Piety and Wisdom would have hindred much of the Violence which after followed’.  

Robert Sanderson, a fellow of Lincoln and Regius Professor of Divinity, led Oxford’s opposition to the Covenant and was ejected in 1648. In 1660 he became bishop of Lincoln and was appointed to the committee charged with revising the Prayer Book. His contributions, which include the Preface, the Prayer of Humble Access and probably the prayer ‘for all sorts and conditions of men’ (in collaboration with Peter Gunning), were among the most significant changes; ‘the whole Congregation valued him’, wrote Isaak Walton, and ‘he was heard with great willingness and attention’. There is no record that he shared the direct interest in education at school or university pursued by many of his friends, but like Barrow, John Barwick and Gunning he contributed much from his own pocket to charitable works and the needs of the poor and disadvantaged.

The third of the Oxford ‘fellow sufferers’ named among Barrow’s friends by Keble was Jeremy Taylor (c.1613-67). Taylor and Barrow were probably contemporaries at the Perse in Cambridge; Taylor proceeded to Gonville and Caius in 1626, three years before Barrow entered Peterhouse. When Barrow and Gunning reached Oxford, Taylor was there as a chaplain with the royal garrison, and during the rest of 1644 they had many opportunities to meet. Whatever association there was between Barrow and Taylor came to an abrupt end early the following year, however, when, after a brief imprisonment occasioned by some provocative public writing, Taylor sought sanctuary in Wales, where he spent a short time as

---

547 Sanderson wrote Oxford’s reply to the Covenant: Robert Sanderson, Reasons of the present Judgement of the University of Oxford, concerning the Solemn League and Covenant Approved by general Consent in a full Convocation, June 1, 1647 (Oxford: 1647).
549 J. Sears McGee, ‘Sanderson, Robert (1587-1663), ODNB, 2004. Like Barrow, Sanderson was the product of a grammar school foundation (Rotherham).
550 Gray, Perse, p. 38.
551 Jeremy Taylor published a number of treatises in support of the established church, among which Of the Sacred Order and Offices of Episcopacy (London: Royston, 1647) was particularly provocative.
a school teacher. In 1657 he moved to London to join Gunning at Exeter House, where both were targets of the Council of State campaign to enforce the ban on use of the Prayer Book. Barrow would undoubtedly have been aware of what was going on and he may have met up with Taylor again through his association with Gunning. By the summer of 1658, however, Taylor was in Antrim, and in 1660 he was appointed bishop of Down and Connor. There his tolerance and desire to accommodate individual belief were in many ways exactly suited to the challenge of post-Restoration Ireland. Despite Taylor’s comparative proximity to Barrow after 1663, no evidence of correspondence between them has come to light.

Conclusion

Some of Barrow’s friends and associates who attained high office have been well served by biographers. For others where records are uneven it is not easy to assess their achievements and the way their motivation and beliefs may have developed later in their lives. The fourteen hidden years of Barrow’s life pose real puzzles for the biographer, but it is not unreasonable to assume that friendships and associations continued, and that ideas and opinions in times of controversy and intrigue were exchanged by various means. Packer’s evaluation of the ease with which Henry Hammond kept alive his friendships might equally apply to Barrow’s circumstances:

Hammond himself is a good example of how the Laudians were left alone during the Protectorate, not only to immerse themselves in their studies, but also to carry on the ordinary civilities of life. Correspondence was voluminous; friends were visited; contacts were maintained; and all the time vital theological and philosophical foundations were being laid, on which the structure of the restored church would be built.

553 Evelyn, *Diary*, II, p. 126.
554 Barrow and Taylor were not so far separated geographically, but they served in two dioceses that could not have been more different. Barrow would certainly have known and valued Taylor’s publications, not least his most celebrated work *Ductor dubitantium, or, The Rule of Conscience in all her generall measures* (London: 1660).
In the context of the network of meetings and letters which sustained the cause of the established church through the *interregnum*, it seems inconceivable that Barrow did not maintain contact with Sherlock, Hammond and Taylor, and those of his friends who would subsequently be delegates to the Savoy Conference – John Barwick, Cosin, Gunning and Sanderson.\(^557\) Barrow would have had opportunities to share with them not only his views, but also his conviction that their work was crucial to the preservation and future of the church. Keble noted particularly the importance of ‘the two friends Sherlock and Barrow’ in giving to the diocese of Sodor and Man ‘its full share of [. . .] benefit in the revised English Prayer-book’, which became one of the most important components of Barrow’s educational strategy in the Isle of Man.\(^558\)

Barrow, John Barwick, Gunning and Ward were among a number of enlightened bishops and senior clergy in the Restoration church who promoted school education as one of the surest means to achieve spiritual and moral regeneration. Their vision belies the older historiography represented by Lawrence Stone and others, which suggests that the Restoration bishops in general were at best indifferent, and often hostile, towards the provision of education. Like Charles Hoole, the reforming bishops rejected the voices of reactionaries like Cavendish, who lobbied against popular education on the grounds that it had fostered rebellion and would encourage sedition again. They founded new schools and supported them and existing foundations with scholarships; they gave new endowments to forge links with the universities; they gave books and money to establish and enhance academic libraries; and they variously reached out to the poorer classes by such means as financing apprenticeships. In much of their published writings, too, like Taylor’s *Holy Living* and Hammond’s *The Whole Duty of Man*, they taught the good practices of godly living, much as Barrow did in his letter to his clergy of March 1663/4.\(^559\) In Oxford, ‘from place to place’ during the *interregnum*, and at Eton Barrow would have been able to discuss with these friends their thinking on the great issues facing the church and its people, and to formulate the ideas for pastoral and social reform which he put in place in the Isle of Man. Barrow shared his aspirations with other Restoration bishops. That he achieved so much may

\(^{557}\) Although Cosin was in France at the royalist court in exile from 1644, Barrow could have corresponded with him.


be attributed to his friendship with Charles Stanley, his unquestioned authority as civil governor and the singularity of his small, independent diocese.

There was another area of thought and debate in which Barrow took an interest. His nephew Isaac and their mutual friend Seth Ward were founder members of the Royal Society. Throughout his life Barrow supported and engaged with his nephew’s work, and through him he would have been aware of what was going on in the contemporary world of mathematics and science, but whether this interest informed his ideas for an academic school in the Isle of Man remains a matter of speculation, since no relevant correspondence has come to light.

By the end of 1661 all the dioceses of the restored church had a bishop. Why was Barrow not one of them? He was clearly a man of considerable ability, of skill and experience in administration, of proven loyalty to the old church, and he had a small network of like-minded friends, many of whom had already attained high clerical office. Three possible reasons spring to mind: although his political and ecclesiastical stance was never compromised, his absence from any records during the *interregnum* must indicate that he was not engaged in active service for the royalist cause in the way that John Barwick was, nor did he use the pulpit or the pen provocatively as Boldero, Gunning and Hammond had done; he also lacked the patronage of powerful men like Hyde and Sancroft; and although almost nothing of his private correspondence has survived, there are clues which suggest that he found it difficult to make friends even in the circles of high academia and the church.560

This study offers new insights into Barrow’s character, and the skills and ideas which were nurtured by the circumstances of his life and the influence of his friends. He was determined, single-minded, independent and strong-willed; and he was hard-working and conscientious. In the collegiate context in which he spent more than half his life he had become used to corporate decision-making with like-minded colleagues and he developed valuable skills as an effective administrator. Other significant strengths of his character, most notably his ability to judge people and choose the right man for a task, and the apparent ease with which he balanced vision and pragmatism, and continuity and reform, emerged later. These qualities are offset by other aspects of his character, however; he was at times impatient and autocratic in his dealings with those who did not share his views, and he was clearly ill at ease among people he did not know. Yet he was also a compassionate man who was genuinely concerned

560 Bodl, Tanner MS 146.51, Barrow to William Sancroft, 22 June 1678. Barrow’s request for a living in London went unanswered. See also Bodl, Tanner MS 146.50, Barrow to Gilbert Sheldon, 23 May 1672.
for the pastoral, social and spiritual welfare of those in his care, not least the poor and disadvantaged.
Chapter 7

Barrow’s schools, 1680-1800

‘Have a special care to see that ye severall schools of this Island bee diligently kept and observed.’ – Isaac Barrow

Introduction

John Keble summarised the state of the church and education in the Isle of Man from Barrow’s departure to the beginning of Wilson’s episcopate in 1698 as a ‘discipline [that] went on impulsu remorum, in some good measure as he [Barrow] had left it. [. . .] The records bear token, as might be expected, of comparative feebleness, but enough remained to be no small encouragement to him [Wilson]’.561 Barrow’s structures for the regulation of the church and the provision of education were certainly still in place, but the reality was far gloomier than Keble’s account implies. This chapter reviews the effects on the schools of the crisis in the Manx church, reported by Governor William Sacheverell in 1695, and then considers the consolidation and development of education at all three levels in the Island in the episcopates of Wilson (1697-1755) and Hildesley (1755-72), and in the final years of the eighteenth century.562

The development of elementary schools

There is no evidence of any intervention to encourage ministers to teach the parish schools in the last two years of Bridgeman’s episcopate, nor during the short tenure of John Lake (1682-84), who seldom visited the Island.563 At the sole convocation over which Lake presided in 1683 he ordered parents to send their children and householders to send their servants to church every Sunday afternoon to receive Christian instruction, but there is no reference to the English schools and, as Hinton Bird has noted, there appear to be no recorded
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563 Caine, ‘Pages from Manx History’, IMNAS, 5, no. 1 (1946), p. 153: Lake refused to give up his incumbency in Prestwick because ‘the value of the bishopric will not compensate any great loss sustained by it’.
presentments for failing to send a child to school during Bridgeman’s or Lake’s episcopates.\textsuperscript{564}

The arrival of Baptiste Levinz, Lake’s successor, brought some prospect of renewal in church and society. In his first convocation (1685) Levinz repeated Lake’s instructions, but in addition he ordered ‘that every minister that receives augmentation, either from his majesty’s benefaction or the appropriation money, be obliged to teach an English school constantly in his respective parish, under the penalty of forfeiting his said augmentation.’\textsuperscript{565} They had to be licensed to preach and teach and he monitored their diligence by requiring ‘a certificate from the churchwardens and parishioners of […] their due performance of this injunction’. Levinz also provided licences for lay teachers appointed to the town schools or to fill the place of a suspended minister.\textsuperscript{566} He was equally aware of the problem of non-attendance and was not prepared to accept the plea of ministers who ‘complain that they are discouraged from teaching Schoole because the parishioners send not their children to them’, an excuse repeatedly recorded in Lonan, for example, towards the end of Barrow’s episcopate.\textsuperscript{567} ‘Parents of such children as are fit for the school and not sent thither,’ Levinz ordered, ‘[shall] be proceeded against according to the strictest severity of the law.’ This should have helped to consolidate Barrow’s design, but the conditional reference to ‘every minister that receives augmentation’ highlights the variable allocations from the endowments which inevitably influenced the commitment of some clergy to their parish school.\textsuperscript{568} It is significant that curates or laymen were employed not only in town schools but also in parishes like Arbory and Marown, where the clergy were suspended from duty.

Levinz’s interventions show a determination to improve standards in church and school. In some parishes responsibilities were carried out in exemplary fashion; the wardens of Santan seem to have taken particular pride in recording the diligence of their vicar, Hugh Cosnahan:

\begin{quote}
        The minister of the parish teacheth the youth of the parish their Catechism […] and keeps a scoole as Formerly hee hath done and allsoe hath given a Call in the Church
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{564} MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, convocation of 26 July 1683 (Convocation, pp. 111-12); Bird, An Island, I, p. 20.
\textsuperscript{565} Lib. Caus., convocation of 17 August 1685 (Convocation, p. 114); Charities, p. 18.
\textsuperscript{566} Lib. Caus., episcopal order, 1 September 1685: clergy paid 2s 6d for a teaching licence; lay licences cost 1s. Levinz replaced Samuel Robinson (Arbory) and Robert Fletcher (Marown) with lay teachers in 1685 and 1686 respectively.
\textsuperscript{567} Lib. Caus., Lonan, 18 July & 30 August, 1669. As late as 1700 seven Lonan parishioners were fined 2s for failing to send their children to school: Lib. Plitor. (10071/1/30), 14 October 1670.
\textsuperscript{568} Lib. Caus., convocation of 17 August 1685 (Convocation, p. 114).
to the parishioners to send there Children to the scoole and if they doe nott they shall be presented the next Court day.\footnote{Lib. Caus., Santan, 1685.}

By contrast the feckless vicar of Arbory, Samuel Robinson, ‘a person of a very scandalous and irregular life and conversation’, was ordered to ‘keep a constant Schoole either by himself or some other sufficient person in the parish for the future, or else to lose his augmentation’.\footnote{Lib. Caus., Arbory, 2 September 1685 & 21 March 1686; MNH, MS 09767/1/2, Malew register, p. 20.} Levinz also sought to regularise the allocation of the Royal Bounty for the benefit of the clergy. His attention was diverted to academic and ecclesiastical developments in England, however, and in 1689, on his appointment as a canon of Winchester, he left the Island, returning only once in the summer of 1691.\footnote{Lib. Caus., Castletown, 29 August 1685. In 1687, Levinz applied for the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford: see John Rouse Bloxam (ed.),\textit{ Magdalen College and King James II, 1686-1688: a series of documents, with additions} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1886), pp. xi-xii.}

Levinz’s efforts to re-invigorate the parochial schools had little lasting effect. In the vacancy (effectively from 1689) every part of diocesan life suffered and it was no compensation for the absence of a spiritual leader that the accumulated episcopal income would be available for later use.\footnote{Moore,\textit{ History}, I, p. 485.} The lack of a bishop threw into stark relief five weaknesses which compromised the whole school system: the funds Barrow had secured to pay the augmented stipends of the clergy who taught the schools had become increasingly unreliable; no provision had been made to fund the town schools in Castletown, Douglas and Ramsey; some clergy were far less competent and committed to their charge than others; most schools were taught only for part of the year; and many hard-pressed families were reluctant to spare children from agricultural or domestic labour.

The funding problem was the most pressing. For extended periods the Royal Bounty had not been paid and the impropriate tithe income was too small to service the multiple claims for which it had become the sole provider. Sacheverell wrote to Thomas Tenison, archbishop of Canterbury, in 1696:

\begin{quote}
At my coming over I found the ancient cathedral down, several churches ruinous, and [the income] infinitely short of the real and pressing necessities of the clergy of the place [who] here so absolutely depend on His Majesty’s benefaction of £100 a year,
\end{quote}
which has for more than two years been unpaid, so that the greatest part are fallen into poverty and debt.\textsuperscript{573}

The inevitable consequence was that ‘three churches are already vacant, the pensions (which are but three pounds per annum) being so small’. He sought Tenison’s help in recovering the Royal Bounty and asked for an additional £1,000 to ‘add some tolerable endowments to these poor livings [. . .] and put us out of condition of making our miseries further troublesome’. For the Island’s children the failure of the church’s income had far-reaching consequences: in the three vacant parishes there were no schools and ‘three of the hopefulllest of our young men that ever the island bred have deserted us, for fear they should be imposed on them’. These scholars were beneficiaries of Barrow’s Academic Students’ Fund; the obligation to repay the bursaries they had received would have been small compensation for the loss of their services as ministers and teachers. A year later Sacheverell wrote to the newly appointed Bishop Wilson advising him that he was coming to serve a diocese whose ‘Church has been sinking into a heap of ruins’.\textsuperscript{574} The people were no less ‘apt for the Studies of Humanity or Divinity, bearing a great esteem and reverence to the Publique service of God’ as they had been when Barrow arrived.\textsuperscript{575} Wilson found no hint of the ‘Leaven of Paganism [. . .] working upon the very vitals of Christianity’ which, according to Ralph Blomer, was threatening the church in England in its ‘age of negligence’.\textsuperscript{576} But the vacancy had seriously weakened the structures of the church and its spiritual and pastoral presence in the Island. The fortunes of the schools were no less desperate, their development compromised over the years by financial, political and social factors.

Wilson acted quickly to save the schools. ‘He regarded the improvement of the parochial schools as an object of high importance,’ Hugh Stowell noted, ‘and was unwearied in his endeavours to render them extensively useful.’\textsuperscript{577} In one key respect, however, his policy differed from Barrow’s; from the outset, he wanted to move the petty schools out of the churches and to appoint lay teachers in place of the clergy. Within five years of Sacheverell’s desponding letter there were schools in every parish again, as there had been in 1672. The

\textsuperscript{573} Sacheverell, \textit{Account}, pp. xiii-xiv.
\textsuperscript{574} ibid, p. 80.
\textsuperscript{575} Chaloner, \textit{Treatise}, p. 5
competence of the teachers varied no less than when the clergy taught the schools, however; some, like John Graham of Braddan, who was presented twice in successive years at the turn of the century for ‘neglecting his schoole by ye deposicions taken’, failed the children supposedly in their charge; others were both diligent and capable: the valued service of Robert Dykes of Arbory was rewarded with a high salary of fifteen pounds.578

Wilson found repeated occasion to admonish his clergy to be diligent in superintending their schools. In 1714 he reprimanded the negligence of ministers who failed to ensure ‘that the Schools be taught as they should be: That the children be [. . .] made to understand the meaning of what they are taught, which cannot be done [. . .] without considerable pains, and patience, and condescension to the capacities of young and ignorant people’.579 Furthermore, he warned that such failings ‘will oblige me in my visitations to enquire very particularly who is, and who is not, careful to discharge this duty conscientiously’. His expectations were notably fulfilled in Lonan, where in 1715 the vicar, John Taubman, gave all the support he could to his schoolmaster: ‘Pray let poore Killip be encourag’d about the schoole’.580 But there were many failings. More than thirty years later the same problems continued to hamper children’s education; in 1747 Wilson noted shortcomings in some of the lay teachers: ‘I have had several complaints that many of the petty schools have been neglected [. . .] let the Masters know, that a very strict enquiry and visitation shall be made, that such as are found faulty may be turned out.’581 This weakness so late in his episcopate was especially galling since he had prescribed strict rules for the conduct of primary schools to ensure ‘that the children have been carefully taught, and do improve in learning and good manners’.582 Yet in this respect the Manx clergy in general carried out their obligation to teach more diligently than their contemporaries in England, where evidence gathered by SPCK correspondents in 1700 shows a widespread lack of interest in or support for schools among the clergy.583

(Figure 15)

Wilson’s concerns about the diligence and competence of the teachers may be attributed to two weaknesses. First, Wilson himself may have contributed to the problem by appointing
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578 Lib. Ptilor. (10071/1/29 & /30), 23 October 1699 &16 October 1700.
579 Cruttwell, Wilson, I, p. 89.
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582 MNH, MS 00803C, Convocation Papers, 29 May 1740, p. 3.
Figure 15 – Convocation minute of 27 May 1741, recording the petty school teachers: ‘Poor Killip’ is still teaching the Lonan school and Rebecca Mordy is schoolmistress in Santan.  

584 MNH MS 00803C (Convocation Papers), 27 May 1741.
lay teachers; evidence considered later, however, suggests that this may not have held back
the progress of education to the extent argued by Hinton Bird.  
Second, some of the costs of
the schools fell to the parish priests, who were required to pay the teachers out of their own
augmented income, according to Barrow’s instructions for the distribution of the improper

tites. Frequent petitions of grievance from unpaid teachers demonstrate how haphazard this
arrangement was and Wilson had to provide additional money to remunerate them from his
own resources, from charitable contributions sought from the clergy, ‘for the encouragement
of such poor schoolmasters as were observed to be diligent in their duty’, and ultimately from
a generous benefaction to support primary education given by Lady Elizabeth Hastings in
1739. 
No fewer than ten lay teachers, including Dykes of Arbory, benefited from this. The
fault did not always lie with the parish priests. There were ongoing problems with the funds
out of which they were paid, despite Barrow’s best efforts to regulate them effectively in his
foundation deeds. In 1726, for example, the assembled clergy recorded with some relief their
gratitude to Wilson’s ‘great care, trouble, and fidelity, in setting the Impropriations, and
receiving the money due for the same, and paying it to us [. . .] so conducive to our
subsistence’. 
There were separate problems with the town schools, for which Barrow had made no
financial provision. One of Wilson’s first acts was to authorise John Watterson ‘to teach
Schoole in the old Chapel of Castletown’, for which he was to receive an annual salary of
five pounds, to be paid by John Woods, vicar of Malew, out of the parish tithes; Watterson
was also ‘empowered to demand six pence for each quarter [. . .] for each child you instruct
(whose parents are of ability to pay)’. Woods disputed his responsibility for the Castletown
school, but a judgement the following year obliged him to pay Watterson.

Having ensured that schools were being taught in the towns and every parish, Wilson
followed Barrow and Levinz in taking action against parents who failed to send their children
to school. He went further than his predecessors, however, by imposing substantial fines to be
paid to ‘ye schoolmaster for his encouragement pursuant to our Hon[ourab]le Lord’s leave
for fines of that nature’. Thomas Moor of Patrick was accordingly fined two shillings in 1699

587 MNH, MS 00802C, Convocation Papers, 2 June 1726, pp. 75-76.
589 Lib. Plitor. (10071/1/29), 23 October 1699.
for failing to send his eldest son to school; a year later John Clark and Robert Kegg of Arbory and eight Lonan parishioners were similarly fined. In 1703 Wilson made primary education for every child compulsory by statute in his Education Act, which required ‘all persons [. . .] to send their children, as soon as they are capable of receiving instruction, to some petty school, and to continue them there until the said children can read English distinctly’. He encouraged poor parents to comply by insisting that all who could not afford to pay were ‘to be taught gratis’, but he understood that many parents simply could not spare their children from subsistence chores, and made provision for strictly regulated absence to be permitted for limited periods in cases of hardship. He also took action to ensure that boys were not drafted into inappropriate labouring service and thereby prevented from attending school: an order of 1713, requisitioning ‘Boon men’ to be supplied to Richard Reece, the lord’s agent for mines, expressly required ‘all persons not to send boys but able men for that service at their peril’. For negligence or wilful non-attendance there were fixed fines: five Rushen parishioners were among the first to be presented and fined five shillings for failing to comply. Wilson was not concerned with attendance alone; he required his clergy on ‘the first week of every quarter [to] visit the petty School and take an account in a Book of ye improv[en]t. of every child, to be produced as often as the Ordinary shall call for it’. These orders endorsed Barrow’s original instructions of 1668 and remained on the Island’s statute book until Tynwald’s Elementary Education Act of 1872.

One of the first orders of Wilson’s successor, Mark Hildesley, in the summer of 1756 was the appointment of Robert Brew, vicar of German, to be master of the town school in Peel. His quick action to fill this vacancy indicates not only that he considered the provision of the schools to be as central to the spiritual and social welfare of his diocese as Barrow and Wilson had done, but also that he was happy for the post to be filled by one of his clergy. Further evidence of Hildesley’s commitment ‘to the improvement and education of the
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growing youth’ is seen in a 1759 instruction to the clergy to use standardised certificates in recording regular visitations to their parish schools.\textsuperscript{597}

A valuable summary of the state of elementary education in the Island towards the end of Hildesley’s episcopate is given in a letter written by Philip Moore in the autumn of 1768, one hundred years after the establishment of the first of Barrow’s schools. Moore, who served as chaplain and master of the grammar school in Douglas, was able to give an accurate picture: he confirmed that ‘there is an English petty school, with a small endowment, in every parish; where the children are taught to read and write, and instructed in the principles of the Christian Religion’.\textsuperscript{598} His observations show that successive bishops valued literacy primarily as the means to bring Christian teaching and values to the people; the purpose of the schools, Barrow’s ‘best way of Cure’, was to ensure their spiritual, pastoral and social welfare. What is of particular significance is that he recorded them as ‘English petty schools’, notwithstanding Hildesley’s championing of the Manx Gaelic translations already in use in the churches and his telling judgement, quoted earlier, that many who could read printed English could not understand it.

\textbf{The grammar schools}

If Barrow drew up a statute of foundation and a curriculum for his grammar school ‘to fit the children for higher learning’ they have not survived, but there can be no doubt that he had given this central part of his grand design much thought, and his knowledge of other new grammar schools, particularly in north west England, together with the influence of advocates of new developments in education must have informed the practical arrangements he made. It is likely that the daily routine began at 6 am in summer (7 am in winter) and ended at 5 pm, with a two-hour break for dinner; texts and tasks, oral and written, would be prescribed, although pupils would spend much of the time in individual study; there would be some play time, but behaviour would be closely monitored to ensure that boys were not ‘troublesome in talks and jingling’.\textsuperscript{599} Above all, Christian principles would have been at the heart of the

\textsuperscript{597} MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, 7 June 1759.
\textsuperscript{598} Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 571.
\textsuperscript{599} Vincent, \textit{Grammar Schools}, pp. 58-59, 89.
school, for all teaching is ‘but meer trifling’, Charles Hoole wrote, ‘unless withall we be careful to instruct children in the grounds of true Religion’. 600

Barrow intended his grammar school in Castletown to serve all the most able boys as the natural extension of the primary schools and to be free to those who could not afford to pay a fee. No registers have survived to give any indication of the numbers educated at the grammar school until well into the eighteenth century, nor is it possible to ascertain if any were required to pay fees. Various documents before 1700 refer to ‘the free school’, but this usually referred to a school’s freedom from episcopal jurisdiction. 601 According to W.A.L. Vincent few of the free grammar schools in England and Wales listed in Carlisle’s register offered genuinely free places to poor students. 602 But Barrow’s intentions are clear and when he endowed the impropriate tithes he was confident that the income would be sufficient; Henry Lowcay, the first master, would have had no need to supplement his income by levying fees, since he held the living of German in addition to his salary of £30.

Lowcay served as master for fifteen years. The Ballaugh parish register recording his death in 1700 commends his scholarship and dedication: ‘The Reverend pious and eminently learned Henry Lowcay, M.A., [. . .] lead his life so that he might be justly termed and esteemed a true pattern of primitive piety’; but he had no previous experience as a teacher, his academic qualifications cannot be confirmed and he held the post as a plurality. 603 Barrow would have wanted to appoint a scholar of the calibre of Ralph Gorse, a university graduate and long-serving master of Winwick Grammar School, of whom he would have known through his friendships with Charles Stanley, patron of the living of Winwick, Richard Legh of Lyme, the school’s principal feoffee, and Richard Sherlock, rector of Winwick. Gorse served at Winwick from 1644 to 1667 and then at Macclesfield Grammar School, where he was much revered for his ‘good services and high reputation in Educational matters’. 604 Lowcay was a local candidate and in appointing him Barrow had to settle for second best.

600 Hoole, New Discovery, p. 59.
601 MNH, MS 09767/1/2, Malew register, 7 March 1671/2 & 5 June 1692, pp. 23, 45; Lib. Caus., 21 June 1695.
603 MNH, MS 10457/2, Ballaugh register, 1701. Lowcay is not listed in the alumni records of Oxford, Cambridge or Trinity College, Dublin.
The school’s success depended on the academic standing and teaching skills of successive masters, which varied considerably. Lowcay’s successor was Gilbert Holt, a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge. He was appointed in 1686 as both grammar and academic master and his stronger credentials throw into perspective Lowcay’s relative limitations. Holt received a combined salary of £60, but the trustees’ expectations of him were cut short; by 1690 his place had been taken by David Genkins, ‘a very ingenious man, a Master of Arts’, according to Levinz. Genkins in turn served for a relatively short period, perhaps just three years, and then left for Ireland; as a consequence Wilson had to make do by asking John Watterson, master of the Castletown primary school, to look after the grammar school boys.

Wilson acted quickly to address this bleak situation by improving the grammar school building and seeking to appoint a well-qualified master. In conjunction with his plans to build a new chapel at the south end of Castletown Parade he provided an additional £235 12s and contracted Thomas Looney ‘to repaire the outer part of the old Chappell by makeing up the Arches making a particon wall across ye same to fit it for two convenient Schooles’ for the grammar and academic students. Six years later he approved the expenditure of £15 to construct an annex wing on the south east side; it is probable that at the same time ‘the Grammar Schooll House was [. . .] repaired, glas’d, & made much more commodious [. . .] for the use of the Scholars that are, or shall be, educated at that school’.

It was not until the turn of the century that stability was fully restored when Wilson appointed James Makon, chaplain of Castletown, to be grammar school master. There are no contemporary reports as to the quality of his teaching, but Wilson’s expectations may be found in the rules he prescribed for the school he founded in 1724 at Burton in Cheshire; he set them within a spiritual framework of prayers and Christian teaching, highlighting the master’s ‘special care to make the children sensible of the end of learning; which is, that they may be better able to read the Holy Scriptures, and therein to learn their duty, to love, to fear,
and to serve God acceptably all their days’. Makon must have satisfied Wilson, since he served until 1736. James Wilks, rector of Ballaugh and vicar general, later claimed that forty to fifty boys attended the school under Makon, though Hinton Bird judged that this was an exaggeration.

The vacancy left by Makon was ably filled for a time by the long-serving academic master, William Ross, but Ross’s decline after 1741 cast a shadow over the school’s fortunes. This was compounded by serious threats to the security of both endowments: the impropriate tithe income was forfeited following the accession of James Murray, second duke of Atholl, to the lordship of Man in 1736, and not secured again for the church and schools until 1758; and the Irish investments of the Academic Master’s Fund were put at risk by the negligence of its trustees, until the capital was rescued in 1773. The consequences were far reaching: salaries due to primary school teachers and to Ross fell into arrears, and in 1744 Wilson noted with concern that ‘the public school house of Castletown is falling into ruins to the great concern of all such as have any regard for learning’.

Ross died in 1754. For more than a decade he had been ineffectual and the school had virtually ceased to exist. It was at this low point that Thomas Castley, a fellow of Jesus, Cambridge, and the most successful, if controversial, master, was appointed to teach both the grammar and academic schools. He was a martinet who not only demanded the highest standards of his students, but also proved a persistent and successful litigant in pursuit of enhanced income from the impropriate and academic funds to his own and the schools’ advantages. Numbers grew and some boys, like William Christian of Jurby, travelled thirty miles to Castletown, rather than to any of the nearer town schools. In 1781 John Taubman, speaker of the Keys, acclaimed the Castletown school as ‘the head school of the Island, both as to Education, and as to number of scholars’, and praised Castley as ‘superior in Learning and Abilities to any Master that hath been in the said School’. As for the quality of the...
scholars produced under Castley, Taubman asserted that ‘there have been men more learned and abler divines educated by [Castley] than under any of the former masters’.  

Robert Brown, vicar of Braddan, who had been taught by Castley, later wrote that he had no equal as a teacher and ‘in all probability we will never see the like again’.  

Wilson described Douglas as ‘much the richest, the best market and most populous of any in the whole island’.  

To accommodate its needs he built a chapel of ease, St Matthew’s, on the north quay and in 1705 he assigned £250 (Irish) from Barrow’s Academic Master’s Fund to extend the town’s petty school in Bond Street, which had been one of the first recipients of an allocation from the Royal Bounty, ‘for and towards the maintenance of a person to officiate as Chaplain and School master [. . .] for the use of a Grammar Schoole in the town of Douglas’.  

Although the endowment was relatively small and entailed some building work, the investment was only required to pay a supplement to the chaplain of St Matthew’s. Wilson departed from Barrow’s principle that grammar school boys should be taught free, however, by charging supplementary fees for tuition in Greek and Latin. He also established a library for the scholars.  

The school’s first master was William Walker, son of a poor widow who had completed his education at Barrow’s academic school, under the patronage of John Stevenson of Balladoole. Wilson appointed him to the chaplaincy of St Matthew’s in 1700 when he was only eighteen, and it is likely that he began teaching in the same year.  

He was an outstanding teacher, possessed, according to Wilson, of ‘a true judicial mind, an imperturbable temper, sagacity, and courage ever ready for emergencies, and the gift of sympathising with all sorts and conditions of men’.  

A separate building for the new grammar school was provided in 1714, when William Dickson gave a house in Douglas ‘for the convenience of a School-house, to be called Dickson’s School-house, and an appartm[en]t. for a Schoolmaster, to be built and erected there’.  
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615 MNH, MD 441-172, Chancery file, Depositions of Witnesses, 19 July 1781.  
616 Manx Sun, 5 August 1835, letter of Robt Brown.  
617 Cruttwell, Wilson, I, p. 356.  
618 Charities, p. 27.  
620 Walker was pre-eminent in his day; according to George Waldron he was ‘indeed a man of letters’: Waldron, Description, pp. 16, 95.  
621 Keble, Wilson, II, p. 705.  
622 MNH, MS 10855, St Matthew’s ‘red file’, deed of April 1714.
In 1735, however, Philip Moore reported that the school was kept by ‘a dissipated youth, who pawned at the ale-house several of the books belonging to the Chapel Library [. . .] At so low an ebb was the state of learning in the Island at that time that the Bishop was under the necessity of ordering laymen [shopkeepers] to supply the necessities to the Church’.\textsuperscript{623} A year later Wilson appointed Moore, a Castletown academic scholar and past pupil of the Douglas school, as chaplain of St Matthew’s and grammar school master. Moore matched Walker in academic standing and qualities of character; he was ‘eminently distinguished as the divine, the gentleman and the scholar’, according to Hildesley, and a fine teacher, good-humoured, witty, and mild of manner to his pupils.\textsuperscript{624} The Douglas school did not satisfy everyone: in 1780 Thomas Christian wrote to John Taubman from Whitehaven that he was ‘resolved to return to the island [. . .] as soon as my children have got a little more education’.\textsuperscript{625} But it flourished under Walker and Moore and successors like Hugh Stowell, an academic tier was added in 1756, and by the turn of the century Stowell recorded a roll of fifty scholars.

It would be easy to argue that Wilson’s diversion of resources from the Academic Master’s Fund in 1705 was a breach of trust, but he was right to address the pressing need for a grammar school in Douglas. The school undoubtedly followed the spirit of Barrow’s endowment and served scholars of the Island’s premier town well for more than a hundred and twenty years.\textsuperscript{626}

The need for a grammar school in Ramsey was even more pressing. A presentment in 1680 implies that a grammar school had been set up there, but that only a primary school was still functioning: ‘There hath beene noe Gramer Schoole kept in our Town since May last, but an English schoole wee have taught by Miss Hannah Bennett’; the ‘most and best of ye Town of Ramsey’ requested Bishop Bridgeman to grant her an allowance out of the Royal Bounty, since ‘we are well pleased in her care and paines in teaching our Sons and Daughters their Bookes & Reading’.\textsuperscript{627} In 1687 Levinz wrote to Cholmondeley asking him to make available income from two hundred pounds entrusted to him by Barrow ‘to use for theyre [Ramsey boys’] benefit, which will bring in some 10l. a yer and this may be set aside as a salary to

\textsuperscript{623} MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Philip Moore to Bishop Mason, 10 October 1781.
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provide a schoolmaster for Ramsey’. 628 Jon Parr was duly appointed as master, with a salary of thirteen pounds (augmented by a contribution from the Royal Bounty), and although Levinz had to prompt Cholmondeley to pay the ten pounds of augmentation in subsequent years, a northern school, endowed by Barrow, seems to have been well established by the mid-1690s. It was not accorded the status of the Castletown school, as its location under the same roof as the petty school in Ballure Chapel and the master’s relatively low salary demonstrate. Its endowment, too, was unreliable, which may account for Parr’s short tenure (1688-91). Bishop Wilson tried to regularise the income from the original investment for Ramsey lodged with the Cheshire trustees, but a note in his Episcopalia as late as 1721 reveals that Barrow’s original bond could not be found.629 Despite these difficulties, for much of Wilson’s and Hildesley’s episcopates Ramsey’s grammar school boys seem to have been well served: James Knipe, a classical scholar and conscientious teacher, was master of what Keble called ‘a sort of grammar school’ for nearly forty years; Thomas Woods, ‘one of the Academic Youths’ appointed by Wilson ‘to teach a Grammar School in the town of Ramsey’, served for eleven years; and under John Crellin, an accomplished classicist, Hugh Stowell ‘made a considerable progress in classical education’.630 After 1762 the grammar and petty schools were taught in a spacious new chapel and schoolhouse in College Street, endowed by Charles Cowle.631 It was still there in 1797/98 when the traveller and antiquarian John Feltham visited, but by the end of the century the Barrow funds designated for Ramsey, which were supposedly lodged with Cholmondeley, were irretrievably lost.632 By 1822 Ramsey’s grammar school had gone, its passing lamented in the Rising Sun, which asked ‘how [. . .] a once flourishing institution is permitted to fall into ruins’.633

630 Knipe’s library contained fifty-three books in classical languages: see Radcliffe, Ramsey, p. 94; MNH, MS 06568, MD 436/2/16 (Harrison), licence, 16 May 1743; Keble, Wilson, II, p. 864.
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The academic school

Although Barrow tried in his will to correct the anomalies surrounding the provision of academic education, the changes failed to prevent ongoing confusion. The aspiration to provide an Island university continued, but its pursuit rested on the changing policies of successive bishops and the constraints of a relatively small endowment, somewhat precariously invested without due security or oversight in Ireland.

After Gostwicke’s resignation in 1678 there is no record in the Isle of Man of the appointment of a successor as academic master until 1680, but an entry in the records of Trinity College, Dublin, suggests that he may have been replaced by Henry Hall, who taught Lowcay’s son, Robert, in 1678 or 1679.634 In March 1680 John Shaw was appointed academic master and commissioned ‘to teach, read, inform and instruct, in the study and reading of logick, philosophy, and history, all and every person and persons within the said Isle of Man who shall [. . .] be willing or desirous to study, read, be informed or instructed in the same’.635 Barrow’s declining health prevented him from taking any part in Shaw’s appointment, but he would have known of it and presumably approved of his academic standing. Within a short time, however, Shaw died or resigned his position.

When the Cumbrian traveller Thomas Denton visited Castletown in 1681, not long after Barrow’s death, he observed:

There is a large Chappell in the town & a school at the west end thereof. The Schoolmaster has £60 a year Sallery [. . .] for reading prayers every morning at 11 of ye Clock & teaching a Grammar School, and for reading Logick & phylosophy to four Accademick Scollars, who are habited in black wide-sleeved gowns & square caps and have lodging in the Castle and a sallery of £10 a year a piece by a new foundation.636

634 George Dames Burtchaell and Thomas Ulick Sadleir, *Alumni Dublinae: a Register of the Students, Graduates, Professors and Provosts of Trinity College in the University of Dublin (1593-1860)*, new edition with supplement (Dublin: Alex. Thom, 1935), p. 513. In the original Matriculation Register & Entrance Books: 1637-1725 the date is 1 June 1678: see IE TCD MUN/V/23/1 (copy 1). It is possible that Hall tutored Robert Lowcay in Dublin.
635 MNH, MS 01507C, Academic Master’s Fund (1827 compilation; Charities, p. 26; appointment of John Shaw, 25 March 1680.
636 Denton, *Description*, p. 440. Denton’s visit is usually dated to 1681. A later date up to 1690 is possible according to a revision by Angus Winchester, Lancaster University, 2000 (filed with original document in MNH, MS 5A). Marshall Cubbon suggests a date no later than 1685: see Cubbon, ‘Chapel of St Mary’s’,
If this is a true picture of the first five years of the academic school for ‘the ablest Scholars, and most capable of the service of the Ministry’ under the tuition of Gostwicke and John Shaw, it would surely have been a disappointment to Barrow. Since his deed of 1668 envisaged a course of five years, there should have been some graduate academic scholars who had already completed their studies in the Island. Perhaps Denton’s description reflects Shaw’s disaffection with his position, not least the unsatisfactory delays in the payment of his salary; his executors were still claiming arrears in 1705. Uncertainty over recruitment and finance may well have led to Gostwicke’s and Shaw’s apparently precipitate resignations. It is possible that Lowcay, who was still serving as grammar school master, also took on the academic students in 1682, but such a retrograde step would have been entirely contrary to Barrow’s high hopes for university level education. Robert Curphey has suggested that the academic students were dispatched to Dublin again until 1686, but the Trinity College matriculation records show no evidence of greater numbers of Manx students at this time.

Gilbert Holt was a scholar much more in keeping with Barrow’s original design and his arrival led the Academic Students’ Fund trustees to order a change of policy for their students:

Haveing taken into consideration that it is not altogether so convenient to continue [. . .] to send those of our Schoolers abroad, whiles they may now have the opportunity of attaining unto academical learning, under the Tuition of Mr Gilbert Holt, Schoolmaster in this Isle, whom wee have now obliged to the discharge of that duty.

This change may well reflect the influence of Levinz, whose practical approach to the development of education helped to consolidate some of what Barrow had put in place. There is no record of the overall number of students for whom Holt was responsible, but the Academic Students’ Fund trustees had already increased the number of endowed scholars at Castletown to four, Henry Halsall, John Woods and two others. The maintenance and

---


637 Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3).

638 Curphey, ‘Bishop Barrow’s Trusts’, p. 9; IE TCD MUN/V/23/1, Matriculation Register.

639 MNH, MS 01507C, Academic Master’s Fund (1827 compilation), pp. 5v, 6r, 7v; Denton, Description, p. 440.
academic education of four students in the Island, each receiving five pounds a year from the fund, continued well into the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{640}

Despite Levinz’s best endeavours, continuing problems with the Irish investments of the Academic Master’s Fund and the poor stewardship of its trustees, in whom Barrow had had great confidence, led to Holt’s departure, his salary still owing.\textsuperscript{641} Levinz acted decisively by appointing David Genkins as ‘Schoolmaster and Academique Teacher’, but this attempt to combine both schools under a well-qualified master soon foundered when Genkins, another victim of financial uncertainty, resigned. The subsequent episcopal vacancy compounded the weakness of the schools. Sacheverell warned Cholmondeley that ‘ye school hath been much neglected’, with successive teachers unwilling to stay long ‘by the discouragement in devideing the sallary as for want of a convenient house’.\textsuperscript{642}

Much of what Barrow had put in place to secure a steady supply of well-educated and committed clergy was now at risk. Cholmondeley’s stewardship of the Academic Master’s Fund had fallen short of Barrow’s expectations, there were still divided views as to the best use of the Students’ Fund, student numbers were in part constrained by limited vacancies in the parishes, the academic school was not housed in its own building, and the turnover of masters hardly encouraged confidence in the whole enterprise.\textsuperscript{643} Sacheverell’s solution to the vacancy left by Genkins’s resignation ironically demonstrated a notable success of Barrow’s strategy, however; he accepted an offer from John Woods, one of the academic scholars tutored by Holt in 1686, to teach the grammar school boys, since ‘at present the school and services of the Chapell stand still to the great prejudice of the youth of the island’. Although Woods had yet to graduate, it seems likely that he also took charge of the academic students.

When Bishop Wilson arrived in the Isle of Man he addressed the problems of the Castletown schools with urgency. He matched his appointment of James Makon as grammar school master with that of William Ross, a well-qualified Scotsman, to the academic school, and within time, having rescued the Irish investments, he was able to arrange separate premises

\textsuperscript{640} MNH, MS 00482C (QBHP), deposition: ‘The Case of Mr Ross relating the arrears of the profits of Ballagilley & Hangohill’.

\textsuperscript{641} Venn, \textit{Alumni cantabrigienses}, pt 1, II, p. 141: Venn records that Holt probably found a more lucrative position as chaplain to the Hon. Sackville Tufton of Newbottle, Northants.

\textsuperscript{642} MNH, MS 06523 MD 401/1719/28 (Derby), Sacheverell to Cholmondeley, 4 August 1693.

\textsuperscript{643} See Barrow and Bridgeman to Ormond, 23 September 1676, in \textit{Historical Manuscripts}, pt 1, p. 776.
for the academic students by moving them into a new library which he built for them, largely at his own cost, in 1706.644 Barrow’s gift of one hundred pounds for his academic library had doubled in value by 1691, and when John Woods catalogued the library for Wilson in 1716 it contained nearly one thousand books, many of which had been purchased on Barrow’s endowment. William Cubbon concluded that ‘in its extent, variety and value it would have ranked with some of the best libraries of the time in England’.645

The prospects of the academic school were further enhanced by the successful rescue of the Irish investments.646 Wilson encouraged Ross to expand the curriculum to include subjects like mathematics and natural philosophy (science), and in doing so he espoused the educational principles advocated by John Locke, which in turn reflected the aspirations of earlier Royal Society fellows, among whom was Barrow’s celebrated nephew.647 Ross was an important figure in the story of the academic and grammar schools and the high regard in which he was held is appropriately matched by the quality and status of the seventeenth-century town house in Castletown in which he lived.648 (Figure 16)

Wilson’s support for the academic students prompted Sacheverell to urge him to ‘the finishing of the designs of Dr Barrow’ by building ‘some convenient lodgings for the academic youths who are forced to diet in public houses in the town’; but the bishop’s priorities lay in Douglas.649 Although this did not signal any dilution of support for the Castletown schools, there is some evidence that academic standards did not rise consistently. In 1728 Wilson complained of the quality of applicants for academy places when he had to admit a boy who was ‘very backward’ in Greek and Latin. George Waldron, who came to the Island in c.1710 as customs officer, was also quick to criticise standards of higher education in the Island, denigrating ‘the little progress made in learning by those who have not had the happy advantage of finishing their education in a Scotch or Irish college’.650 On the other hand, when Ross, the academic master, agreed to take over responsibility for the grammar
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645 Cubbon, ‘Early Schools’, *IMNHAS*, 3, no. 1 (1926), pp. 127-28. The library was moved to King William’s College in 1833 and subsequently lost in 1844 when much of the college was destroyed by fire: see Michael Hoy, *A Blessing to this Island* (Isle of Man: James and James, 2006), p. 28.
646 Charities, pp. 26-27.
650 Waldron, pp. 17, 124. Waldron’s comment confirms that Ross did not teach all the academic scholars.
Figure 16 – Chapel Lane, Castletown: residence of academic masters William Ross and Thomas Castley.
school boys in 1736, in response to a petition from Castletown parents, he used ‘Academy youths [. . .] three very good lads that are willing to assist me’ to teach them.\(^\text{651}\) Despite a period of uncertainty for the academic school during Ross’s last years and the short temporary appointments that followed, Bishop Hildesley was able to inform Robert Hay-Drummond, archbishop of York, in a letter of June 1762, of the successful implementation of Barrow’s vision: ‘With respect to the Clergy, I am happily enabled to give a different account from what b[i]sho]p. Barrow does of those in his time, namely, that I have found them, in general, a very sensible, regular, decent sort of men, almost without exception.’\(^\text{652}\)

Hildesley’s appointment of Thomas Castley in 1758 as master of the academic students as well as the grammar school boys enhanced the standard of teaching for both foundations, and when Castley recovered a second tranche of Irish investments the financial prospects for master and students were much improved. In 1771 the academic scholarships were increased to twelve pounds, plus a three pounds grant for books, and three scholars were each awarded thirty-five pounds to study at Oxford, Cambridge or Trinity College, Dublin. Hildesley approved the purchase of additional books, the school and library buildings were repaired, and Castley received an augmentation of five pounds. Although much of this largesse was subsequently cut back, Bishop Claudius Crigan gave a glowing account of the Castletown schools as he found them in 1794: ‘The fund is in as good a state and the education of the youth as well attended to now, as at any other period and the master and Scholars enjoy even higher than the usual established salaries.’\(^\text{653}\) Despite periods of uncertainty, as the eighteenth century progressed successive academic masters, supported by slowly strengthening funds, were able to provide for the diocese a clergy worthy of Barrow’s reforms who fulfilled the expectations set down by Wilson in 1707 in his *Coyrle Sodjeh*.\(^\text{654}\)

No one, apart perhaps from William Walker, owed a greater debt to Barrow than Philip Moore. In a letter of 14 November 1768 he commended Barrow’s vision in establishing ‘an academy in Castletown, for the education of young men to serve the church’, and his

\(^{651}\) MNH, MS 00810C, p. 135; MNH, MS X13/26 (AP), letter 25 August, 1736.


\(^{653}\) MNH, MS 09707 (AP) 116 (2\(^{nd}\) folder) 10, Bishop Crigan to Duke of Atholl, 20 September 1794. Thomas Stowell described two separate institutions: see MNH, MS 06575 (Stevensons of Balladoole), box 3, T. Stowell, ‘The Free Grammar School of Castletown’.

generosity and skill in setting up his two academic endowments, the means whereby ‘the church here is supplied with ministers’:

There is a competent salary for the teacher, and a handsome exhibition for the three or four youths of the establishment [. . .] so that from these seminaries we have the blessing and benefit of a competent share of classical, theological, and other learning in the arts and sciences, to qualify for the ministry; which has greatly contributed to dispel that mist of ignorance and illiterature, of which b[isho]p. Barrow so justly complained [. . .] you may perceive that things are much mended with us since good bishop Barrow’s time.655

Weeden Butler noted that in 1783 ‘all the clergy of the Isle of Man, except four only, were educated by Mr. Moore’. Moore’s epitaph records: ‘His education was completed under the auspices of good Bishop Wilson; and he made a grateful return for this singular advantage, by contributing to the virtuous Instruction of Youth: being above forty years Master of Douglas School’. Not only did he teach so many of the Island’s most able young men, but he also gave them a curriculum which was dynamic and comprehensive. The same was true of the Castletown schools; David Craine noted the paramount importance for the Island throughout the eighteenth century of ‘the humanistic education afforded by the schools at Douglas and Castletown’.656

Conclusion

Barrow’s vision in 1668 was that every boy and girl should attend an elementary school and receive the benefits of education and literacy, primarily for their moral and spiritual well-being. Although the endowments which he put in place for the schools and teachers were at times beset with problems, most notably when the Stanley line failed in 1736 and as a consequence of the Revestment in 1765, the funds survived and the significant growth of the academic investments in the later eighteenth century proved Barrow’s financial acumen. The difficulty of finding good teachers, however, was a constant problem. As a remote location the Isle of Man could not hope to attract off-Island scholars; its situation was even worse than that described by Henry Newman in a letter to a rural correspondent in England in 1713:

655 Butler, Hildesley, pp. 570-71: Philip Moore to Rev. Dr Walker of Moffat, North Britain, 14 November 1768.
656 Craine, Mananan’s Isle, p. 128.
‘Masters don’t care to go into the country but upon consideration of having so much as they have here [in London].’  

The majority of the Island’s children were of poor families. The constraints of home and work kept many out of school, at least for part of the year, well into the second half of the eighteenth century, but they were not excluded, whether by design or circumstance, and there is no evidence of deliberate opposition from leaseholders who might have sympathised with Bernard Mandeville’s wry observation that ‘Going to School in comparison to Working is Idleness, and the longer Boys continue in this easy sort of Life, the more unfit they’ll be when grown up for downright Labour’.  

The restrictions placed on the poorest in England, as described by Lawrence Stone and Joan Simon, did not apply to the same degree in the Isle of Man. Yet it was the relatively small number of entrepreneurs and professional men of the ‘middling sort’ who were more ready and able to take advantage of the schools and in this respect the Island was no different from England.  

The changes in the primary schools implemented by Wilson (moving the schools out of the churches and employing lay teachers) and Hildesley (instituting teaching in Manx Gaelic, not English) seem to have had limited consequences; schooling was still provided and parents who were willing and able to send their children did so. The rapid growth of the running trade may well have had a more significant impact, at least on attendance, if perceptions of the value of education were changed by prospects of ‘easy’ money, while the sudden collapse of the illicit economy after 1765 may have had similar consequences as more hands were needed to work again in the crofts, fields and fishing-boats.  

For boys who were supported by parents or patrons there was the grammar school. Having secured the tithes of Rushen to pay the salary of the first master, Barrow’s school provided, as far as can be judged, an institution where the quality of teaching, the take-up of places and the achievement of pupils were comparable to the situation in England.  

---

657 SPCK, Letters, 26 May 1713, cited in Jones, Charity School Movement, pp. 100-01.  
The case of the academic school is unique.661 Although it can be argued that it fell far short of Barrow’s grand design of a university college, the academic foundation and university scholarships provided more than sufficient clergy for the Island, and most who served in the parishes through the eighteenth century seem to have given the spiritual, moral and pastoral care which he found so lacking when he arrived. His endowments enabled the Isle of Man to achieve the signal aspiration of so many: ‘Nor is it a privilege to be meanly prized by any people to have education provided,’ Christopher Wase asserted, ‘that out of their children in due season may be chosen such as may bear the office of the ministry.’662

Hinton Bird’s account of the development of education in the Isle of Man gives a comprehensive and informed sense of the distinctive strengths and weaknesses of the system which developed from Barrow’s reforms. This new study offers additional insights into some of the problems highlighted by Bird, notably Wilson’s removal of the schools from the churches, Hildesley’s language policy in the schools, and the frequent strains on the receipt and distribution of endowed funds at various stages through the eighteenth century. It also considers more fully some of the consequences of the Island’s isolation and the relative failure of successive bishops to attract to the diocese clergy and teachers who were educated at the universities.

In the final two chapters questions not addressed in the work of Bird, Clamp, Crampton or other writers on Manx education are explored. Chapter eight gives a new account of the long-term effects of Barrow’s educational reforms on the quality and recruitment of the Island’s clergy and teachers, and charts through a close reading of court records and other documents new evidence of significant developments in the attainment of literacy. In chapter nine a comparative evaluation of the provision of education and the growth of literacy in the Isle of Man and in the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph gives further new insights into aspects of social change in a wider context in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

661 Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3).
662 Wase, Free Schools, p. 33.
Chapter 8

An evaluation of Barrow’s educational and social reforms and the development of literacy, 1660-1800

‘Learning is the fine raiment of the rich man and the riches of the poor man’ – Manx Proverb

Introduction

Barrow’s vision for the Isle of Man was to give every parish a well-educated priest capable of providing for the spiritual and pastoral care of the people; and to provide free elementary schooling for every child, with additional opportunities for the most able in grammar and academic schools. In this chapter the quality of the clergy, teachers and academic scholars educated through the schools is assessed and the effectiveness of the schools in advancing oral and written literacy is evaluated. Some socio-economic evidence which may throw additional light on the ways in which education at all levels contributed to family and community life in the Island in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is also considered.

The clergy, schoolteachers and academic scholars

Barrow appointed only three clergy during the seven years of his episcopate. Since he had attributed the shortcomings of the priests who were serving when he arrived to their insular education, he must have tried to fill these vacancies with men who had received a university education. He was unable to do so, however; the poverty of the livings and the remoteness of the diocese inevitably deterred men who could command far higher stipends and tithe income in England, where Barrow himself held two such rectories.663 The situation was not the same in Ireland, where, even by the early eighteenth century, although they had the opportunity of a university education in Dublin, ninety per cent of benefited Protestant clergy had been

---

663 Downham in the Isle (Cambridgeshire) and Piddlehinton (Dorset).
Barrow would have to generate a new resource of graduates from among young Manxmen.

Barrow’s appointment of an incumbent for Maughold in 1666 illustrates the problems he faced. Thomas Allen was the third of five members of the Allen family who successively held Maughold from 1625 to 1754; his father Robert became vicar in 1660, but died in 1662, leaving the parish vacant when Barrow arrived. Since the poor state of pastoral service in the parishes was foremost in Barrow’s mind he would have made it a priority to fill such a vacancy, yet three years were to elapse before Thomas Allen’s appointment. It may be that Barrow took this time to try to attract a priest from off-Island, although, since he would not have left a parish without a minister for so long, it is likely that Thomas Allen carried out parochial duties during this time. The situation is far from clear, but if Barrow’s eventual confirmation of Allen as a dynastic successor in Maughold was reluctant, his subsequent service over sixty years (1666 to 1727) proved to be of great benefit to the parish; Bishop Wilson wrote of him that ‘he left a good name behind him, having been a diligent pastor, of a serious, grave, sober behaviour, kind to his neighbours and to the poor, and very hospitable to all others’. Barrow faced similar difficulties in Santan, another dynastic parish which had been held by successive members of the Cosnahan family until the upheavals of the interregnum and was now vacant following the deposition of John Halstead. Barrow may have overcome some misgivings when he appointed Hugh Cosnahan in 1667, since his father John had been ‘a merry old roisterer, who kept an ale house’.

Barrow had the opportunity to make his first off-Island appointment in 1667 when Jonathan Fletcher, the archdeacon who had given valued assistance during the purchase of the impropriate funds, died at Lathom. He must have wished for a dynamic candidate who would commit himself wholly to the Island’s needs and help to drive forward the reforms, but it
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666 MNH, MS 00810C, p. 2, Charles Stanley’s presentation of Thomas Allen to Maughhold, 5 June, 1666.
seems that he had to accept Charles Stanley’s nomination of his chaplain, William Urquhart, who subsequently treated the archdeaconry as a sinecure. 669

The purpose of Barrow’s two academic funds was primarily to provide a supply of young men ‘of the most pregnant parts’ to serve as parish ministers and chaplains; they would be educated either in the Island at his ‘Academical School, when it shall be there settled’, or ‘at some University abroad’. 670 The Academic Students’ Fund was established in time for the first beneficiary, Francis Quayle, to set off to Dublin in 1669. 671 From 1676, however, when Gostwicke became the first academic master, the most promising students could choose Castletown or Dublin for their tertiary education, a situation which continued for ten years until the appointment of Gilbert Holt. 672 No register of the recipients of Barrow scholarships has survived, but it is possible to identify some of those in their twenties who were taught in Castletown by Gostwicke, Holt or Genkins from an analysis of the clergy lists in the period from 1678 to 1695 (1692 or 1693 being the last year of Genkins’s service, after which, according to Sacheverell, ‘ye school hath been much neglected’). 673 At least one promising scholar shunned Gostwicke’s school: Charles Crowe, who was born in 1660 into a long line of dynastic vicars of Lezayre, received his education wholly at home before leaving to serve in the Irish church, perhaps drawn by the prospect of living ‘in greater affluence than the generality of farmers’. 674 He later became bishop of Cloyne. 675

Ten of the sixteen clergy appointed to office in this period were young enough to have been Barrow scholars; they were among the first to be eligible to benefit from the Academic


670 TNA, Wills PROB 11/363/622, fols 413’, 414”; Charities, p.34.

671 IE TCD MUN/V/23/2, Trinity Matriculation Register, 1637-1725 (copy 2), Dublin, Trinity College, p. 63.

672 Henry Lowcay may have taught some academic students before Gostwicke’s appointment in 1676, but his claim against the Academic Master’s Fund trustees for arrears of salary more likely refers to the period after Shaw’s departure, before the appointment of Holt. It is also possible that Lowcay’s academic teaching was found wanting and that the Barrow trustees may have reverted to sending students to Dublin between 1674 and 1676, but there is no evidence to support this in the Trinity Matriculation Register. See Bird, An Island, 1, pp. 34-35; IE TCD MUN/V/23/1 (copy 1); Curphey, ‘Bishop Barrow’s Trusts’, p. 9.

673 MNH, MS 06523, MD 401/ 1719/28 (Derby), Sacheverell to Cholmondeley, 4 August 1693.

674 Barnard, New Anatomy, p. 98.

Students’ Fund and all but one seem to have served their parishes effectively.\(^{676}\) Three proceeded to higher office in the Island church: Samuel Wattleworth, appointed to German in 1682, was Bishop Wilson’s choice as archdeacon in 1710, and John Cosnahan and Robert Parr served Wilson as vicars general. The case of Robert Parr is a striking illustration of the problems Barrow faced in selecting young men for the ministry. When his successor Henry Bridgeman voiced reservations about Parr’s candidacy, James Butler, first duke of Ormonde (Earl William’s guardian), wrote:

> I received your Lordship’s of the 13\(^{\text{th}}\) October, acquainting me of the unfitness of one Robert Parre for the […] living of Kirk Lonan within the Isle of Man, to which as I remember he was recommended unto me by the Bishop of St Asaph [Barrow] as being of the Isle, the people of the parish being all Mankesmen and not understanding English, though he was not so good a scholar as he wished for the place.\(^{677}\)

Barrow’s pragmatism stands out; he was right, despite his misgivings, to recommend Parr, who went on to give valued service (not in Lonan, but in Lezayre).\(^{678}\)

At least sixty-five clergy (excluding archdeacons) were beneficed between 1663 and 1780. Many of them were given additional pastoral training by Wilson and Hildesley at Bishopscourt, which complemented the academic teaching they received from Ross and Castley in Castletown and Philip Moore in Douglas, and in this way the bishops ensured that Barrow’s design to provide academically educated young men ‘to serve their own country till the supply be thought sufficient for the Island’ was sustained.\(^{679}\) Barrow would certainly have challenged Hildesley’s Manx Gaelic language policy in the churches and schools, and he might well have viewed with concern Bishop Richmond’s observation in 1777 that, apart from himself, there was only one other English clergyman in the Island – Thomas Castley. Yet without Barrow’s vision and endowments Philip Moore would not have been able to make his proud claim that he had been ‘instrumental in the education of several ingenious,

\(^{676}\) The exception was Robert Fletcher who was disciplined by Bishop Wilson and dismissed in 1704: see John Gelling, *A History of the Manx Church* (Douglas: Manx Heritage Foundation, 1998), p. 20.


\(^{678}\) Kermode, *Annals of Lezayre*, pp. 75-76.

\(^{679}\) Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3).
sensible, and pious young men, for the service of the church, and other publick stations in life’. 680

Whatever the merits of the Island-based academic education commended by Philip Moore, the contrast with the qualifications of clergy beneficed in other dioceses during the same period is striking. In the diocese of St Asaph two-thirds of beneficed appointments during Barrow’s episcopate (1671-80) were graduates, and from 1680 to 1780, in seventeen randomly selected parishes, of 161 named appointments 101 held university degrees (63%). 681 Yet in the Isle of Man only seven of twenty-five grammar or academic school masters were university graduates and five of these stayed no longer than three years.

When Barrow established his Academic Students’ Fund in 1668 to assist ‘the ablest Scholars, and most capable of service of the ministry’, he assigned the annual income ‘towards the maintenance and education of two Scholars at the University or Colledge of Dublin’. 682 The choice of Trinity College was not arbitrary. Geographically it was by far the closest of all the universities and most of the few young Manxmen who took university places before 1663 had chosen Dublin; the most recent was John Thompson, son of vicar general Patrick Thompson, who entered on 2 May 1662, after completing his preparatory education at St Bees. 683 The Barrow trustees’ decision in 1686 to end off-Island scholarships implies that most if not all of the academic students over the preceding eighteen years had studied in Dublin. Yet the number of Manx entrants to Trinity during this period is surprisingly small; only three can be identified with any certainty, and only one of them duly returned to the Island to serve as a parish minister. This was Henry Norris, one of Shaw’s students, who entered Trinity on 19 June 1684 and returned two years later to take the parish of Michael, where he remained for the rest of his life. The amendments Barrow made to the terms of his Academic Students’ Trust in his will of 1679, whereby the choice of university was no longer prescribed, may reflect some disappointment with the low take-up of academic scholars at Trinity. But Norris’s service alone would justify Barrow’s vision. He served in Michael for forty-eight years, taking special care to foster education and the welfare of the young just as Barrow had

680 Butler, Hildesley, p. 192.
681 Thomas, St Asaph, passim; CCEd: www.theclergydatabase.org.uk (accessed 18 September 2013). St Asaph parishes: Abergele, Denbigh, Gresford, Llandrillo (Rhos), Llanfair (Caereinion), Llanfair (Dyffryn Clwyd), Llangwm, Llansantffraid yn Mechain, Llanwrst, Llanycil, Llanyllis, Meifod, Melverley, Newtown, Rhuddlan, Ruabon, Ysgeifiog.
682 Lib. Mon., vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, 7 July 1668 (copy: MNH, MS 09707 (AP), 136/3); Charities, p. 32.
683 Burtchaell and Sadleir, Alumni Dublinenses, p. 808.
wanted; in his will he bequeathed forty shillings ‘Towards buying books and clothing for [. . .] poor children [. . .] And these children are to be kept to school closely until they can read distinctly and are fit to go to a trade’. 684

Francis Quayle, who was educated by Lowcay and entered Trinity on 8 July 1669, did not return to the Isle of Man. Barrow would have known him; he was just such a candidate for whom the Academic Students’ Fund was established, but he remained in Ireland, serving the church with distinction and becoming archdeacon of Ross. Lowcay’s son Robert, the third of the identifiable Manx students, entered Trinity on 1 June 1678 (or 1679); he, too, remained in Ireland and served in the church. 685 It may be that both Quayle and Lowcay were willing to return to the Isle of Man, but records of parish clergy suggest that there were no vacant livings when they graduated. 686

The part played by Trinity in educating young Manxmen is difficult to assess. In the first Trinity Matriculation Register, 1637-1725 only eight young Manxmen who were educated in Castletown can be identified with any certainty as entrants between 1668 and 1725. Particular circumstances in the Island which might have had some bearing on enrolments, such as the failure of academic teaching noted by Sacheverell in 1693, are not reflected in the Register. 687 The absence of Manx entrants after 1705, apart from Anthony Halsall in 1716, may well signal a deliberate policy adopted by Wilson following his appointment of Ross as academic master, and it also reflects the changes Barrow made to the terms of his Academic Students’ endowment in his will. 688 Of forty incumbents appointed from 1668 to 1750, only two had studied at Trinity – Henry Norris (Michael) and Anthony Halsall (St Matthew’s, Douglas). 689 Most of Wilson’s clergy never left the Island.

Twenty-nine of the academic scholars educated in the Island can be identified by name. Eighteen of these became parish ministers, four serving additionally as grammar school masters – John Bridson and John Crellin in Ramsey, and Philip Moore and William Walker

684 AW, Henry Norris, 17 January 1717.
686 Gelling, Manx Church, Douglas, appx ii: ‘Parish Clergy’; Harrison, Sodor and Man, pp. 73-138 passim.
687 MNH, MS 06523 MD 401/ 1719/28 (Derby), Sacheverell to Cholmondeley, 4 August 1693.
688 TNA, Wills PROB 11/363/622, fols 413v, 414r.
689 IE TCD MUN/V/23/2, Trinity Matriculation Register (copy 2), p. 323; Burtchaell and Sadleir, Alumni Dublinenses, p. 359: Anthony Halsall entered Trinity College on 23 November 1716, but the register gives no further information; it is probable that he was the Douglas chaplain appointed by Wilson in 1717, although it is most unlikely that Wilson cut short his studies in Dublin in order to bring him back to the Island.
in Douglas. Among those who did not enter the church were Daniel Callow, Mark Wilks and Richard Wilson, who gave valued service in civil capacities.\textsuperscript{690} Four scholars were lost to the Island, two by death and two by breaking the terms of their scholarships.

This analysis of the education and service of the academic students, the take-up of places by Manx young men at Trinity, Dublin, and the qualifications and status of the clergy appointed to serve the Island’s church from 1663 to 1780 offers new evidence in our understanding of what Barrow hoped to achieve for the Isle of Man, and the extent to which his schools and endowments provided later bishops with the clergy they needed for the diocese.

Although Barrow’s academic trusts provided education for more than sufficient young men to fill the Island’s need for clergy, Wilson still faced difficulties throughout his episcopate in filling every vacancy with men of the highest quality. When he identified a candidate of real promise he acted decisively to secure his future service: he appointed William Walker to teach in Douglas at the young age of twenty-three and kept the rectory of Ballaugh open for him for two years until he reached the statutory age for priesthood; and more than fifty years later he licensed Henry Corlett ‘to read the prayers and services of the Church’ in German at the age of nineteen in order that his services should not be lost.\textsuperscript{691} Wilson’s problems in finding well qualified and competent men to teach in the schools were no different from those encountered in rural England, particularly in the appointment of teachers for new charity schools. The SPCK found it difficult to attract as teachers candidates who satisfied the rigorous criteria they set down at the beginning of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{692}

In 1757 Thomas Fargher, Thomas Moore and Richard Stevenson, members of the Keys, proudly celebrated the record of the academic school, which ‘has produced many ingenious scholars who were and still are an honour to this Island’.\textsuperscript{693} The accomplishments of the most distinguished of those who stayed in the Island to complete their tertiary education are notable, and among them four stand out – Philip Moore, Hugh Stowell, William Walker and

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{691} Moore, \textit{Worthies}, p. 28.  
\textsuperscript{693} Report to the Keys, 1757, \textit{JMM}, 2 (1932), no. 33, p. 86.
\end{flushright}
John Woods. They exemplify all the qualities that Barrow hoped to foster in future generations through his academic trusts; they were consummate scholars who did much to lift the standard of education, facilitate social progress and enrich community life, and they served high and low alike in their parishes with diligence and compassion.

**Literacy in reading**

Barrow’s purpose in setting up English schools was to teach every Manx boy and girl to read and write; this was the ‘best way of cure’, to enable them to read the Bible and ‘books of devotion [and] be bettered [and] acquainted with the very principles of Christianity’. They were to be given the skills of basic literacy within a pastoral context as the primary means of moral and spiritual improvement.

There are obvious problems in attempting to assess the development of literacy in reading. The only primary sources that may give some clues are probate records listing books and, in the second half of the eighteenth century, accounts of the supply and distribution of printed material. Secondary sources, formal and anecdotal, such as readers’ diaries and letters, provide more comprehensive evidence on which an evaluation may be based, although the observations they record are inevitably incomplete and in some cases designed to reflect a constructive agenda. It may be assumed, as Cressy and others have shown, that people who could sign their names could also read. Schofield argues that signing evidence not only gives a good indication of those able to read fluently, but also underestimates the number who could read at a basic level by at least 30%; sequential teaching of reading and writing, the disincentive of fees for writing tuition and the varied length and irregularity of attendance all mitigated against the attainment of writing skills.
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694 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, *Hildesley*, pp. 304-05. There is nothing in the work of Wilson or Hildesley, whose episcopates dominate the eighteenth century, to validate Clamp’s characterisation of the Manx bishops as a ‘dominant metropolitan elite [who] consciously sought to replace the Celtic, indigenous culture with a more acceptable, anglicized form’: see Clamp, ‘Schooling, 1650-1950 (1986), p. 390.

695 Schofield notes the importance of context and purpose in defining literacy: see Schofield, ‘Measurement of literacy’, pp. 312-14.

696 Cressy, ‘Levels of illiteracy’, p. 2; Cressy, ‘Educational opportunity’, p. 314; Schofield, ‘Dimensions’, p. 440. At Borough Road School the average length of attendance was thirteen months (above the national average); it took twelve months for a child to learn to read and a further three to four years to learn to write fluently: see Schofield, ‘Measurement of literacy’, p. 317; Joseph Lancaster, *Epitome of some of the chief events and transactions in the Life of Joseph Lancaster* (New Haven: Baldwin & Peck, 1833), p. 13.
The most important factor in the development of literacy in the Isle of Man is the provision of schools. Cressy and Schofield have shown that changing literacy across England and Wales through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries correlates closely with the availability and effectiveness of elementary education. Cressy links a significant setback in the process of improving literacy between 1680 and 1710 with increasingly negative attitudes to education which became widespread after 1680; in the 1680s in East Anglia, for example, about 90% of husbandmen and general labourers were illiterate and forty years later there was still no real improvement. In an earlier investigation into changes in literacy, particularly among labourers’ children, W.L. Sargant similarly charts the development of literacy as a product of increasing school attendances in the later eighteenth century. The process of change was irregular, but it followed the fortunes of the schools. Where teaching was poor or non-existent, or where children were unwilling or unable to attend school, literacy rates stagnated or regressed, and although there were variations of achievement in all social ranks, it was inevitably the poorest who fared worst. 

Laqueur takes a different view, arguing that the development of literacy had little to do with the provision of elementary education; citing examples from the dioceses of Oxford and York in the early eighteenth century, he makes the case that children’s acquisition of literacy owed less to schools than to ‘the cultural basis of everyday life’. ‘Parents take care to teach them at Home’ was the deposition of one North Yorkshire vicar; another recorded that ‘two poor, honest, sober, and well meaning persons [. . .] teach children to read’. David Vincent, too, describes formal schooling as one resource among many means of acquiring literacy in England. Aytoun and Markman Ellis make the case for the importance of coffee houses, the ‘penny universities’, but they were almost exclusively city institutions whose clientele were already literate and they were seldom found in market towns. These assessments may
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701 Vincent, *Literacy and popular culture*, p. 69.  
be valid for the English-speaking people of Britain, but in the Isle of Man in the late
seventeenth century, when few could speak or read English and where nothing was written in
Manx Gaelic, the means and incentive to educate children in the home, other than in an oral
capacity, did not exist. Once children had learned to read in school, however, they brought
into the home the opportunity for everyone in the family to benefit from their expertise. ‘Not
a few ignorant [parents] have learn’d their Catechism and Prayers from their Children, and
some to write,’ William Hendley claimed in his defence of Charity Schools. Schofield
argues convincingly that where one or two became literate they could initiate significant
change in the wider community. The part played by Barrow’s elementary schools and the
men and women who taught in them is central to the story of the development of literacy in
the Isle of Man.

‘How few, how very few are there [. . .] that can exactly read, spell and write true English, or
indeed [. . .] but distinctly read a chapter.’ Such was the state of literacy across the British
Isles as recorded by Thomas Lye in 1677, and its cause was also its consequence – poverty.
What Barrow found when he began his episcopate in 1663 was the common condition of the
poor and disadvantaged; like Richard Baxter he saw not only its socio-economic dimension,
but also the moral and spiritual consequences of illiteracy: poor tenant farmers ‘cannot spare
their children from work while they learn to read,’ Baxter wrote, ‘[. . .] so that poverty
causeth a generation of barbarians in a Christian, happy land.’ Barrow’s judgement was the
same: he had found ‘the people, for the most part, loose and vicious in their lives, rude and
barbarous in their behaviour’, and his care as their pastor was to give them instruction and
make them literate. The Island’s children would be taught to read in schools.

Thomas Denton’s account of his visit to the Isle of Man (probably in 1681 towards the end of
Bridgeman’s episcopate) is enlivened by his description of the academic students he observed
in Castletown. He recorded nothing about the parish schools, however, and although he noted

Matthew’s Chapel): see Neil Mathieson, ‘Old Inns and Coffee-Houses of the Isle of Man’, *IMNHAS*, 5, no. 4


Thomas Lye, *A spelling book: or, Reading and spelling made easie, the second edition* (London: 1677),
introduction: ‘To the reader’.

Racking Landlords)*, eds F.J. Powicke and George Unwin (Manchester: 1926), cited in Cressy, *Literacy and the
social order*, p. 42.

There is no indication of the age at which Manx children would begin to attend school. John Newton, writing
in 1668, noted that English children began elementary education at four or five: see John Newton, *The scale of
interest: or the use of decimal functions* (London: 1668), introduction (n.p.).
that the Islanders ‘do more assimilate the Irish than British in Languages’, he made no
observations on the extemporary use of Manx Gaelic in church services or the endeavours of
the ministers charged with teaching children to read and understand English. Denton was an
accurate and enquiring observer who travelled widely across the Island, and it seems likely
that he would have included some reference to the schools if they had been a significant
feature of daily life. Unfortunately G.W. Wood’s note on the provenance of Denton’s
manuscript does not suggest the time of year of his visit; if it was in high summer or at
harvest time schools would not have been in session.708

Bishop Levinz’s strict regulations concerning the provision of schools and compulsory
attendance, together with his careful allocation of the Royal Bounty and impropriate tithe
funds, may have fostered some progress, but no such evidence has come to light.709
Sacheverell’s letters and essays similarly offer no direct assessment of the state of education
at the end of the seventeenth century, but there are clues as to what had been achieved in
three decades of English schools. Barrow would have been dismayed to learn that only ‘those
who are refined by travel prove men of parts and business’, and that spoken English was no
more common than it had been in 1663: ‘The common sort speak the native language’.710 In
the light of this evidence it is difficult to accept Clamp’s assertion that the widespread
acquisition of literacy in English encouraged the emigration of Manx youth in the late
seventeenth century.711 As for the clergy, Sacheverell judged that the Manx church,
compared to its English counterpart, ‘is as far short of its learning as it is of its revenues’. His
well-meant tribute to Barrow has a hollow ring: ‘to [his] industry is owing all that little
learning amongst us’.

Bishop Wilson’s hopes for the Island’s children were as high as Barrow’s had been, but a
celebrated story related by Philip Moore shows how little the English schools had achieved
by the turn of the century. Moore observed Wilson giving spectacles, which ‘he used to
purchase three or four dozen pair at a time’, to ‘some aged poor of the island [. . .] whose eye-
sight failed them’. Wilson’s rationale for their use confirmed what they both knew, that none
could read: ‘“No matter,” said the Bishop with a smile, “they will find use enough for them;

708 Denton, ‘Description’, pp. 435-36, 437. The practice of calling children out of school for ‘thinning of
turnips’ continued well into the nineteenth century: see I.M. Killip, ‘Unwillingly to School’, JMM, 6 (1959-60),
o. 76, pp. 95-96.
709 Lib. Caus., convocation of 17 August 1685 (Convocation, p. 114).
710 Sacheverell, Account, pp. 15, 91, 94.
these spectacles will help them to thread a needle to mend their cloaths; or, if need be, to keep them free from vermin.”

Wilson was confident that the numbers of those who could read would grow, however, and as early as 1699 he recorded his intention to compose prayers and guidance in Manx Gaelic for publication. In 1707 he duly published his *Coyrle Soda* in Manx Gaelic and English, which he described as ‘the first book ever printed in the Manks language’. He also established parochial libraries across the Island, perhaps influenced by Thomas Bray’s initiative in founding a library at Nantwich in c.1699, and ‘gave to each a proper book-case’. The gift of a bookcase must have served to show to the recipient the value Wilson placed on reading as central to his teaching ministry. A.W. Moore described these collections as ‘public libraries [...] intended for the needs of those beyond school age’, and it seems likely, as Moore implies, that Wilson intended the books, which were ‘both practical and devotional’, to be available to interested readers other than the clergy, despite the fact that they were kept under lock and key. Wilson recorded that he ‘gave a Book box with lock for the Parochial Library’ in German and his Ramsey library was kept in ‘a Press with a lock’. Wilson certainly intended Barrow’s Castletown library, which he considerably expanded, to be a public collection available to all. He also established a library for the grammar school in Douglas in about 1700. These were notable educational resources, containing many texts in classical languages, of which young academic scholars like William Walker could take advantage. Such evidence is strikingly at odds with Waldron’s dismissive comment on the clergy: ‘I attribute their Want of Books to their innate Ignorance.’

Wilson paid particular tribute to the vision and ‘good deeds’ of ‘the pious and worthy Dr. Isaac Barrow’, not least in establishing the endowments to support the clergy and ‘such young persons as should be designed for the ministry’. Keble picked up this attribution and sense of continuity in his biography of Wilson: ‘To Wilson the memory of such a
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713 Basil Megaw noted in MNH, MS 05397A that an earlier date of 1699 proposed by Cruttwell and Stowell is probably incorrect; Keble, *Wilson*, I, pp. 122, 148-49.
predecessor, and the thought of entering into his labours, must have been especially helpful’. Yet Wilson recognised that much of what Barrow had planned for the education of the Island’s children had achieved limited success.

Waldron’s tone could not be more different from Wilson’s, but the circumstances he found during his residence in the Island (c.1710 to 1730) are the same. His attitude to the people he interviewed is patronising and his judgements are skewed to suit his agenda, which he claimed was ‘to show the world what a Manxman truly was’, but which in fact peddled sensational entertainment with an eye to profitable publication. Despite his ill-disguised contempt for the Manx and their ‘most miserable ignorance’, his account of the clergy and schools is detailed and convincingly referenced, not least in his assertion: ‘Books written in the Manks tongue they have none, except a catechism and instructions for youth, with some prayers not many years since compiled.’ Many of his conclusions are suspect, but some credence must be given to his judgement that the Islanders in general were very poorly educated and that much of the blame lay with the parish clergy who were responsible for the petty schools. Some of these, he observed, ‘have had the happy advantage of finishing their education in a Scotch or Irish college, which is commonly the case of such as are designed for Holy Orders’, but he censured them for their complacency in perpetuating the methods of instruction described by Chaloner seventy years earlier, whereby ‘the minister mentally translates the service into the Manks tongue, as he delivers it to the people’. Most of these ministers were beneficiaries of Barrow’s Academic Students’ Fund and they were, for the most part, more conscientious and effective in serving their parishioners than the clergy Barrow found in 1663; Waldron wrote: ‘They are, in a manner, idolised by the natives.’ But in the parochial schools they and their predecessors had achieved little. ‘Why [are] these people so ignorant’, Waldron tellingly asked, with characteristic pomposity; ‘why [is] there not better care taken in forming their youth.’ He was reflecting the inescapable fact that the English tongue was still not accessible to most Islanders.
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719 Keble, Wilson, I, p. 133.
720 Waldron is referring to Wilson’s Coyrle Sodjeh.
721 Waldron’s assertion that some of the Island’s clergy had been educated ‘in a Scotch or Irish college’ is interesting. Very few are listed in the records of Trinity College Dublin; Scottish university admissions records of the relevant period are incomplete.
722 Waldron, Description, pp. 16-18.
Competence in reading English seems to have been stubbornly elusive, at least during the first two decades of Wilson’s episcopate. Joseph Lancaster reckoned it took a year to teach a child to read. Children taught at primary level wholly in Manx Gaelic at the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh today, most of whom are from English-speaking families, are able to read Manx Gaelic fluently by the end of Year 2 (age 6 to 7). Even allowing for irregular attendance, Manx children should have been able to learn to read more quickly than seems to have been the case three hundred years ago, but the Island’s exclusively oral culture and a general perception of English as an alien and therefore difficult language presented formidable obstacles. Since the only published Manx Gaelic book before 1748 was Wilson’s 

*Coyrle Sodjeh*, however, there was no alternative.

While never relaxing his insistence that teachers and clergy should make the primary schools a central part of their pastoral service, Wilson seems to have faced this disappointment quite equably:

> When I have recommended Family Prayers,’ he told his assembled clergy, ‘I have often met with this objection, that few can read; and what can be expected from such families? Why, I will tell you: There is scarce one person of years in the whole Diocese who cannot say The Lord’s prayer.

For Wilson the primary purpose of teaching his people to read was no different from Barrow’s: it was ‘to acquaint the people with the English tongue, so that they might be in a capacity of reading Catechisms, and books of devotion [and] acquainted with the very principles of Christianity’. If they could not read, then reciting prayers, regularly hearing the Bible read to them in church, and having its meaning and the precepts of Christian living authoritatively and thoughtfully expounded by the ministers would have to suffice. It seems

723 Analysis of statistics for literacy in writing after 1720 suggests that the ability to read also improved significantly at this time. See below.
725 Julie Matthews, headteacher, Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, 31 March 2014, pers. comm. The Bunscoill Ghaelgagh (St John’s) is the Isle of Man Department for Education and Children’s Manx Gaelic primary school.
726 In 1748 Wilson published, at his own expense, William Walker’s Manx Gaelic translation of St Matthew’s Gospel: see William Cubbon (ed.), *A bibliographical account of works relating to the Isle of Man*, 2 vols (London and Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933), II, p. 760. William Morgan’s first edition of his Welsh Bible was published in 1588, the first Irish Bible was published in 1680, and the first Scottish Gaelic Bible was published by the Scottish SPCK in 1801.
728 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, *Hildesley*, p. 304.
likely that literacy in reading improved markedly after 1720, however, since statistics for literacy in writing at this time show significant change, as will be seen later.

The state of all Barrow’s schools in Hildesley’s episcopate is recorded by Philip Moore. He paid warm tribute to Barrow, ‘who [. . .] founded a publick free-school, and established an academy for the education of young men, to serve the churches of his diocese; besides making provision for English petty schools in the seventeen parishes of the isle’. Yet Hildesley’s account of the state of literacy in his diocese, communicated to Hay-Drummond in 1762, repeats precisely the circumstances recorded by Barrow a century before: ‘Having neither printed Bibles, nor Common-Prayer Books, in the native language of the country [. . .] the major part of the people are unable to attain any knowledge of the genuine Scriptures, but what they receive from the off-hand translations produced by the minister’. For younger clergy, ‘having been for some years versed in English and the learned languages, under an Academick tutor bred in England’, the task was particularly challenging.

It appears that little had changed. Wilson’s application ‘with the utmost assiduity to learn something of our language [. . .] to make himself understood by the native inhabitants’ won special commendation from Philip Moore because ‘two thirds of [them] know nothing, or very little, of English’. The true situation appears to have been even more negative. In the north and east of Ireland, English had replaced Irish as the more common vernacular by the second half of the eighteenth century; the English traveller John Bush found in 1769 that ‘very few of the lowest classes’ were unable to speak English. But this was in part the product of British migration linked to the plantations in Ulster and of Protestant ascendancy in the long campaign against Papacy in Ireland, dynamics wholly absent from Manx society, where there were no English plantations and no Catholics to be evangelized. In the Isle of Man the majority still spoke and understood only Manx Gaelic. When Hildesley approached the SPCK in 1764 for financial assistance in printing Manx Gaelic texts it was noted with dismay ‘that the diocese of Mann is supposed to contain near twenty thousand souls; the far greater number of whom are entirely ignorant of the English language’. The tone of this report may reflect a missionary agenda in its rhetoric of moral improvement, espoused by
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fervent educational philanthropists like Sarah Trimmer, whose crusade was ‘to promote [. . .] holy religion which is dreadfully neglected. I am desirous to save young persons from the vices of the age’.  

But the SPCK’s facts are broadly confirmed by Philip Moore, who wrote five years later of the Manx: ‘The bulk of the common people understand very little, and many thousands nothing at all, of the English language.’

For Hildesley publication of the translated Gospels in 1763 signalled the end of Barrow’s strategy. Manx Gaelic would wholly replace English in church and school alike; he wrote to his ministers:

I have great confidence in my faithful clergy, that they will not be wanting in their share of pains and study to promote the spiritual welfare of their respective charges; by helping to administer light to them, that sit in darkness, compared with what they will enjoy from an uniform translation of the Scripture.

As for the people, he believed they ‘would be, I am confident, extremely fond of perusing the Scriptures, if they had them, and were taught to read them, in their own tongue’. What Hildesley does not record is whether those who could articulate printed English without understanding it could also read Manx Gaelic; and if they could, then who had taught them? According to Philip Moore there were many who were literate in the vernacular; he wrote to Hildesley in 1763:

The people here are ready to tear me out of the house for Manx Prayer Books, as numbers of our people yt can read go to the neighbouring parish churches. I wish your Lordship would enable me to gratify their desires by sparing me a few dozens to distribute amongst them.

In at least three parishes children were being taught in Manx Gaelic in 1757, and it may be that in other parishes the primary school teachers, abetted by their ministers, used Wilson’s dual language publications to teach children to read Manx Gaelic as well as English, both in the schools and in catechism lessons. Wilson had long made the latter a priority for his clergy
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735 MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Philip Moore to Hildesley, 12 October 1765.
and it may be that he had tacitly encouraged the practice.736 This intriguing and ironic possibility is prompted by statistics recording the distribution of printed Manx Gaelic books, beginning in 1763 when the SPCK shipped from Whitehaven the first of many thousands of religious texts to be ‘disseminated gratis amongst the Manks people, in their native tongue’. Over the next fifteen years at least 6,500 Books of Common Prayer, 5,000 Old and New Testaments (most of which were printed in octavo for individual, rather than lectern, use) and 3,500 copies of Wilson’s popular treatise on ‘The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper’ were distributed, with yet more planned ‘for the use of the people, as ability shall be given them, and occasion shall arise’.737 The contribution of the SPCK was remarkable and must testify to the Society’s conviction that its investment would find a ready readership; the number of Manx Gaelic and English texts sent to the Isle of Man at the beginning of the 1770s was comparable to the SPCK’s average annual distribution of all its English Bibles.738

This remarkable response to Philip Moore’s first request of 1763 for ‘a few dozen’ copies of the Manx Gaelic Prayer Book suggests not only that a significant number of lay people could already read at the beginning of Hildesley’s episcopate, but also, as the SPCK’s subsequent response implies, that there was a real desire to learn in order to read the scriptures. In April 1764 Moore recorded receiving a letter which confirmed this: ‘A poor woman [. . .] upon her son’s reading a chapter to her [in Manx Gaelic], cried out, with great exultation, “We have sit in darkness till now!”’739 Ten years later Daniel Gelling, vicar of Malew, requested more copies of the Manx Gaelic Bible: ‘I have such a Demand [. . .] that I know not how to satisfie the Clamour of my Parishioners [. . .] so that every one who can read will be supplied with one, so soon as they can be got ready, the last 41 [. . .] were distributed in two Days.’740 John Gelling states that a second bulk printing of the Manx Gaelic Prayer Book in 1768 was specifically for the use of the people; two lists in the Ballaugh parish register in 1772 and 1774 record the distribution of 104 Manx Gaelic Bibles to parishioners (representing about 60% of all households in the parish).741 Since the Manx, like the Irish, Scots and Welsh, were for the most part a devout people, it is likely that there was a shared motivation within the

736 Broderick, Language Death, p. 17; Keable, Wilson, I, pp. 133-34.
739 Butler, Hildesley, pp. 499-500: Hildesley to Moore, 2 April 1764.
740 MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Gelling to (?) SPCK, 20 December 1774.
741 MNH, MS 10457/3, Ballaugh register, 1772 and 20 November 1774, p. 122.
community to be able to read devotional books; as T.C. Smout observed, people in Scotland in the eighteenth century were ashamed if they could not read the Bible for themselves.\textsuperscript{742}

There is evidence to suggest that many more could read English than Hildesley implied in his 1764 letter to the SPCK: in 1770 and 1771 the SPCK recorded distribution to the Isle of Man of 2,000 copies of Lewis’s \textit{Catechism} and 1,200 copies of the \textit{Christian Monitor}; and all 3,500 copies of Wilson’s treatise on ‘The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper’ which Hildesley’s successor Richard Richmond received from the SPCK in 1776 were printed in English and Manx Gaelic.\textsuperscript{743}

These clues point to considerably more progress in general literacy across the Island, even by 1755, than Hildesley’s assessment of his diocese suggests. He may well have been following a constructive agenda to convince the SPCK and other potential benefactors in England of the Isle of Man’s special need, appropriating Wilson’s policy earlier in the eighteenth century of painting the worst possible picture of the state of the Manx churches to solicit financial help. There can be no doubt that the Manx, in their desire to read the Bible and other works of devotion for themselves, shared the wider Protestant imperative of much of northern England, Wales, Scotland and Protestant Ireland, and this was a key driver of the development of literacy in reading.\textsuperscript{744} Furthermore, since the supplementary fee required for a child to be taught to write would have been an obstacle for most parents, and not only the poorest, it is likely that only 50\% of those who could read could also write fluently.\textsuperscript{745} Anne Ashley notes the significance of the disparity between the numbers able to write a signature in documents and those able to read in the Isle of Man, which she attributes to the separation of reading and writing tuition in the schools and the additional quarterly levy of 9\textit{d} required from those who could afford to pay for the latter.\textsuperscript{746}

It is interesting to note some marked changes in church architecture in the second half of the eighteenth century which may well have a bearing on changing literacy. When a new chapel of ease was built at St Mark’s (Malew) in 1771 and Santan church was renovated in 1774

\textsuperscript{743} Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 243.
\textsuperscript{746} Anne Ashley, ‘The claims and needs of children in traditional Manx law and custom’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 5, no. 4 (1953), p. 367.
they incorporated wide, low-lintel windows extending into the nave which admitted far more daylight than in earlier buildings. These new churches were preaching houses designed to encourage individual reading of the scriptures by the people as well as the clergy.\(^747\)

(Figures 17 & 18)

Hildesley’s success in completing the translation and publication of the Manx Gaelic texts masks an ironic shift in comparative attitudes to the vernacular and English. He had found it necessary to accompany his promotion of the use of Manx Gaelic with an order to counter ‘some doubts [which] have arisen among some of the clergy concerning the sense in which they are to observe my late injunctions to instruct the people in a Language they best understand’. The use of Manx Gaelic was not to be prescriptive: ‘English and Manx shall be proportioned to the capacities and talents of the Congregation’.\(^748\) This was a compromise; as early as 1747 a diocesan visitation reported that four parish school teachers could not speak Manx Gaelic, and although Hildesley’s vigorous campaign improved vernacular teaching, a plan in 1776 to print 2,500 dual language copies of Wilson’s treatise on the Lord’s Supper, so ‘that the two tongues would help those to understand both, who as yet were not over perfect in either’, suggests a parity of public aspirations for literacy in Manx Gaelic and English. In the 1790s the vicar of Santan was still translating the services into Manx Gaelic for his congregation, yet in 1786 a visitation ordered by Bishop Crigan found that only two parish schools, German and Maughold, were now being taught in the vernacular. Philip Moore noted in 1766 that in the Douglas schools ‘they all speak English and know it best’, and twenty years later the linguistic preference of most parents in the towns and many across the Island had moved decisively away from the vernacular. English was now seen as the language of practical necessity and social advantage, as it had been in the north and east of Ireland for much of the eighteenth century.\(^749\) A 1786 visitation response from the vicar of Onchan recorded: ‘The School Master here does not teach the Children Manx, but as much

\(^{747}\) W. Harrison (ed.), Memorials of ‘God’s Acre’ [. . .] taken in the Summer of 1797 by John Feltham and Edward Wright (Manx Society, 1868), XIV, facing p. 70: Miss Oliver’s copy of Bishop Wilson’s sketch; MNH, MS 17096 E205/5 (1), Bishop Ward’s Appeal on behalf of the poor churches in the Diocese of Sodor and Man, c.1827. I am grateful to Pat McClure for this suggestion, which is reflected in her doctoral thesis: see ‘The Archaeology of Manx Church Interiors; contents and context, 1634-1925’ (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Liverpool, 2013). Examples of new or rebuilt eighteenth-century churches incorporating similar large, clear glass windows in Lancashire and Cheshire may be found at St Aidan’s, Billinge (1718), St Mary’s, Tarleton (1717) and Hale Barns Chapel (1723); see Terry Friedman, The eighteenth-century church in Britain (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2011), pp. 317-19, 321.

\(^{748}\) Moore, Note Book, III, p. 99.

Figure 17– Bishop Wilson’s sketch of Santan church, c. 1700.

Figure 18 – Bishop Ward’s sketch of Santan church, renovated in 1774.
English as possibly he can, agreeable to the request of their parents’.\textsuperscript{750} Barrow’s strategy had at last become the accepted norm in late eighteenth-century policy and practice throughout the Island.

The process of learning to read was supported and encouraged in the Isle of Man, as in other parts of the British Isles, by the use of a Horn-Book, an aid to learning in the form of a simple portable tablet, which displayed the alphabet, common syllables and the Lord’s Prayer. Horn-Books are rare in the Isle of Man, which perhaps indicates that they were commonplace and considered not worth preserving, but two were discovered in 1895 hidden in the roof scraa (sods) of an eighteenth-century thatched cottage. Whereas Horn-Books found in Wales are usually in Welsh, the language of these Island examples is English.\textsuperscript{751}

The advance of reading literacy in English in the second half of the eighteenth century is further reflected in a growing demand for printed secular material. Although a prospectus issued in c. 1760 by Henry Pepyet, a Dublin businessman, to set up a newspaper and press for the Island failed, from 1774 the literate public could read Manx news in the imported \textit{Cumberland Pacquet}.\textsuperscript{752} This new market prompted publication of the Island’s first newspaper, \textit{The Manx Mercury and Briscoe’s Douglas Advertiser}, which appeared in 1792.\textsuperscript{753} There were tracts and broadsheets, too, printed at least as early as 1763, when the Island’s first extant temperance tract was circulated.\textsuperscript{754} A few additional clues suggest a steady if slow growth in the materiel of literacy. In 1759 Michael McDaniel, an Irish paper manufacturer, leased the Tuck Mill at Ballasalla to produce paper, an enterprise for which he had been ‘frequently and pressingly solicited by most of the Merchants and some other considerable persons’. This failed, but there was significant paper production in the Island in the 1780s, and in 1789 Alexander Lewthwaite established a successful, long-running paper

\begin{footnotes}
\item[750] MNH, MS 00793C, Visitations, 1747 & 1786.
\item[751] Earnest B. Savage, ‘Horn Books’, \textit{Manx Church Magazine} (March 1895), p. 34; John Fisher, ‘The Old-time Welsh Schoolboy’s Books’, \textit{Journal of the Welsh Bibliographical Society}, 2 (1991), pp. 193-201; D.R. Thomas, \textit{St Asaph}, II, p. 151. The Island Horn-Books were discovered at Ballamodha-beg (Malew) during demolition of a cottage; since they were hidden in the roof scraa, which is not renewed during re-thatching, it is likely that they were placed there when the cottage was built: Helen Ashcroft, Yvonne Cresswell and Andrew Johnson (Manx National Heritage), pers. comm., 6 February 2015.
\item[753] Cubbon, \textit{Bibliographical Account}, II, pp. 1138-39. The \textit{Manx Mercury} was printed by Christopher Briscoe on the Douglas press founded nine years earlier by his brother Joseph.
\item[754] MNH, MS 05298/1C. The provenance of an earlier satirical publication, \textit{The Squib: an Epistle from a Gentleman in the Country, to his Friend in Town}, ‘Isle of Man: Printed in the Year MDCXLIII’, is doubtful: see MNH, L/7/2 (M 04047).
\end{footnotes}
mill at Tromode.\textsuperscript{755} It is also likely that there were booksellers in Douglas in the closing years of the century, although the earliest extant bookseller’s advertisement is dated 1813.\textsuperscript{756} Another useful measure of reading literacy is the membership of subscription libraries, but there is no record of public libraries in the Island until well into the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{757}

The listing of books in probate inventories is also a significant factor. Researchers like Peter Laslett have questioned the value of such lists in indicating levels of literacy, but Cressy suggests that a more positive conclusion is possible, citing, for example, Peter Clark’s view that book ownership was ‘part of the general advance in literacy’.\textsuperscript{758} The quest for evidence is hampered by the relative scarcity of inventories of poor people and the haphazard nature of recording. Spufford concludes that in the probate lists of rich and poor alike ‘books were not worth listing, even if they were there’.\textsuperscript{759} In the Isle of Man, as in England, the compilation of probate inventories inevitably reflects the vagaries of clerical whim.

Whereas there can be no doubt that the relative few who left comprehensive libraries (notably some, though by no means all, of the clergy) could read, it is the probate lists of those who possessed just a few books which are of particular interest in attempting to evaluate the progress of general reading literacy. No less telling are the inventories of lay men and women of substance who possessed no books at all. Two probate lists of 1701/02 show just such a contrast: Christopher Marsden, archdeacon and rector of Andreas, who perished in a shipwreck on Liverpool bar, left books valued at six pounds; but Thomas Huddleston, merchant venturer, of Ballahott, Malew, whose estate was valued at £136 19s 1d, left no books at all. It is not until 1717/19 that significantly more probate lists containing books occur; of particular interest are those owned by people of modest means: John Gell of Castletown (1717) left ‘9 old books’; Jane Casement of Lezayre (1719) left ‘old books’; John and Isobel Christian of Bride (1722) left books valued at 2s 6d; and David Clague of


\textsuperscript{756} Manks Advertiser, 13 March 1813. Five Douglas booksellers advertised in Pigot’s \textit{Directory}, 1824, pp. 198-201.


\textsuperscript{759} Spufford, \textit{Contrasting communities}, p. 211.
Castletown (1740) left ‘a Bible and some old books’ valued at 1s 3d.\textsuperscript{760} Whether the description ‘old books’ reflects their condition or suggests that they were considered of little value by the compiler is open to question; the frequency of probate entries like ‘a bible and other lumber’ confirms for Spufford a generally dismissive attitude to books.\textsuperscript{761}

Some Island probate lists provide a more considered sense of the value of books, however: twenty-four books belonging to John Williams of Ramsey (1719) were valued at 3s; John and Anne Christian of Ballakilley (1726) left ‘30 books at 6d each’; Edward Christian of Lewaigue (Maughold), who drowned in the Santan river in 1759, left 35 books, valued at £1 2s 10d, which included three works of contemporary literature – ‘Congreve’s Works’, ‘The Fortunes of Moll Flanders’ and ‘Robinson Crusoe’s Reflections’; and John Cummings, watchmaker, of Douglas (1780) left books valued at 7s 6d in an estate of £30 17s 3d. These libraries were the exceptions, however; for the most part it seems that books, other than the Bible and Prayer Book, were rare in Island households, even among the wealthy, right through the eighteenth century. John Corrin of Castletown, for example, one of the most successful merchants, was obviously fully literate, yet when he died in 1724 he possessed only a few ‘old books’, valued at 2s 6d, in an estate worth £766 6s 8d.\textsuperscript{762} Yet wherever books are listed in probate records it is likely that their owners could and did read; as Vivienne Dunstan has argued, book owners, particularly those of modest means, would buy books to read, not as ornaments.\textsuperscript{763}

It is no surprise that Bibles are listed more frequently than any other book in Manx inventories, just as they are in England, where Laqueur found ‘that substantial numbers of even the very poor owned Bibles’.\textsuperscript{764} Barrow’s first aim was that every child should be able to read the Bible, ‘that they might be in a Capacity of reading Catechisms, and books of devotion’, and Bishop Wilson made Bibles available in homes throughout his diocese through the agency of the SPCK, much as Richard Baxter, Thomas Gouge and others did as gifts to poor families in England and Wales.\textsuperscript{765} Whether the recipient could read mattered little to Wilson, as Philip Moore’s story of Wilson’s gifts of spectacles shows, but a Bible

\textsuperscript{760} EW, 23 January 1702, 19 September 1701, 1717 (n.d.), 6 November 1719, 1722 (n.d), 23 July 1740.
\textsuperscript{761} Spufford, \textit{Contrasting communities}, p. 211.
\textsuperscript{762} EW, 17 February 1719, 21 February 1726, 26 March 1760, 20 August 1780, 22 May 1724.
\textsuperscript{763} Dunstan, ‘Reading habits’, p. 206.
\textsuperscript{764} Laqueur, ‘Cultural Origins’, p. 265.
\textsuperscript{765} Baxter, \textit{Reliquiae}, pt 1, p. 89: ‘Every family [in Kidderminster] that was poor, and had not a Bible, I gave a Bible to.’
might well be an inducement to learn to read.\footnote{Cruttwell, \textit{Wilson}, I, p. 56 n.; Cressy, \textit{Literacy and the social order}, p. 51.} Probate lists seem to confirm Hugh Stowell’s claim that no poor man’s cottage was without its Manx or English Bible and Prayer Book.\footnote{Stowell, \textit{Wilson}, p. 108.}

The Manx probate lists are interesting, but as an indicator of reading ability they are of limited value. Much more useful in gauging general literacy are the secondary sources of commentators like Wilson, Hildesley, Philip Moore, Denton and Waldron, and although what each of them wrote inevitably reflects their own agendas they provide enough evidence to support a fair evaluation of the changing state of literacy in reading across the Island.

**Literacy in writing**

The standard method of assessing changes in written literacy is by analysis of signatures and marks in a range of documents.\footnote{See Stone, ‘Literacy and Education’, pp. 98-99, 102-03, 107.} Although Cressy argues that the ability or inability to write a signature may not in itself be the most interesting or significant body of evidence, it is direct, authentic and objective, and facilitates valuable comparative judgements between different socio-economic groups.\footnote{Cressy, \textit{Literacy and the social order}, pp. 53-54.} This is particularly important in evaluating documentary evidence in the Isle of Man, where marked contrasts, not only between the poor and the relatively more affluent, but also between the old-style rural leaseholders and the burgeoning entrepreneurs of the new ‘middling sort’, may be explored. Schofield has argued convincingly that valuable conclusions about more comprehensive writing skills and literacy in reading may be drawn from such evidence, provided that the research base is sufficiently broad.\footnote{Schofield, ‘Measurement of literacy’, pp. 319-20.} The general correlation between reading literacy and the ability to write a signature explored by Cressy and Schofield is confirmed in regional studies by M.J. Campbell (Bristol and Gloucestershire), Cressy (London and East Anglia), Houston (northern England) and Spufford (Cambridgeshire).\footnote{See Cressy, ‘Levels of illiteracy’, p. 2; Schofield, ‘Measurement of literacy’, p. 317; Houston, ‘The Development of Literacy’, p. 200; Campbell, \textit{Bristol and Gloucestershire}, pp. 164-66.}

Signatures and marks may be found in a wide variety of documentary evidence in the Isle of Man as in other parts of Britain. Sources identified by Cressy as particularly useful in studying literacy are equally available in Manx records: marriage contracts, wills and
beneficiary receipts, leases, leaseholders’ registration or voting lists, jury enrolment and court records all contribute to an effective evaluation of changing literacy from 1668 through to the end of the eighteenth century. (Signatures of clergy, Keys and senior civil officers, which are generally identifiable, are excluded from the following analysis).

There are no Protestation Returns (1642) for the Isle of Man, but a glimpse of the state of literacy in writing before Barrow’s episcopate may be seen in a 1648 ‘humble petition of the parishioners of KK. Maughold’ requesting the lord’s approval for the election of William Christian as clerk, in which almost all the petitioners signed with their marks. The situation had not changed in the 1660s: sixty Arbory parishioners wrote marks when they petitioned for the re-instatement of John Crellin as minister in c.1660.772 By 1700, however, some of the children educated during the first ten years of Barrow’s primary schools (1668 to 1678) may be expected to feature as participants or witnesses in documents; it is possible that some parents, too, may have acquired a measure of basic literacy from their children by this date.

It is particularly opportune that in the first summer of the eighteenth century all leaseholders were assembled in each of the six sheadings to appoint a representative to ‘treat with our Hon[oura]ble Commissionrs touching our houldings’ in deliberations on the Island’s proposed Act of Settlement, on which William Stanley, ninth earl of Derby, had commissioned Bishop Wilson to advise.773 The returns of five sheadings have survived: those from Garff, which include four women leaseholders, and Glenfaba list all the leaseholders by name with their signatures or marks; the Michael return is signed by Henry Norris, vicar of Michael, and lists all names without marks or signatures; the Ayre and Rushen returns are signed by the respective vicars and coroners, but no names are listed.774 (Figure 19)

The Garff and Glenfaba returns provide a valuable insight into the literacy in writing of leaseholders in the six constituent parishes, which include the towns of Douglas, Peel (German) and Ramsey (Maughold). Non-Manx names, which may indicate education off-
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772 ‘Petition’, JMM, 3 (1935), no. 44, p. 54: the original document listing 102 parishioners is referenced ‘Claghbane Papers’, no. 127; MNH, MS X, 14 & 81. (These two documents have obsolete references and cannot be located).
773 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), 1703 Act of Settlement: Election of Representatives, 25 June 1700. Sacheverell lists the sheadings (area sub-divisions) with their constituent parishes and towns in his survey of 1702: see Sacheverell, Account, p. 11, and figure 9.
774 Women’s rights of inheritance were preserved in the Isle of Man, whereas customary protection of property rights of women and minors was abolished by statute for Wales in 1696 and the rest of Britain in 1725: see Katherine Warner Swett, ‘Widowhood, custom and property in early modern North Wales’, Transactions of the Honourable Society of Cymmrodorion, 18, no. 2 (December 1996), p. 195.
Figure 19 – Garff and Glenfaba leaseholders, 1700.

1703 Act of Settlement: Election of Representatives – leaseholders’ voting returns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Manx names</th>
<th>Non-Manx names</th>
<th>Manx names</th>
<th>Non-Manx names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Garff</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onchan</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maughold (includes Ramsey)</td>
<td>55 men; 3 women</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lonan</td>
<td>52 men; 1 woman</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Glenfaba</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German (includes Peel)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Town parish totals</strong></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals in all areas</strong></td>
<td>245</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

775 MNH MS 09782 (CRP), 1703 Act of Settlement: Election of Representatives, Garff and Glenfaba voting returns, 25 June 1700.
Island, are listed separately. These figures suggest that 8.8% of town leaseholders in Peel and Ramsey could write, but when rural leaseholders are added the figure drops to 5.7%. It is unfortunate that similar data is not available for the other four sheadings, and particularly for Castletown, but if the Garff and Glenfaba returns are projected onto the rest of the Island, then the data suggests that c. 6.5% of the Island’s leaseholders in 1700 could write. An even gloomier picture emerges in presentments to the church courts and petitions to the Court of Common Pleas in 1700: of 58 petitioners and witnesses in a total of ten records, 57 gave marks and just one signed. A year later all twenty-four leaseholder jurymen representing Garff and Middle sheadings at a Great Enquest authenticated their depositions in a land dispute with marks.

A more comprehensive longer view, however, drawn from a wider range of documents over thirty years from 1695, gives evidence of significant progress in written literacy. Although the number of documents available and the data recorded in them fluctuates markedly from year to year, analysis shows that the percentage of signatures proportional to marks doubled in ten years from a modest 6% in 1695 to an average of 12% by 1705 (with more than 20% in 1704), thirty-five years after the establishment of Barrow’s first schools. This delay before real evidence of progress may be observed accords with Cressy’s conclusion that there is a time-lag of thirty-five years before the results of childhood schooling are reflected in documentary evidence. Over the next ten years the proportion of signatures rises by another 6% and then gathers pace to reach an average of 29% by 1725 (with more than 35% in three of the years).

By far the greater number of signatures proportionate to marks occurs in Chancery Court records, where many of the actions were brought by merchants and retailers, the ‘middling sort’, which accords with Sacheverell’s description (c.1692) of the Island’s ‘men of parts and
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business’. Some signatories can be identified as off-Island traders, notably in cases involving ships’ cargoes, but the names in most records are Manx and these men and women must have come through the schools established by Barrow. In seven of the ten years from 1720 to 1729 signatures in Chancery Court records significantly outnumber marks and in 1750, in 21 records, there are nearly twice as many signatures as marks. Ten years later, however, one striking record gives a contrasting picture which confirms a significant divide in written literacy between entrepreneurs of the ‘middling sort’ and land leaseholders: in May 1760 the parishioners of Patrick and surrounding parishes were presented for failing to repair the highway; of the 84 petitioning parishioners, only five were able to sign their names. It is not clear whether German (which includes Peel) was one of the surrounding parishes, but Patrick and Michael are relatively rural areas where few of the petitioners would have been merchants.

A similar pattern is found in Exchequer Court records for some, but not all, years. Two particular years present some striking evidence and give an illuminating glimpse of the concerns and interests of those involved. A record of 1720 confirms that Island merchants in general could write: when a number petitioned Governor Horne to pass legislation requiring French ships to be quarantined in time of plague, all eleven petitioners wrote a signature. The Exchequer Court was particularly busy in 1728, when there were sixteen cases, including three petitions, with records containing a total of 128 marks and 134 signatures; analysis of these records suggests that many of the signatures may well be those of merchants. In one, in which 77 inhabitants of Douglas requested Governor Horton to grant a temporary embargo on the export of corn from Ramsey, most of the twelve who signed with their names were merchants. In another it seems likely that some of those who signed were land leaseholders: ninety-two ‘Inhabitants of Ramsey and the Adjacent parishes’ requested the governor’s permission to raise money to build a bridge over the Sulby river; although 27 of its 46 written signatures are by Ramsey townspeople, some of whom will have been traders, the remaining signatories are from the surrounding rural parishes. This represents a marked change from the leaseholders’ voting returns of Garff and Glenfaba in 1700.

780 Lib. Canc. (10071/5/15 /16 & /17), 1720-9, passim; (10071/5/24), 1750, passim; (10071/5/29), May 1760.
781 Lib. Scacc. (10071/3/18), 1720, pp. 78-79, Merchant Traders to Governor Horne.
By contrast, between 1663 and 1740 there are relatively few signatures in the records of the Court of Common Pleas and analysis of evidence is problematic. From 1690 jurymen were no longer required to mark or sign their attendance and after 1710 very few cases are recorded, most of which have neither marks nor signatures. One interesting exception is a Setting Quest jury list (four per parish) of 1750, in which 29 jurors made marks and 35 signed their names; in Lezayre, Marown, Rushen and Santan (none of which included the four towns) every jurymen was able to sign his name; in Lonan and Onchan, however, none could sign. Ten years later there is evidence from Lonan that indicates some progress and, more tellingly, a determination to improve literacy: a petition of 1 May 1760, requesting the building of a new schoolhouse, has nine signatures and thirty-one marks; yet Lonan still lagged behind: at a vestry meeting in Lezayre four weeks later twenty-one of twenty-eight wardens and parishioners signed their names.\(^{783}\)

The relative scarcity of signatures in the records of the Court of Common Pleas may reflect the nature of its cases (civil disputes and minor felonies) and the comparatively lowly status of many who were summoned to its sittings.\(^{784}\) The business of the Courts of Chancery and Exchequer, by contrast, typically involved Islanders who were more economically and socially advantaged. The low level of written literacy found in Common Pleas records is similar to that reflected in the diocesan presentments, where the affairs of common people were often represented. Although many presentment records are badly damaged and the practice of writing signatures or marks to authenticate a person’s presence is inconsistent, it is possible to get some sense of written literacy. In 1705, for example, among wardens, plaintiffs, complainants and witnesses there is just one signature in thirty-eight presentments; in one transaction in the Book of Causes, however, a receipt for ‘£18 Poors Money’ is proved by four signatures and two marks.\(^{785}\) The evidence is very sketchy, but a picture emerges of an illiteracy rate among husbandmen and servants in Presentments and Common Pleas records for 1710 of 89%; Cressy found a rate of 87% in the Norwich consistory court records of the 1720s.\(^{786}\)

\(^{783}\) Lib. Caus., 1 & 27 May 1760.  
\(^{784}\) John Feltham described the nature of the Court of Common Pleas after his visit to the Island at the end of the eighteenth century, in *Tour*, pp. 39-40.  
\(^{785}\) Lib. Caus., 9 April 1705.  
\(^{786}\) Cressy, *Education and Literacy in London*, p. 347.
The long gap before the first real signs of significant growth in written literacy appear seems at first to suggest that Barrow’s strategy had very limited success. But it accords with Cressy’s time-lag and other considerations, and what happened in the Isle of Man is strikingly matched by similar outcomes across the Irish Sea. Thomas Gouge established his Welsh Trust to provide primary schools in Wales in 1674, but, despite early success, his programme became mired in controversy over the use of English or Welsh as the language of instruction, and it was not until the 1730s, sixty years later, that some improvement in literacy in Wales was achieved. In Scotland, too, a considerable time elapsed before the statutory provision of primary schools brought about any comprehensive growth in literacy among ordinary people. As Cressy has observed, educational opportunity did not always reflect the intentions of reformers and philanthropists. A more detailed comparative assessment of literacy in the dioceses of St Asaph and Chester follows in chapter 9.

The take-up of places at the Island’s grammar schools is another indicator that the primary schools, at least in the towns, were providing a significant number of literate boys as Barrow had planned. James Wilks claimed that 40 to 50 boys were being taught by James Makon, grammar school master in Castletown from 1700 to 1736, and since a census of 1726 numbered the populations of Castletown and Douglas broadly on a par, it is reasonable to infer that at least a comparable number were attending the grammar school in Douglas, where mercantile enterprise was growing fast. In Peel towards the end of the seventeenth century there were sufficient literate boys to provide pupils for Philip Christian’s free grammar school, which opened in 1688, and by the middle of the eighteenth century the number had grown to make two more secondary schools, the Peel grammar and mathematical schools, viable. Ninety-five boys were educated by Richard Wilson at the mathematical school from its establishment in 1768 to 1784; all were literate and numerate and most went on to careers in merchant shipping. The population of Ramsey in 1726 was 460; if the situation there was similar to Peel it may be estimated that perhaps two hundred boys across the Island.


790 Report to the Keys, 1757, JMM, 2 (1932), no. 33, p. 86; Curphey, ‘Bishop Barrow’s Trusts’, p. 6.


were attaining a sufficient standard of literacy to take secondary school places each year from 1700.\footnote{M.W. Harrison, \textit{South Ramsey and its Churches} (Ramsey, Isle of Man: Ramsey Courier, 1923), p. 9.}

Although it is not possible to use similar statistics to suggest comparable numbers for girls, since only boys attended the grammar schools, there are clues that some girls attained a measure of literacy, an aspiration which their high status in Manx society, with its strong Celtic and Scandinavian heritage, would have encouraged. In 1680 forty-eight Ramsey parishioners commended their ‘English Schoole’ teacher, Hannah Bennett, ‘in her care and pains in teaching our Sons and Daughters their Bookes’.\footnote{Lib. Caus., Ramsey, 21 September 1680.} Hannah Bennett, Ann Callin, Sophia Douglas, Rebecca Mordy and Isabel Quiggin were among a number of women who became primary school teachers; and there were notable initiatives by benefactors like Catherine Halsall, Lady Elizabeth Hastings and Thomas Gawne to provide primary and secondary education specifically for girls.\footnote{H.S. Cowin, ‘Genealogy in the Isle of Man’, \textit{IMNHAS}, 7, no. 1 (1964), p. 23; MNH, MS 00803C, Convocation Papers, p. 3: review of Lady Elizabeth Hastings’ will, 29 May 1740, and petition, 27 May 1741, p. 10; MNH, MS 09756, Diocesan Archives, Philip Moore, \textit{et al.}, testimonial re. Mrs Sophia Douglas; Keble, \textit{Wilson}, II, p. 861. See also MNH MS 00803C (Convocation Records): ‘Rebecca Mordy School Msr. of KK Santa (figure 15).}

Women who became retail entrepreneurs must have been both literate and numerate: listed in the probate inventory of Margaret Quaile of Douglas (1680) were ‘two Bibles, one Concordance [. . .] other English books [. . .] two New Prayer Books [and] 12 quire of white paper’; Deborah Looney’s estate (1711), valued at £85 3s 5d, included ‘a Reading Desk [and] Dixionary’; Margaret Killey (1714), however, one of the most successful of the Douglas merchants of the early eighteenth century, had no books, but left estate valued at £376 5s 10d. Among less affluent women, too, probate records suggest that some could read: Dorothy Birkett of Douglas (1718) left a ‘Bible [. . .] 2 Books [and] 2 prs spectacles’ in an estate valued at £4 8s 6d; and among the goods of Ann Shimmin of Malew (1779) were four books valued at 3d.\footnote{EW, 25 June 1680, 24 October 1711, 8 September 1714, 1718 (date below binding), 18 November 1779. This suggests that there may have been a greater degree of literacy among Manx women than was the case in England, at least in the later eighteenth century, where a study of ecclesiastical court depositions in the diocese of Norwich found that 89% of women in East Anglia could not write their names: see Cressy, ‘Educational opportunity’, p. 314.}

It would seem therefore that, far from failing, Barrow’s schools facilitated a modest growth in literacy, both in reading and writing, which gathered pace through the following century, as analysis of records from 1640 to 1780 demonstrates. (\textit{Figures 21 & 22})

In 1663, when Barrow arrived in the Isle of Man, just 3.9% of document authentications across all sets of records were by signature; by 1770 signatures numbered 51.5% and had for the first time overtaken marks. One document which shows a remarkable contrast with the sheading representatives’ vote of 1700 is a petition of 1780, in which more than eight hundred ‘of the Clergy, Landowners, and other Principal Inhabitants of the Isle of Man’ asked the House of Commons to replace the House of Keys with a reformed assembly ‘elected by the free voice and suffrage of the people’. A few of the subscribers were clergy or senior lay officers, many were merchants, but the majority were land leaseholders; only 47 (6%) of them were unable to sign their names.797

The most notable change occurred during the second decade of Wilson’s episcopate. The dramatic rise after 1710 correlates well with Cressy’s built-in time lag between schooling and adult literacy, and it may also reflect Wilson’s determination to strengthen all the instruments of diocesan organisation and service, which at best had been tackled piecemeal, and often neglected, since Barrow’s departure. Regularisation of clergy income through the Royal Bounty and Impropriate Funds, at least until the constitutional crisis of 1736, played a significant part in improving the provision of all parochial social obligations, not least in the schools, and Wilson’s pursuit of parents who failed to send their children to school and his actions against negligent clergy like Samuel Robinson show how much he valued education.798 It would also appear that his desire to move the schools out of the churches into separate buildings, together with the consequent appointment of laymen as teachers, did not adversely affect the quality of instruction that children received to the extent suggested by Hinton Bird.799 It may be, however, that the relative plateau of change after 1720 reflects limitations in the capacity of the lay teachers. Perhaps, too, the number of parents who saw any need for literacy or the advantages of education and were willing to send their children to school without compulsion had reached a natural peak by the end of the first quarter of the eighteenth century. The four towns, and Douglas particularly, had grown significantly, increasing the number of merchant and new professional families, but most Islanders still lived rural lives governed by subsistence farming, fishing and domestic service, where there was no perceived need to acquire literacy, where children could not be spared from work and where even modest costs were beyond the means of most parents. In this they were no

798 Lib. Caus., Arbory, 2 September 1685 & 21 March 1686.
different from ‘the ordinary Englishman’, for whom, as Cressy concludes, ‘writing [. . .] facilitated a great range of activities, but it was not absolutely essential for any of them’.  

There was another dimension in Island life, however, which quickly came to dominate its economy during the closing years of the seventeenth century – smuggling. By 1721, when merchant-venturers Richard Macquire and Josiah Poole bought the customs revenues from James Stanley, tenth earl of Derby, the running trade which they fostered had taken over the lives of many who found, as Kit Gawne has described, that ‘the money made from a small amount of low risk smuggling far outweighed the pittance made from working the land’.  

The new prosperity was not founded on real improving prospects in trade, manufacture and farming, which Charles Wilson identifies as the main drivers of employment and sustainability for the poor in Lancashire. Yet in the Island such easy money no doubt cast a shadow over the long-term benefits of a school education no less than the drudgery of the croft and the fishing boat.

Statistical analysis of marks and signatures in court records is a blunt instrument, but it is the only obvious method by which to attempt some conclusions about changes in written literacy. The patchy state of court and parish records in the Isle of Man (both in terms of their somewhat haphazard content and often poor physical condition) creates particular difficulties when attempting to apply evaluative criteria; for example, it is almost impossible to differentiate between parishes and in the four town parishes to identify any variations which might reflect the presence of in-comers educated off-Island. Nevertheless, the evidence explored, and not least the glimpses of individual cases and people, gives some sense of what followed from Barrow’s reforms.

Collateral clues

Any attempt to see some correlation between the new educational opportunities and socio-economic changes in the Island from the 1660s is at best speculative. There are some additional indicators, however, which may reflect indirectly the long-term benefits of Barrow’s wide-ranging contributions to Island life. One key example is the expansion of...
trade through to the mid-eighteenth century, which has been fully documented by Roger Dickinson and Kit Gawne. Customs revenues show significant growth up to the Act of Settlement in 1704: although fluctuating widely, from a base of £32 19s 4d annual totals reached over £100 by the 1690s, rising further to a peak of £175 8s 7d in 1701. The same sources inevitably do not provide such clear cut evidence for the burgeoning growth of mercantile enterprise in the ensuing fifty years, since it was by duping customs officers like George Waldron and evading the tariffs they tried to collect that the Manx ‘running trade’ prospered; but where legitimate trade grew hand in hand with the clandestine, the success of venturers like George Moore far outstripped what had been achieved before. Whether or not their activities were legal in the eyes of the revenue men, the wealth they generated for themselves and the Island was remarkable. Growing prosperity, beginning as early as the 1680s and 90s, is also reflected in the appearance of new houses, or substantial extensions added to existing buildings, owned by some of the ‘middling sort’ of people, as Nigel Crowe has shown: Balcony House in Malew Street, Castletown, built by David Murrey, is a notable example. The pattern of changing literacy suggests that it was these entrepreneurs who most readily took advantage of the educational opportunities instituted by Barrow; as noted earlier, all the trading men who petitioned Governor Horne in 1720 to request a quarantine injunction against French vessels were able to sign their names.

At the opposite end of the social spectrum the impact of Barrow’s reforms may be more directly seen in the pastoral ministry of the church, and in particular the provision of social care for which it was the sole agent. Poor relief in the parishes, which had been strengthened by legislation enacted in Barrow’s governorship, worked effectively through the episcopates of Wilson and Hildesley. Not long after his arrival Wilson related an incident when a pauper, calling on him for alms to feed his children, explained: ‘I go round with my bag from house to house, and generally get a herring from each housekeeper. This is our food’. Wilson was prompted to set up a welfare fund, to which all his clergy agreed to contribute, and although he acknowledged that ‘no great matters can be expected, considering the poverty of the Place, and Circumstances of the Clergy’, their gifts, together with parishioners’ alms collected in the
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803 Dickinson, Lordship, appx. ix.
804 Gawne, Controversy, pp. 29-33.
806 Lib. Scacc. (10071/3/18), 1720, pp. 78-79, Merchant Traders to Governor Horne.
807 Keble, Wilson, I, pp. 135-36; in his Matricula Pauperum (Register of the Poor) Wilson listed all the poor, as reported by the clergy, and ensured that poor relief was given to every Islander in need: see Cruttwell, Wilson, I, p. 56.
churches, enabled him to help the disadvantaged and pay for lay teachers in the poorest parishes. Disbursements from this fund in the year 1700/01 included 2s 10d to ‘Wm Christian, a poor youngman, who lay a long time sick, in great misery’; 10s ‘to Widow Sayle’s 4 small Children of [Andreas]’; and 6d to ‘Wm Saint, a poor Man’. And it was not only Islanders who were helped: 2s 8d was given ‘to 4 poor Passengers detain’d here by contrary winds’; and 4s 8d ‘to Mr Walker of Douglas, to pay for the lodging & dyet of a poor Strange woman’. Such welfare support was singularly more generous than the few pence customarily paid as statutory relief to poor ‘travellers with passes’ in eighteenth-century England.

Wilson’s biographer Clement Cruttwell commended his generosity in giving more than half his income to the relief of the poor: ‘The charities he bestowed himself, and the contributions he obtained of others, are proofs of his munificence and the benevolence of his disposition.’ But Wilson’s remarkable energy had to be matched by the support of his clergy, their charitable contributions and their diligence and effectiveness in parochial service. ‘Church livings,’ he explained to his children, ‘were [...] designed [...] to maintain our families, to keep up hospitality, to feed the poor.’ This charity contrasts markedly with the situation in Ireland, where sectarian bias often obstructed the disbursement of poor relief; the philanthropy of Wilson and his clergy and Manx parishioners’ alms would have found little favour among the more affluent of the people of Sligo, for example, who in 1714 were unwilling to help ‘a parcel of beggars’ brats’. Philip Moore exemplified just such a pastoral commitment to ‘the Stranger, the Fatherless & the Widow – the Blind & the Lame & the Halt, [who] find their way to his Door, to his Fireside – for where else sh[oul]d they go – if the Parson be n[o]t charitable who sh[oul]d’. To be effective the clergy had to be not only committed to their duties, but also well-educated and sufficiently remunerated to avoid the need to supplement their income through inappropriate alternative enterprises. They had to be the sort of men Barrow had sought to bring to the diocese and, notwithstanding Waldron’s patronising comments, the fact that Wilson could rely on most of his clergy to
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808 Lib. Caus., 5 November 1700, 10 September, 30 October & 16 December 1701.
813 MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Philip Moore to Hildesley, 17 December 1768.
fulfil these obligations is further testimony to Barrow’s vision, pragmatism and financial acumen.\textsuperscript{814}

All this was put at risk by the two defining crises of the eighteenth century: the transfer of the lordship to the Atholls after the failure of the Stanley line in 1736, and the Revestment to the British crown in 1765. One of the first actions of James Murray, second duke of Atholl, was to annul the agreement Barrow had made with Charles Stanley in 1668 to purchase the old monastic tithe income for the benefit of the clergy and the schools; at a stroke the Impropriate Fund was lost. Bishop Wilson wrote to Murray in desperation: ‘The maintenance of the clergy does in great measure depend upon them, together with the free school in Castletown, and thirteen petty schools in several parishes; which schools must entirely be laid down, there being no other provision for them.’\textsuperscript{815} Murray granted Wilson permissive loans to allow the schools to function and clergy to be paid, but the situation remained precarious. Barrow had foreseen just such an eventuality, however, and had negotiated a security of ‘lands and herediments within the county of Lancaster, of the value of £2,000’. Wilson’s application to Edward Stanley, eleventh earl of Derby, to retrieve this collateral met with prevarication, but after lengthy and costly pursuits through the courts, funding for the schools and clergy stipends was eventually restored in 1758.\textsuperscript{816}

The constitutional crisis of 1765 rocked the Island to its core.\textsuperscript{817} The imposition of the Mischief and Revesting Acts had immediate effect; what had been celebrated as ‘a place of trade and liberty’ was transformed, as Philip Moore lamented to Bishop Hildesley:

> Nothing now but Anarchy & Confusion, ruled by Custom house officers, tide waiters & vinegar men [. . .] Bands of armed men go about the Country, terrifying the people [. . .] ’Tis a very melancholy situation that we are in at pres[en]t, for want of a regular form of Civil Gov[ernmen]t amongst us [. . .] This is the Wisdom & Council of Gothomic men, w[i]th a Sledge Hammer to break an Egg [. . .] I pray God, y[ou]r Lordship’s endeav[ou]rs to remedy these Cruel Evils of our unsettled state may be attended with success.

\textsuperscript{814} Waldron, \textit{Description}, pp. 16-18.  
\textsuperscript{816} MNH, MS 06568 MD 436/17/4 (Harrison), ‘Tripartite Indenture: Collateral Security’, 24 January, 1675/6; Charities, pp. 11 & 13, Orders of Chancery, 7 July 1757 & 11 May 1758.  
During the decade of political and legislative paralysis that followed, the only instrument of administration that operated with any degree of effectiveness was the church, at local level and Island-wide. ‘We have no civil magistracy,’ Philip Moore recorded. ‘The Governor and Deemsters have suspended their functions, and forbear to act, not knowing on what ground they stand.’ One agency alone continued to operate: ‘The Spiritual Court, indeed, has gone on with their business as usual.’

The fabric of social care which the church provided was more important at this time than at any other since Barrow’s episcopate and the ministers who delivered it were in effect Barrow’s men, the beneficiaries of his drive for improved conditions and education for the clergy. Most took his vision to heart in their care of souls, the cura pastoralis of their parishioners, both spiritual and social, which Wilson and Hildesley asked of them and for which they were the sole agents. It may be argued, then, that Barrow’s vision and endowments, together with the resourcefulness and resilience of the clergy he had sought to provide for the Island church, saved the day.

Conclusion

Any evaluation of advances in literacy in the Isle of Man must rely on anecdote and inferential document analysis. There has been no previous attempt to use the documents in this way, and the method can at best only indicate trends, but the range and provenance of the documents analysed, although constrained in part by the nature of the court records, are sufficiently broad and varied to give a useful picture of developing literacy. Some questions cannot be answered with any certainty; for example, it has not been possible to gauge the extent to which women’s literacy changed. But the evidence presented and analysed in this chapter contributes significantly to our knowledge and understanding of social changes, particularly in education and the acquisition of literacy in reading and writing, in the Isle of Man in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries and there is much that can be concluded.

Although the number of Manx documents which have survived is limited in some years, they provide a reasonably representative body of evidence from which to draw valid conclusions about changes in written literacy. The charts (figures 19, 20, 21 and 22) are compiled from all
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818 MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Philip Moore to Hildesley, 26 June 1765.
archived court records, secular and ecclesiastical, in each year, and from selected probate records and wills in sample years. Signature evidence for the clergy, the Keys and the lord’s administrators are not included in the analysis, since all were fully literate. Apart from these, two social ranks feature most widely in the records – the leaseholder farmers and the ‘middling sort’ of people. There are inevitably significantly fewer records representing the majority poor, not least because jurymen, witnesses, petitioners and others called before the Court of Common Pleas were not required to sign or mark their attendance after 1690; furthermore, very few cases were recorded after 1710. Nevertheless, the available records offer a sufficiently consistent representation of the wider Island community to validate a useful assessment of changing trends.

The ‘middling sort’ of people, the professional men and the merchants and entrepreneurs, were the most ready to capitalise on educational opportunities, as was the case beyond the Island’s shores where, as Keith Wrightson concludes in his study of English society from 1580 to 1680, ‘Education, for the most part, was for those who could afford it. The mass of the poor were excluded.’ It is clear that the acquisition of literacy progressed faster and more comprehensively in the Island’s towns, but since records for Castletown, Douglas and Ramsey are frequently not listed separately within the old parochial structures it is often difficult to identify the social and economic status of signatories (except in wills and probate records). The Island’s rural leaseholders were much slower to embrace the schools, at least for themselves, because they did not need to read and write.

In documentary evidence the Island’s majority poor are under-represented, even in the records of presentments and actions in the Court of Common Pleas, but there is sufficient anecdotal evidence to back up a sense of the pattern of change across all the social strands through the eighteenth century. Barrow’s elementary schools were free for poor families, but the real price, even for those who paid ‘the school penny’, was the loss of children’s earnings, and this, as Houston has shown, was the real deterrent, in Britain as in the Isle of Man. ‘The poorer sort,’ Bishop Wilson observed, ‘may have just cause, and their necessities require it, to keep their children at home for several weeks in the summer and harvest.’ In this respect they were no different from the rural poor in England; the school hours in the

819 Wrightson, English Society, p. 225.
820 Houston, Scottish Literacy, p. 119; Spufford, Contrasting Communities, p. 173.
Cheshire village of Odd Rode, for example, were limited at harvest time\(^{821}\). Yet if Island children could not be spared from the croft, the fields and the fishing in high summer or at harvest, they could attend at other times, and many did.

David Vincent describes formal schooling as one resource among many in the process of acquiring literacy in England, but in the Isle of Man the instruction given in the schools played the primary role, since in the homes of the Island’s labouring poor the written word would have had no place in the process of cultural exchange and education; they could not speak or read English and nothing was printed in Manx Gaelic before 1707\(^{822}\). Although the teaching was often poor and resources inadequate or non-existent, there is a good deal of evidence suggesting that many parents came to see the value of schooling for their children. The initiative of twenty Ballaugh parishioners who engaged and paid the salary of a teacher when the diocese failed to provide one is reflected across the Island in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries in petitions for instructive sermons, preferably in Manx Gaelic, and spiritual and lay teaching. It may well be that these popular aspirations were inspired by Barrow’s educational vision, but they also betray the reality of the patchy implementation of his plans. Spufford (like Joseph Lancaster at Borough Road at the end of the eighteenth century) calculated that a child of average ability in the seventeenth century could learn to read in school by the age of seven and to write after a further year (although fluency in writing took considerably longer)\(^ {823}\). Judged against these expectations the Island’s schools before 1720 fell far short of what Barrow had intended, although the delay of up to two generations before their contribution had a significant impact on the growth of literacy was not unique to the Isle of Man.

The causes were many and varied – uncommitted teachers, poor teaching methods, inadequate and unreliable remuneration, unsuitable and sometimes squalid buildings and, in some parishes, an almost complete lack of books. Furthermore, the Isle of Man shared with Ireland, Highland Scotland and European regions like Flanders and the Sami lands of northern Scandinavia the complication of having its own language, a significant obstacle to the acquisition of literacy, particularly where the vernacular was primarily an oral language; as Houston has noted, in such regions literacy levels remained relatively low well into the

\(^{821}\) MNH, MS 00802C, Convocation Papers, 3 February 1703, pp. 4-5; Robson, *Education in Cheshire*, p. 114.

\(^{822}\) Vincent, *Literacy and popular culture*, pp. 69, 92.

\(^{823}\) Margaret Spufford, ‘First Steps in Literacy: the Reading and Writing Experiences of the Humblest Seventeenth-century Spiritual Autobiographers’, *Social History*, 4, no. 3 (October 1979), p. 412.
nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{824} Wilson’s and Hildesley’s well-intentioned changes of policy, too, which substituted laymen and laywomen as the children’s teachers and then made Manx Gaelic the language of instruction, may have held back the progress of literacy to a degree, as Hinton Bird suggests. Wilson’s removal of the schools out of the churches may be reflected in the relatively slower rate of developing literacy from 1720 to 1760, but if the notable advance after 1670 is considered according to Cressy’s built-in time lag between schooling and adult literacy, it is reasonable to assume that elementary education was not weakened. Most of Wilson’s lay teachers seem to have been competent and diligent; there are relatively few instances of complaint, and a number of the petty school teachers listed in the convocation minute of May 1741, cited earlier, were long-serving. Hildesley’s change to Manx Gaelic as the language of instruction in the schools also appears to have had little effect on the progress of literacy. Philip Moore’s reference to the Island’s ‘English schools’ late in Hildesley’s episcopate (1768) and the presentment reference to Ramsey’s ‘English’ school in 1780 suggest that in practice English was still being taught from 1755 to 1772, and Bishop Richmond’s speedy reversion to the former policy confirms the preference of many Islanders and most of the clergy for instruction in English. The practical advantages of using English, especially as perceived by the ‘middling sort’ of people, worked against Hildesley, and the linguistic preference recorded in Onchan in 1786, where the teacher ‘does not teach the Children Manx, but as much English as possibly he can, agreeable to the request of their parents’, confirms that Barrow’s original policy had become the choice of those who valued educational opportunity.\textsuperscript{825} Although the scope of this study does not extend into the nineteenth century, ongoing trends discernible up to 1780 show no signs that either Wilson’s or Hildesley’s changes held back the continuing development of literacy, whether in English or Manx Gaelic.

As late as 1798 Thomas Cubbon wrote: ‘The present number of Inhabitants in the Isle of Man [. . .] is conjectured to exceed twenty-eight thousand; nearly two-thirds of whom are supposed not to understand the English language.’\textsuperscript{826} But Cubbon’s statistic does not imply that more than sixty per cent were illiterate. If the correlation between oral and written literacy noted by Cressy, Schofield and others is correct when applied to the Isle of Man,

\textsuperscript{824} R.A. Houston, ‘Literacy and Society in the West, 1500-1850’, \textit{Social History}, 8, no. 3 (October 1983), p. 285. In Wales, however, Griffith Jones’s circulating schools provided the means for dynamic growth in reading literacy in the second half of the eighteenth century.

\textsuperscript{825} MNH, MS 00793C, Visitation, 1786.

\textsuperscript{826} Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 259, subscript to letter, Cubbon to Butler, 17 March 1798.
statistical and anecdotal evidence suggests that by 1780 a greater proportion of Islanders could read than their contemporaries in much of rural England and Wales, although for many their literacy was in Manx Gaelic rather than English.827

Both Wilson and Hildesley were able to commend the competence and diligence of most of their clergy, the majority of whom had been educated on Barrow’s academic foundations.828 The grammar and academic schools and the scholars they produced made possible the progress of literacy, civil and ecclesiastical reform, and the development of social welfare in the Isle of Man; the pastoral and social care given by the ministers did much to sustain the poor, not only in the two major socio-political crises, but also right through a century marked by desperate need and the indifference of secular agencies. One inevitable consequence of their continuing wretchedness was that many of the poorest Islanders, particularly in the country parishes, remained illiterate right through the eighteenth century. Yet it became the aspiration of the majority to read and learn, using either English or their Manx Gaelic vernacular, and the means to do so were the schools and teachers first put in place by Barrow and financed by the endowments he had secured.829 So it was that Hugh Stowell could record:

On entering the peasant’s humble dwelling, the first objects which present themselves, in the white-washed window, are the Bible and Prayer-book in Manx or English, and underneath are generally found some of the Bishop’s [Wilson’s] publications in both these languages. Such are the contents of the poor man’s library in the Isle of Man.830
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828 For example, when James Stanley found fault with the academic master and Castletown schoolmaster, Wilson was quick to defend them: ‘They are known to be men of Exemplary Lives and have always been very diligent in their Respective Employments’. MNH, MS 09309, Wilson to earl of Derby, 19 September 1718.
829 Craine, ‘Ballaugh,’ IMNHAS, 4, no. 3 (1940), p. 463.
830 Stowell, Wilson, p. 108.
Chapter 9

Context and comparison: education, literacy, pastoral welfare and the care of children in the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph, 1660-1800

‘Nor is it a privilege to be meantly prized by any people to have education provided’ – Christopher Wase

Introduction

This chapter considers developments in the Isle of Man in the context of the provision of schools, social welfare and the progress of literacy in north-east Wales, Cheshire and south Lancashire.831 The evaluation is particularly illuminating in view of Barrow’s association with the Welsh counties of Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery during his episcopate in St Asaph, and with Henry Bridgeman (dean of Chester and bishop of Sodor and Man), the Stanleys at Knowsley, Richard Sherlock at Winwick, William Banks (of Winstanley) and Thomas Cholmondeley (of Vale Royal) in the diocese of Chester.

Elementary education in the diocese of Chester

When Isaac Barrow arrived in the Isle of Man in 1663 he attributed the wretched condition of the Manx people directly to the poor education and remuneration of the clergy. They were cut off from the potential benefits of association with mainland contemporaries and it is likely that only two, Henry Lowcay and John Thompson, attended a university.832 But in three key respects the Island was more fortunate in its clergy. First, the diocese was not plagued by the absenteeism and pluralism that was widespread in England and Wales.833 Second, the lack of a university education was not necessarily a disadvantage in preparing men for their pastoral duties; Rosemary O’Day has shown that the universities singularly failed to give any pastoral training, an omission noted by Barrow’s friend Richard Sherlock, who set up in his parish at

831 The epigraph for this chapter is from Wase, Free Schools, p. 33.
832 MNH, MS 10457/2, Ballaugh register, 1701 (recorded in Baptisms). Lowcay and Thompson [Thomson] are not listed in the alumni records of Oxford, Cambridge or Trinity College, Dublin.
Winwick an organised scheme for his young clergy. The importance of pastoral training for an isolated diocese was recognised again by Bishop Wilson, Sherlock’s nephew, who brought the Winwick scheme to Bishopscourt in 1699. Third, no university training could give the Island clergy an essential knowledge of Manx Gaelic. Barrow rightly planned to improve the standing and effectiveness of the clergy in the future by establishing the means to give them an academic education, either overseas or at the Island’s academic school. In the meantime he may well have had Sherlock’s initiative in mind when, having re-constituted the Island’s ecclesiastical laws, he set down for his ministers clear pastoral instructions within a firm framework of discipline, which he monitored closely by letters and visitations.

The diocese of Chester was as poor as Sodor and Man when its episcopal jurisdiction was restored in 1660; Archbishop Sheldon advised John Wilkins, bishop of Chester from 1668 to 1672, that it was ‘too impoverished for [his] merit’. It was a vast, ramshackle diocese which had suffered considerable deprivation during the interregnum and many of its clergy were correspondingly impoverished. The gift of Queen Anne’s Bounty in 1704 began a slow process of improvement, but it was not until 1717, fifty years after Barrow secured augmentations for Manx clergy, that some Chester stipends reached thirty-five pounds. Pluralism, non-residence and the poverty of many livings continued to plague parts of the diocese throughout the eighteenth century: a visitation return of 1743 complained of ‘a whole Colony of poor raw Boys taken from the home-bred insignificant schools of this Country and Ordain’d Deacons on some sorry Titles [. . .] by his Lordship of Chester”; and as late as 1778 Bishop Beilby Porteous recorded that in the diocese of Chester two hundred clergy were non-graduates and ninety-eight were non-resident.

This may account in part for the church’s reluctance to address the problem of educational need in the north-west. Many clergy supplemented their meagre incomes by teaching, but their own indifferent education compromised their effectiveness. The consequence was that it was left to dame schools, charity schools, parish apprenticeships and, later, Sunday Schools to provide basic instruction for the poor majority. Many of these volunteer associations which
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836 Bodl, Tanner MS 314.50, Gilbert Sheldon to John Wilkins, 1668 (n.d.).
replaced ‘the collapsed power of ecclesiastical authority’ were short-lived, but the SPCK, founded in 1698, became the primary agency in setting up charity schools in the eighteenth century.\footnote{Michael J. Roberts, ‘Head versus heart? Voluntary Associations and Charity Organisation in England, c. 1700-1850’, in Cunningham and Innes (eds), Charity, pp. 68-69.}

Puritan legislation in 1649, based on Hartlib’s proposals that sequestered episcopal money should be used ‘to maintain English Schoolmasters, for the well governing of all sorts of poore children’, could have provided elementary education throughout England and Wales by 1660, but the resources were squandered; Hartlib reflected: ‘If we had paid as many schoolmasters as we have done military officers […] we had reaped better fruits of our labours and expenses, then disappointment, division, poverty, shame, and confusion.’\footnote{C. Webster (ed.), Samuel Hartlib and the Advancement of Learning (Cambridge: CUP, 1970), pp. 114-15; J. Crossley (ed.), The Diary and Correspondence of Dr John Worthington (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1847), pt 1, p. 166, Hartlib to John Worthington, 30 January 1660; A.E. Dobbs, Education and Social Movements, 1700-1850 (London: Longman, 1919), p. 96.}\footnote{Robson, Aspects of Education, p. 8.} In south Lancashire and Cheshire the reality fell far short of these high intentions; only in the city of Chester and in three Wirral villages were a handful of elementary schools successfully established during the interregnum.\footnote{Robson, Aspects of Education, p. 8.}

In comparison with much of the rest of England the commercial and industrial development of the north-west region was slow; educational provision correspondingly lagged behind and the situation did not change significantly after the Restoration. There were nearly seventy endowments for elementary education in Lancashire and Cheshire in the later seventeenth century, but far fewer were actually established as schools, and many that were continued for no more than a year or two. In Lancashire south of the Ribble only eight elementary schools were established between 1660 and 1699. All were endowed to provide free instruction in reading for poor local children, although whether they fully satisfied this obligation is open to question. At Walton-le-Dale (1672) reading tuition was ‘free only to the children of the town’, but this appears to have applied only to a limited number of poor children; those who could afford to pay and children from outside the parish were charged a fee for reading and every pupil was charged for writing and accounts. Andrew Dandy’s endowment at Cuerden (1673) was ‘for teaching or apprenticing’ local children, but his gift was relatively small and
only five poor children were taught free. In Cheshire there were at least twenty-four
elementary schools functioning before 1699, of which fourteen were established after the
Restoration; most were required to give free reading tuition to the poorest local children.
Schools founded on substantial or multiple gifts, such as Ashton-on-Mersey and Sale (1667),
were able to fulfil their endowment obligations; but, as in south Lancashire, this was not
always possible in schools with weak or poorly managed endowments.

Even if all these schools were operating effectively on continuing endowments it is difficult
to accept C.D. Rogers’s claim that almost every village in Lancashire and Cheshire had a
school by 1699. Evidence compiled by Derek Robson and the editors of the Victoria
County Histories suggests that this was not the case. At the beginning of the eighteenth
century there were far fewer elementary schools per head of population in south Lancashire
and, to a lesser degree, in Cheshire than in the Isle of Man, where every parish and town had
a school. A hundred years later, with numbers boosted by charity school endowments, many
under the auspices of the SPCK, and foundations by dissenting assemblies, the provision in
Cheshire and, to a lesser degree, in south Lancashire had improved, but the proportion of
schools to children was still well below that of the Isle of Man.

During the eighteenth century fifteen more elementary schools endowed to provide reading
tuition free to poor children were established in south Lancashire. Among the most
successful were the Warrington Blue Coat endowments (1709 and 1717) and Anne Hinde’s
endowments for boys and girls in Manchester and Stretford (1723), which served well those
who wished to learn. In Winwick, however, ‘a Charity School lately built for 20 poor
children’, recorded in 1719, was gone by 1735. In Cheshire at least fifty parish schools,
more than three times the total in south Lancashire, were established during the eighteenth
century, of which a little under half had some connection with the SPCK. They ranged from
small village schools like Eccleston to large and influential establishments like the Chester

841 The schools were at Aughton, Billinge (2), Cuerdon, Didsbury, Newton-in-Makerfield, Walton le Dale and
West Derby. Francis Gastrell (comp.), Notitia Cestriensis (Manchester: Chetham Society, 1850), II, pt 1, pp. 88,
89, pt 2, pp. 162, 226, 254, 291, pt 3, p. 381.
842 Gastrell, Notitia Cestriensis, I, p. 312.
843 C.D. Rogers, ‘Education in Lancashire and Cheshire, 1640-1660’, Historic Society of Lancashire and
844 According to Walton, charitable endowments in Lancashire doubled between 1700 and 1750: see Walton,
Lancashire, p. 97.
845 Farrer and Brownbill (eds), County of Lancaster, II, pp. 619, 620-21.
Blue Coat School and the boys’ and girls’ charity schools at Nantwich. By the last quarter of
the eighteenth century a number of schools were additionally providing vocational and
technical instruction to prepare boys and girls for a useful working life. Charity schools did
not always have the support of the parish clergy, although their purpose was to give ‘a liberal
and a Christian Education’, since they were open to dissenters, but it is interesting to note that
the only two bishops recorded as founding such schools were Nicholas Stratford of Chester
(1689-1707) and Thomas Wilson of Sodor and Man.847 Their contributions belie the
indifference of the majority in the Church of England to the educational needs of the poor.
For the most part support for the schools was secular, much of it sourced from the growing
wealth of the ‘middling sort’; by 1766 the philanthropist Jonas Hanway could write of the
cities and towns, though not of rural England, ‘The nation abounds in charity schools’.848

The successful establishment of a network of parish and town schools in the Isle of Man
would not have been possible if Isaac Barrow had not secured Charles II’s royal bounty and
raised funds to buy the Island’s impropriate tithes. Through his vision, organisational skill
and financial acumen the Manx church and its ministers became the agents not only of
education but also of social welfare for the next two centuries. In England, by contrast, the
established church and most of its senior clergy played no official part in the provision of
weekday elementary education for children until the early nineteenth century when the first
National Schools were set up. Their neglect may be attributed to the church’s limited view of
the purpose of such an education, as represented, perhaps surprisingly, by the reformist
Bishop Porteous, who supported proposals to establish Sunday Schools in Liverpool only on
the narrow principle that ‘the very small degree of learning which is or can be given in these
schools [...] does not either indispose or disqualify them from undertaking [...] the most
laborious employments in town and country’.849

What was taught in most endowed and charity elementary schools was limited to basic
literacy, but private philanthropy, at least towards the end of the seventeenth century, wanted
to give poor children more than utilitarian instruction designed to prepare them for
apprenticeship and work.850 David Owen considers the prescriptions of James Talbot’s The

847 Robson, Aspects of Education, pp. 11, 13, 28, 34, 169-73; William Hendley, A Defense of the Charity-
Schools, p. 25.
848 Jones, Charity School Movement, p. 6; Jonas Hanway, An Earnest Appeal for Mercy to the Children of the
Poor (London: 1766), pp. 111-12.
849 Liverpool General Advertiser, 25 May 1786.
850 Wilson, England’s Apprenticeship, p. 234.
Christian Schoolmaster to be ‘an arid and meagre curriculum’, but they formed the basis of charity school instruction for more than a century.\textsuperscript{851} One of the earliest foundations, at Odd Rode (1681), was ‘for the education and instructing of poor children [. . .] in the principles of the Church of England [. . .] and to read, write, and cast accounts, and other useful learning for poor children’. These were the aims of the benefactors of Seamon’s Moss and Little Heath Schools in Bowdon, too, and the same regulations were set down for Burton School in 1724 by its founder, the Isle of Man’s Bishop Wilson; he required the schoolmaster to take ‘special care to make children sensible of the end of learning, which is that they may be better able to read the Holy Scripture and therein learn their duty’.\textsuperscript{852} By the end of the eighteenth century the prescription was still much the same; when the charity school at Old Swan in West Derby was founded in 1794 as a free school for the children of the poor its ‘chief object [was] to promote Decency of Behaviour and by teaching the Children to read to instill into their Minds more effectually the Principles of Religion and a proper Sense of moral Duty’.\textsuperscript{853}

Whether the poor of the diocese were able or willing to benefit from such philanthropy is open to question. John Clayton and John Wesley believed many had no inclination to become educated: ‘The Poor [of Manchester] refuse or neglect to help themselves,’ Clayton wrote in 1755; ‘they have an abject Mind [. . .] and a sordid Spirit, which prevents all Attempts of bettering their Condition.’\textsuperscript{854} Wesley was equally critical of the ignorance and intemperance of the poor of Lancashire, yet the condition of which he and Clayton complained may well have been the consequence of widespread failure to provide schools. The inadequacy of elementary education, even for children who wanted to learn, is well illustrated by the complaint of a grammar school master in Manchester that he or older scholars had to teach the basics of schooling to many new pupils.\textsuperscript{855} In Liverpool in the first quarter of the eighteenth century just three schools for poor children were established – the Blue Coat Hospital foundation for orphans in 1709, a Quaker school for ‘poor friends children’ and a charity school set up by dissenting congregations in 1715.

In Cheshire more than fifty elementary school endowments were founded by local philanthropists during the eighteenth century, many of which had some connection with the SPCK, and there was similar growth in Lancashire.856 The primary concern of the SPCK, particularly in the first quarter of the century, was to reverse the moral and spiritual decline of the poor, as Joan Simon has argued, and not to alleviate poverty itself; this task was taken up by Cheshire’s Blue Coat and Blue Cap charity foundations, which contributed significantly to social relief.857 Most charity schools charged a fee, however, and the poor were still excluded; even ‘the school penny’ was beyond their resources. Only with the establishment of the first Sunday Schools were poor children at last given a chance; five thousand flocked to these new schools in Manchester in 1785.858

In two key respects the use of Barrow’s funds was more focused than most endowments in north-west England. First, since the Manx clergy were to teach in the churches, no money was diverted to provide separate premises for schools until Bishop Wilson’s change of policy at the beginning of the eighteenth century; furthermore, in 1739 Wilson was able to draw on additional endowments for buildings from Lady Elizabeth Hastings. Second, some endowments in Cheshire and south Lancashire had to provide clothing for poor children and support for those who were to be apprenticed as an extension of their elementary education. Such financial constraints inevitably compromised the basic terms of free schooling for the poor, and this weakness, together with the ambivalent or hostile attitudes of parents who feared the loss of their children’s earning potential, seriously reduced the number of children of the lower social ranks who would benefit from endowments that aimed to better their conditions. In one other key respect the Isle of Man had a significant advantage over Lancashire and, to a lesser extent, Cheshire: its church did not have to contend with the distractions of Catholicism and growing numbers of dissenting assemblies.

Those most likely to attend elementary school consistently were of the ‘middling sort’, the children of tradesmen, craftsmen and free-holding farmers who could afford to pay and for whom further education in a grammar school was an additional aspiration.859 For the poor the eighteenth century offered little. It was not until 1786 that proposals were published in

859 Walton, Lancashire, pp. 97-98, 100.
Liverpool to establish free weekday elementary schools ‘at which the children of the poor shall be taught the most important branches of knowledge, without any expense to their parents’.\(^{860}\) Yet by the end of the eighteenth century, when its population had reached 77,000, there were still no more than five public elementary schools sponsored by the church in Liverpool – two for Church of England children, two founded by Unitarians but open to all, and one Roman Catholic school.\(^{861}\) In the Isle of Man, with a population of 28,000, there were twenty-one.

**Elementary education in the diocese of St Asaph**

The limited provision of education in the diocese of St Asaph during Barrow’s episcopate in the 1670s, which he did not manage to address, proved equally problematic for his successors. The diocese was well served by bishops like William Lloyd, William Beveridge and John Wynne, and according to Erasmus Saunders there were many diligent and competent clergy; pluralism and non-residence were no less prevalent than in north-west England, yet the church was held in great affection, particularly in the northern counties, and the Welsh had a ‘pretty glowing zeal’ for spiritual teaching and pastoral care.\(^{862}\) Diocesan support for the parochial clergy was compromised by the simple barrier of language, however; William Lloyd, Barrow’s successor, expressed concern that ‘We have a great many more cures of souls than we have graduates in this country; and as most of the people understand nothing but Welsh, we cannot supply the cures with any other than Welshmen, [and] the graduates have not been always the best scholars’.\(^{863}\) The main weakness of the diocese was its poverty, the consequence of deliberate alienation of parochial endowments which Erasmus Saunders roundly condemned; John Jones, minister of Capel Garmon, who

\(^{860}\) The Liverpool General Advertiser, 8 June 1786.

\(^{861}\) James Murphy, ‘The Rise of Public Elementary Education in Liverpool: Part One, 1784-1818’, Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire, 116 (1964), pp. 173, 181. There was one other elementary school for the poor in Liverpool – the residential Blue Coat Hospital for orphans, founded in 1709.


\(^{863}\) Bodl, Tanner MS 30.170/172, William Lloyd to William Sancroft, 4 January 1685/6.
subsisted for nearly fifty years on an annual salary of twenty pounds, complained as late as 1749 that his children ‘are at present not only without education but without shoes’.  

The first attempt to provide elementary education for poor children in Wales came in 1674, during Barrow’s episcopate at St Asaph, when Thomas Gouge set up the first of his Welsh trust schools. Humphrey Lloyd, bishop of Bangor, opposed Gouge’s schools and attacked him as an ‘itinerant emissarie of the leading sectaries [who drew] the credulous common people into a disaffection to the government and liturgy of the Church’. There is no record of Barrow’s response to Gouge’s initiative, but his successor, Henry Bridgeman, dean of Chester, was a member of the Welsh Trust. Gouge also drew criticism from Stephen Hughes, a fellow reformer, who argued that the Trust’s policy of teaching children in English was restrictive and divisive. Three hundred Welsh Trust schools were set up, but controversy dogged them and the Trust achieved much more outside its schools through the distribution of Welsh books among the poor, particularly in Denbighshire.

A number of clergy in the diocese were licensed as schoolmasters, some giving instruction in Welsh as well as English, but their teaching was only available to children who could pay. The failure of the Welsh Trust following Gouge’s death in 1681 left north Wales without any provision for elementary education of the poor until the turn of the century when the first of ninety-six SPCK schools was established in Wales. Some of these charity schools were set up in the diocese of St Asaph and by 1738 these, together with a growing number of endowed
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864 Erasmus Saunders, A View of the State of Religion in the Diocese of St David’s (London: 1721), pt 4, pp. 63-74; NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/QA/4, no. 35, visitation return to Robert Hay-Drummond, bishop of St Asaph, 1749. Jones may be referring to all the children of his parish.
865 Bodl, Tanner MS 207.18, Humphrey Lloyd to Gilbert Sheldon, 10 August 1676.
867 Jenkins, Foundations, pp. 199-200; M.G. Jones, ‘Two Accounts of the Welsh Trust, 1675 and 1678’, Bulletin of the Board of Celtic Studies, 9, pt 1 (November 1937), p. 72; Bodl, Tanner MS 207.18, Humphrey Lloyd to Gilbert Sheldon, 10 August 1676; Stephen Hughes, Canwyll y Cymru; sef, Gwaith Mr Rees Prichard (1672) (Llandovery: 1676), prefixed letter.
869 D.R. Thomas, St Asaph, I, p. 133. Bishop Lloyd licensed ‘Gulielmus Jones scholaris ad exercend. offic. Ludimag’ri sive puerorum instructoris in lingua Anglicana et Cambro Britannica infra par’oc’am de Eglwysvach, 1687’.
free schools and small ‘reading schools’, were providing some kind of elementary education in nearly half the parishes.\(^{871}\)

The advocacy of enlightened clergy like bishops Beveridge and Wynne and ministers John Price and Thomas Williams convinced the SPCK, all but one of whose founding members had Welsh connections or interests, that English schools would be of limited value in their diocese; Price wrote to the SPCK in 1700: ‘The Clergy of Denbighshire, Flintshire and Montgomeryshire are agreed to set up Free Schools for the Poor Children [and] they find it most convenient to set up Welsh Schools, that being the Language w[hi]ch ye Parents best understand’.\(^{872}\)

In Ireland the situation was very different. There the acquisition of literacy in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was more commonly in English, a contrast which in part reflected the sectarian dynamics of the Protestant agenda to suppress Catholicism and the Irish vernacular.\(^{873}\) When John Richardson, chaplain to James Butler, second duke of Ormonde, persuaded the SPCK in 1712 to publish Irish language translations of the Book of Common Prayer and the catechism, he promoted his initiative as the best means of evangelizing Irish Catholics. Unlike the popularity of Welsh-language books and the SPCK’s Manx Gaelic publications, however, Richardson’s programme met with little success; whereas Philip Moore and Daniel Gelling could not satisfy the demands of their parishioners for copies of the Manx Gaelic Bible and Prayer Book, most of the 6,000 Irish-language Prayer Books printed remained undistributed.\(^{874}\) The establishment of English-language Charter Schools in Ireland in 1733, supported by government finance, consolidated a widespread acceptance of the superiority of English over Irish as the preferred language of education, on political and practical grounds.\(^{875}\)

---


\(^{874}\) John Richardson, *A short history of the attempts that have been made to convert the popish natives of Ireland, to the establish’d religion: with a proposal for their conversion* (Dublin: 1711); Michael Cronin, *Translating Ireland: Translations, Languages, Cultures* (Cork: Cork University Press, 1996), p. 59; MNH, MS 09309, Diocesan records, Philip Moore to Hildesley, 12 October 1765, and Gelling to (?) SPCK, 20 December 1774.

In the larger market towns like Denbigh and Wrexham and through the Vale of Clwyd Welsh schools were quickly established and endowments were also secured in some smaller Montgomeryshire villages. Bishop William Havard, writing in 1945, praised ‘this great Movement [. . .] born of faith [. . .] to bring light and knowledge to the children of the poor [. . .] the numbers who profited from it were considerable’. But its impact was more limited than he believed; in the rural areas it was almost negligible, and that was where only Welsh was spoken. When Bishop Isaac Maddox initiated a searching visitation enquiry in 1738 the returns revealed that only thirty-one of the diocese’s 118 parishes had charity schools and the poorest children who were required to work or ‘to go for ever and anon to beg for victuals’ did not attend; in Llangerniew, ‘bread was the cry, not education’; in Cerrigydrudion ‘there is neither money available, nor children with time or leisure to be taught’; and in Llandrillo yn Rhos there was no school, although an endowment to educate three poor boys in the parish existed. In the three counties, as in Cheshire and south Lancashire, it was in the towns that the SPCK was most successful in setting up viable charity schools; its methods of associated philanthropy, which underpinned the London system, were ill-suited to the countryside.

It was only when Griffith Jones established his itinerant circulating schools that poor children and adults alike were given an effective and practical opportunity to learn to read, and significantly the language of instruction in the new schools was Welsh. Many Welsh clergy welcomed Jones’s initiative and were diligent in superintending teachers or taking upon themselves the task of teaching children, but inevitably the uneven quality of the clergy significantly affected the provision of education in Wales no less than in the diocese of Chester. ‘Welsh is still the vulgar Tongue, and not English,’ Jones argued. ‘The English
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Charity-Schools, which have been tried, produced no better effect in Country Places.\(^{881}\) The first circulating schools in the diocese of St Asaph were held in 1738 and in the following year fifty-eight scholars attended a school in Denbigh. They were late to reach Flintshire, however; not until 1751 did the first circulating school open at Dyserth with thirty-six scholars, followed two years later by another at Meliden with forty-three scholars.\(^{882}\) The late arrival and small number of itinerant schools in Flintshire may well reflect its demography and the prevalence of the use of English in the north-east of the county; in Mold and Gresford, for example, English and Welsh were being used alternately in church services in the second half of the century.\(^{883}\) In the south-western parts of Denbighshire and throughout Montgomeryshire, however, Griffith Jones’s schools reached remarkable numbers of children and adults. Many of the teachers were unqualified, like John Griffith, ‘a weaver by trade’ who brought a school to Llanddoget, Denbighshire, in 1753, and most were poor, but they were effective; Hugh Davies commended the skill of the visiting teacher in his remote parish of Gwytherin, Denbighshire, whose ‘method seems to me so well adapted to the Genius of the Country Children that they improve more under his tuition than the generality of English Schoolmasters’. Even such skilled vernacular teachers could not reach those who were indifferent or hostile to any notion of schooling, however, while abject poverty kept many in a state of illiteracy; Thomas Hughes lamented the wretched state of his parishioners in Llanfwrog, Denbighshire: ‘Perhaps few parishes in North Wales exceed this in Number of Poor, and (what generally goes together) illiterate Persons, who cannot afford to give Education of any sort to their children.’\(^{884}\) Yet Griffith Jones convinced the English-speaking land-owning gentry of Wales to help pay for circulating schools and Welsh books. His aim was limited to giving ‘but a cheap education [. . .] only the moral and religious branch of it’, yet by the time of his death in 1761 more than 200,000 adults and children, 45% of the total population of the Principality in mid-century, had learned to read in itinerant Welsh schools.\(^{885}\)


The grammar schools

Grammar schools fell out of favour in the aftermath of the \textit{interregnum} and relatively few were founded before the beginning of the eighteenth century. According to W.K. Jordan more grammar school endowments were made in Lancashire in the seventeenth century than in any other English county, but only seven of the twenty-eight free schools in the south of the county listed in the \textit{Victoria County History} up to 1700 were founded after 1600.\textsuperscript{886} A significant number of additional gifts by benefactors like William Hulme were made to existing foundations between 1660 and 1700, which gives more credence to Jordan’s claim, but endowments for new schools were very sparse; only four are listed for the whole county, of which two, Upholland (1668) and Newchurch, Rossendale, (1701), are south of the Ribble. In the eighteenth century schools with secure endowments and the advantage of growing urban populations, like Blackburn, Bolton (le Moors) and Warrington (The Boteler School), continued to prosper, as did well endowed schools in smaller villages, like Winwick; others, like Farnworth and Leyland, dwindled into small elementary schools; and some were either lost or re-founded with new money, as at Leigh.\textsuperscript{887}

In Cheshire eleven new grammar schools were endowed between 1660 and 1800.\textsuperscript{888} There were up to thirty at some time during the eighteenth century, but the majority did not teach a broad secondary curriculum of ‘grammar and classical learning [and] writing, arithmetic, geography, navigation, mathematics [and] the modern languages’.\textsuperscript{889} Many grammar school foundations were degraded and functioned only at elementary level, as at Goostrey.\textsuperscript{890} A large endowment alone did not guarantee an effective school, however; more important was the reliability of income, good management by the trustees and an efficient, conscientious master. William Gleave’s gift of five hundred pounds ensured success at Woodchurch; Audlem School’s annual income of forty pounds was much smaller, but it was regular. Whatever their income, schools that were fortunate to have long-serving and effective masters generally flourished, as at Audlem, where William Evans was an outstanding teacher,
at Stockport under Joseph Dale (1703-54) and at Henry Meols’s free school at Wallasey, where Thomas Robinson taught for sixty-four years.891

The grammar schools in north-west England varied greatly in the quality of education they provided. Masters and ushers were often young, inexperienced men, many of whom were filling in time before proceeding to clerical or professional advancement; some had little interest in or aptitude for teaching, and the benefits of continuity were impossible where lengths of tenure were short. Adam Martindale’s account of his education in Lancashire grammar schools at St Helen’s and Rainford illustrates the uncertainties of the student experience; he valued highly two masters who had been educated at Winwick Grammar School, one of the county’s most successful and well-reputed schools.892 (Figure 23)

In marked contrast to the situation in Cheshire and south Lancashire, there were so few old school foundations in Wales in the mid-seventeenth century that parliament intervened to establish ‘propagation’ free schools. Sixty were founded, but of the few that survived after 1660 only one, at Cardigan, was a grammar school.893 So quick and disastrous was this decline that Hugh Lloyd, bishop of Llandaff, wrote to his clergy in October 1662 asking them to subscribe ‘to the good worke of the free schools [. . .] Of old, Christian schools began here, and (to our great shame) it was not, before the dissolution, so utterly destitute of them, as it is now’.894

When Barrow arrived in St Asaph there were just six grammar schools in the diocese, at Denbigh, Llanrwst, Ruthin and Wrexham in Denbighshire, Berriew in Montgomeryshire and Hawarden in Flintshire, and the endowments of at least two of these were insecure. Richard Clough’s gift in 1570 of ‘the impropriation of Kilken, worth £100 per ann. to the Free School in Denbigh’ was lost (ironically ‘annexed, as a sinecure, to the Bishoprick of St Asaph’), and although the borough’s new charter in 1661 granted certain rents and tithes to re-endow the

894 Bodl, MS Rawl. Misc. 308, Hugh Lloyd to clergy, 29 October 1662.
Figure 23 – ‘The ancient Grammar School at Winwick [. . .] here shewn as it appeared to the eyes of [. . .] Sherlock, Bishop Wilson [and] the martyr Earl of Derby [. . .] from a neat drawing in pencil, made early in the [nineteenth] century by Robert Booth, a Warrington artist.’

foundation and pay the master, it was not until 1726 that sufficient funding was secured to build a school.\textsuperscript{896} The foundation at Llanrwst was operating as little more than a charity school. The master of the free school at Wrexham was paid only ten pounds in the 1670s; this endowment failed later in the century and was not re-established until 1728.\textsuperscript{897} In Ruthin, however, the Goodman foundation was more secure, providing free education to local boys, university exhibitions and apprenticeships for ‘Three Poor Boys of the Town and Liberty of Ruthin’.\textsuperscript{898} The small Montgomeryshire village of Berriew acquired a free school comparable to those in the main market towns when Humphrey Jones gave an endowment of four hundred pounds in 1653. In the later eighteenth century, like many secondary foundations, it lost its classical curriculum and became an elementary school, but it served its community well; local historian D.W. Smith attributes to its ‘exceptional education [Berriew’s] high level of literacy over the generations, compared with less fortunate parishes’.\textsuperscript{899}

Flintshire’s only grammar school at Hawarden served a populous region of growing industry and trade and was well patronised by aspiring parents of the ‘middling sort’ who wanted an English classical education for their sons.\textsuperscript{900} It may well have attracted pupils from Cheshire, too, but according to Clifford Jones, less affluent Welsh-speakers even from villages as close as Buckley never benefited from the foundation, since it was part of an elite English tradition.\textsuperscript{901} Just five years after it opened Roger Mostyn, coal mining pioneer and Lord Lieutenant of Flintshire, wrote: ‘It is difficult to find a convenient school; Harden, in respect
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of the English tongue, is a fit place but there are many children there'. 902 It is unlikely that Mostyn would have chosen Hawarden for his son’s education a century later, however; in 1749 the master, who was paid only fifteen pounds, complained that the school was crowded with ‘Little Children, to be instructed in the first rudiments of the English language’.903 The trustees quickly took action to restrict entry and restore the foundation as a grammar school. As the north-eastern part of the county grew in population and industry a second grammar school was founded at Llanasa on the Dee estuary in 1675. Barrow would have known Thomas ap Hugh who endowed the foundation and since this was when Barrow was trying to secure finance for his own grammar school at St Asaph he must have encouraged this benefaction.904 There were endowments in Flint and Mold, too, but neither survived as grammar schools: Bishop Maddox found in 1738 that Flint had only ‘A Publick School [with] fifty scholars’, and that Mold had ‘No Publick or Charity School [but] there is a school where children are taught to read and write’.905

Barrow’s wish to build and endow a grammar school in St Asaph was not realised until 1688. The omission from his will of his intended gift of two hundred pounds precipitated a long and tangled dispute between his successor, William Lloyd, and his executors, but eventually a settlement was reached and the diocese duly received the full amount from Barrow’s estate. Half the income (valued at twelve pounds by Browne Willis in 1719), together with the Pentre-uchaf endowment, was used to pay the grammar school master and support foundation scholars.906 In 1710 twenty-six boys were benefiting from this endowment.907 By 1738, however, St Asaph grammar school, like so many other foundations, had become an elementary school: ‘We have a Charity School endowed by Bishop Barrow,’ Bishop Maddox’s visitation was told. ‘Stipend of the Schoolmaster £18 p.a. [. . .] nine children taught free’.908 It is possible that there were grammar school pupils in the elementary school, but it was not until 1778 that a modest single-storey schoolroom was built at Roe Gau for the

903 Carlisle, Endowed grammar schools, p. 929.
905 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/QA/1, no. 1, Report of Bishop Maddox’s visitation 1738.
906 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/MISC/919, William Lloyd, deposition, 28 May 1687; Wood, Athenæ, IV, p. 837; Willis, St Asaph, 1801, I, pp. 120-21; Hoy, Isaac Barrow, pp. 73-74, 80, 111. The remaining half of the endowment was assigned to the maintenance of almshouses built by Barrow in 1678.
907 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/QA/1, no. 1, Report of Bishop Maddox’s visitation 1738.
grammar school students. As for the provision of tertiary level education, Wales had to wait until 1872 before the first of the constituent colleges of the University of Wales opened more than two hundred years after Barrow established his two academic trusts for Manx scholars.

Barrow intended his Island grammar school to be free to those who could not afford to pay a fee. The tithe income of Rushen, which he reserved for the grammar school, was to be used solely to pay the master’s salary of thirty pounds, and there was no other call on this portion of the Impropriate Fund; there was no outlay to provide new premises or pay rent and no additional charge on the endowment to provide clothing (as at the Blue Coat and Blue Cap schools). Lowcay’s salary of thirty pounds was comparable to other schools: at Winwick the endowment income was thirty-four pounds in 1668; at Bolton (le Moors) Grammar School the master was paid twenty-six pounds in 1661 and thirty pounds ten years later; in 1691 Thomas Lawton’s salary at Ormskirk, which was ‘endowed very poorly’, was augmented to twenty-six pounds by additional gifts. Samuel Shaw, master of the Boteler School in Warrington from 1687 to 1718, received sixty pounds, but out of that he paid ‘at mine own charge’ the salaries of one or two ushers. When the posts of grammar and academic school masters at Castletown were combined in 1686 the new salary of sixty pounds was significantly higher than in other schools: forty years later re-endowment at Bury Grammar School provided a salary of fifty pounds and it was not until 1747 that a similar salary was recorded at Bolton (le Moors). The academic standing of the first master of the two Castletown schools, Gilbert Holt, was significantly higher than Lowcay and comparable to contemporaries at Audlem and Winwick. Although the offer of a high salary could attract well qualified graduates, however, it could not guarantee continuity; just as Holt, David Genkins, John Woods and John Watterson served successively at Castletown for short periods between 1686 and 1700, so at Frodsham, Knutsford, St Helen’s and Rainford there
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909 Hoy, Isaac Barrow, pp. 112, 114; D.R. Thomas, St Asaph, I, p. 388; Rhyl Record and Visitor, 3 November 1877.
912 Farrer and Brownbill, County of Lancaster, II, pp. 597-98, 611, 612.
913 Beamont, Winwick, pt 7: Robert Wright, master at Winwick (1696-1735), of Jesus College, Cambridge, was a celebrated mathematician and friend of Isaac Newton.
were similar rapid changes, and even the King’s School, Chester, had four briefly serving masters in the mid-eighteenth century.914

Frequent changes were probably inevitable in the Isle of Man, but at least the high salary for the Castletown master for the most part attracted good graduates. Yet a relatively poor salary did not necessarily deter good teachers. When the modest sum of two hundred pounds was assigned from Barrow’s funds, at Bishop Levinz’s request, to provide the Island’s second grammar school at Ramsey in the north in 1687, no more than thirteen pounds could be paid to the master, which was less than the usher’s salary of fourteen pounds at Bolton (le Moors) in 1661 and twenty pounds at Bury in 1726; the comparison makes all the more surprising the relative success of the Ramsey school during parts of the eighteenth century.915 In Douglas, too, Wilson’s careful use of limited funds and his judicious appointment of William Walker as the first master provided the Island with a third grammar school in 1705 comparable to other foundations in the north-west, such as Newchurch, Rossendale (1701), Marple (c. 1714) and Halton (c. 1725).916

Most free grammar schools were not ‘free’, even to the poorest children; it was generally expected that the master would supplement his salary by taking fees.917 There were cases where this was challenged; the imposition of a 16d levy on every ‘English scholar’ at Ormskirk aroused fierce criticism from the vicar, Zachary Taylor, who objected that ‘it would tend to the destruction of the freedome of the Schoole, contrary to the intent of the Founder and to the damage of the inhabitants of the Parish’.918 The rights of the poorest were not often defended so vigorously, however; in England secondary education in the main was for the affluent alone.919 But in the Isle of Man there is no evidence to suggest that Barrow’s grammar school was not free to any able boy as he intended. The fee-paying terms set down by Bishop Wilson for the new grammar school in Douglas in 1705 did not apply to Castletown Grammar School; Barrow’s intentions were vigorously defended by James Wilks in 1757:

914 Robson, Education in Cheshire, pp. 180-84.
915 The Ramsey master’s salary was augmented by £3 from the Royal Bounty.
916 Farrer and Brownbill, County of Lancaster, II, p. 613; Robson, Education in Cheshire, p. 168.
917 Vincent, Grammar Schools, pp. 40-41.
918 Bate, ‘Ormskirk Grammar School’, p. 110.
The Grammar-School of Castletown is by its original Foundation a free-School and all Degrees of People within this isle have an unquestionable right to send their sons thereto as soon as they are capable of Learning Grammar, without Fee or Reward to the master thereof for their Education further than what they shall voluntarily think proper to complimen[t] him with.  

The principle of free secondary education in the Island was not lost. When Barrow’s endowments were cynically manipulated more than a century later by Bishop George Murray and Thomas Thimbleby, the government chaplain, with the result that one ten year-old boy was charged a ten guinea fee, the Keys expressed outrage and stepped in to safeguard Barrow’s Impropriate Fund and re-assert the public obligations set down in his endowment deed.

The development of literacy in the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph

The provision and take-up of elementary education and the development of literacy did not advance in a steady progression in England and Wales in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. After the relative failure of parliamentary plans for the expansion of popular education during the *interregnum*, there was some growth in literacy following a modest renewal in private investment in schools in the 1660s and 70s, but public attitudes to education were equivocal, and when Edward Chamberlayne, among others, made the schools and universities a scapegoat for ‘our late unhappy troubles’, he found a ready audience.  

The church, too, was uneasy about popular education, which peddled ‘erroneous instruction’, according to Archbishop Sheldon, and fuelled increasing dissension. Yet what Dury advocated was simply that ‘the whole work of education, both in boys and girls, should be none other than this: to train them up to know God in Christ, that they may walk worthy of him in the Gospel’. Cressy concludes that ‘the godly motive was effectively smothered by commercial motives and the interests of preserving order’; a teacher’s duty, according to
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920 MNH, MS 06568 MD436/20/22 (Harrison), James Wilks to Governor John Wood, 7 June 1757.
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Francis Brokesby, was to fit children for their social place in life.\textsuperscript{925} The wealthy and socially advantaged turned their backs on Hartlib and Dury, and by the end of the seventeenth century the provision of popular education at all levels was in serious decline.\textsuperscript{926} Most disadvantaged were the poor labouring classes of husbandmen and servants, but loss of educational opportunity was not limited to the lowest social classes or to elementary level. O’Day cites the example of the grammar school in Colchester, where children of yeomen, as well as husbandmen and labourers, had disappeared from the rolls by the 1670s.\textsuperscript{927} In Lancashire illiteracy rates remained higher than in many other parts of England in the mid-seventeenth century.\textsuperscript{928} Only through the new input of the charity schools and non-conformist educators was this trend halted, but there remained for much of the next century an uneven and generally unimpressive picture of popular literacy. Cressy and Schofield estimate that by the 1740s a little under 60\% of men and 40\% of women were able to write, but they note that the inclusion of large numbers of city dwellers, particularly Londoners, and members of new social and occupational groupings in market towns considerably inflates their literacy graphs.\textsuperscript{929} In some parts of the north-west improving literacy reached a high point in the mid-eighteenth century: in Preston the illiteracy rating for men and women fell to 41\% by 1760.\textsuperscript{930} In much of Lancashire, however, including the growing conurbations of Liverpool and Manchester, illiteracy rates remained relatively high; many of the poorer urban children in Lancashire, like rural children, had no schools to go to or spent only a few months at school. It was the children of the ‘middling sort’, often prompted by aspirations to progress to a grammar school, who were most likely to attend regularly.\textsuperscript{931} A.E. Musson attributes to high levels of provincial illiteracy the fact that not a single daily newspaper was published in Lancashire before 1803.\textsuperscript{932}

\textsuperscript{925} Cressy, \textit{Education and Literacy in London}, p. 38; Francis Brokesby, \textit{Of education with respect to grammar schools and the universities} (London: John Hartley, 1701), pp. 3-4.
\textsuperscript{926} Stone, ‘Literacy and Education’, pp. 85, 90; Cressy, \textit{Literacy and the social order}, p. 173.
\textsuperscript{927} O’Day, \textit{Education and Society}, p. 37; Cressy, \textit{Education and Literacy in London}, p. 201: James Cranston, master of Colchester grammar school, listed forty-one admissions in 1671, of which twenty-two were tradesmen’s sons and none were of yeoman or lower rank.
\textsuperscript{929} Cressy, \textit{Literacy and the social order}, p. 177; Schofield, ‘Dimensions’, p. 453.
\textsuperscript{930} M. Sanderson, ‘Literacy and Social Mobility in the Industrial Revolution in England’, \textit{Past and Present}, no. 56 (1972), pp. 76-77, 82-83.
The rural demography of the Isle of Man was very different from these burgeoning urban centres. Although the number of men and women who could sign their names increased in the 1740s by 15%, 54% were still unable to sign by 1750, a figure which suggests that the progress of written literacy in the Island fell significantly short of what was happening elsewhere. But Lawrence Stone estimates that, although the average illiteracy rate for men in England and Wales in 1675 was 60%, falling to 44% a hundred years later, the illiteracy rate was probably as high as 90% in remote rural areas.933

Some sense of the true development of literacy in the Isle of Man relative to other areas can be seen in a comparison with Cheshire, south Lancashire and north-east Wales, although there are still significant socio-economic variations in some of these regional populations. Joseph Massie calculated that labourers and servants constituted about half the population of England in the mid-eighteenth century, a figure similar to that suggested in Gregory King’s analysis of ‘insolvent persons in a poll tax’ in 1688.934 In the Isle of Man, however, the comparable socio-economic groups which constituted the general poor made up a much greater percentage. Some of the categories listed by Houston in his study of literacy in northern England are sparsely represented in the Isle of Man: of 2,061 male deponents of known occupations in the Northern Circuit Assizes records (1640-1750), 11.5% are listed as gentry, 18% as yeomen and 36% as crafts and trades. Some Manx families might be classed as gentry (for example, the Christians of Milntown and Ronaldsway), but there were no yeoman farmers (land-owning ‘forty shilling free-holders’), since all land was held by lease, and far fewer than a third of the Island’s working men practised crafts or trades as their sole occupation.935 The greater majority fell into the categories of labourers and servants, the socio-economic groups identified by W.G. Stephens as those where illiteracy was most common, particularly ‘where farming was dominated by tenant farmers (with absentee landlords) and small freeholders’.936 The absence or relative scarcity of other occupations distorts a comparison with Houston’s findings. Houston records that the percentage of male labourers and servants who were illiterate fell from 82% in the 1680s and 90s to 65% in the

933 Stone, ‘Literacy and Education’, pp. 120, 125.
935 Chamberlayne, Angliæ Notitia, p. 441: ‘The Freeholders of England, commonly called yeomen’; Cressy, ‘Levels of illiteracy’, p. 7. In the north of England the term ‘yeoman’ was often loosely used to describe tenants as well as freeholders; see Houston, Scottish Literacy, pp. 29-30.
1720s and 40s; when statistics for women are added in, the percentage rises to 85% and 72% respectively. Against these figures the Isle of Man appears to fare badly, but some of the demographic and economic forces proposed by Houston as engines of literacy development do not feature as prominently in insular society; for example, there is no equivalent of city residence in the Isle of Man, which in Houston’s figures accounts for nearly 15% of deponents, and only about 8% of Islanders in 1700 lived in the four towns, compared to 24% of Houston’s deponents classed as market town dwellers.\footnote{Houston, ‘The Development of Literacy’, pp. 205, 208. In the case of the ‘middling sort’, however, Houston makes the case that economic and social aspirations played a significant role in the attainment of literacy, and in this respect evidence of developing literacy in the Isle of Man’s small but growing class of merchants and entrepreneurs may correlate more closely with what was happening in provincial towns in England, where urban communities with populations no larger than five hundred were functioning effectively as towns in 1700.\footnote{W.B. Stephens, ‘Illiteracy and schooling in provincial towns, 1640-1870’, in D. Reeder (ed.), Urban education in the nineteenth century, Taylor and Francis, 1977, p. 32. See also C.W. Chalklin, ‘A seventeenth-century market town: Tonbridge’, Archaeologia Cantiana, 76 (1961), pp. 152-62.}

The demographic and socio-economic conditions of the Isle of Man and the counties of Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery, the dominance of their Celtic vernaculars and the similarities of their oral cultures suggest that the progress of literacy in both areas may be usefully compared. But whereas Houston and others have looked closely at statistical evidence for parts of England, including specific research on some northern counties, no comparable work has been done to determine the progress of literacy in Wales, although Geraint Jenkins and Glanmor Williams have proposed some broad assessments of developments in the later seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.\footnote{Geraint Jenkins, Literature, Religion and Society in Wales, 1660-1730 (Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1978), pp. 297-304; Jenkins, Foundations, p. 210; Glanmor Williams, ‘Language, Literacy and Nationality in Wales’, History, 56, no. 186 (February 1971), p. 8.} Jenkins and Williams consider the expansion of schooling, the growing availability of printed books, the spread of libraries and the changing aspirations not only of the ‘middling sort’ but also of workers in industrialising communities (like north-east Flintshire) and the less poor of the rural areas as key drivers of literacy.
Central to the progress of the greater majority was the provision of Welsh language schooling and books printed in Welsh. The Welsh scholar John Morgan, curate of Llanfyllin, Montgomeryshire, in the early eighteenth century, wrote to Moses Williams in 1714:

> It is a grand Mistake to teach poor Children their Duty in a foreign Tongue, which takes up a good deal of time to little purpose [. . .] and they are so wise after five or six Years Schooling as they were before, whereas were they taught in their Mother’s Tongue it would take but little time and Charges.¹⁴⁰

Edmund Samuel, vicar of Betws Gwerful Goch, Denbighshire, celebrated the stimulus to literacy and learning of printed books in Welsh: ‘To God be the thanks that the light of the gospel now shines as brightly in Wales as in almost any other country; there are more edifying, godly books more frequently printed [. . .] than existed in any age for more than a thousand years.’¹⁴¹ The growing availability of books supported and reflected the creation in Wales of ‘a literate, bible-reading society’. From 1660 to 1730 there were six major editions of the Welsh Bible (40,000 copies) and at least 545 Welsh books were published; in the diocese of St Asaph many of these were made widely available in six libraries, while Thomas Jones of Corwen established five outlets where books he published could be purchased.¹⁴² In Ireland, by contrast, only four Irish-language books are known to have been published from 1650 to 1750.¹⁴³ The demand in Wales was from the ‘middling sort’; among labourers, servants and poor tenant farmers illiteracy stubbornly persisted through much of the first half of the eighteenth century.

Many ministers thwarted the policies of some of the English bishops appointed to Welsh sees in the eighteenth century by their support for Welsh-language teaching in the SPCK schools and in Griffith Jones’s circulating schools, which did much to facilitate the growth of literacy. Yet many were still excluded. Sufficient literacy in reading developed to sustain Welsh language printing enterprises, but Griffith Jones found in 1747 that ‘very few of the Welsh people, even of the farmers, and scarce any of the labourers, can at present afford to buy

¹⁴⁰ NLW, MS 17B, p. 12: John Morgan to Moses Williams, 13 May 1714.
¹⁴¹ Edward Samuel, Gwirionedd y Grefydd Grist'negol (Shrewsbury: Yn y Mwythig, 1716), p. 5.
¹⁴² Jenkins, Foundations, p. 203; Havard, ‘Educational and Religious Movement’, p. 43; there were libraries in St Asaph, in Llandrillo-yn-Rhos, Eglwys Rhos and Llantysilio-yn-ial in Denbighshire, and Darowen and Llansantfraid ym Mechain in Montgomeryshire; Brush, ‘Literacy in the Eighteenth Century’, p. 149.
books’. John Jones, dean of Bangor, concluded that ‘taxes, want and poverty’ were the main obstacle to the growth of literacy among the lowest orders of society. Yet there were other ways in which literacy spread. Alice Hibbot, a poor widow of Llanwyddelan, Montgomeryshire, made ‘a shift to get a poor livelihood by [teaching poor children] by the additional help of some other children committed to her care’. Jenkins stresses the efficacy of informal instruction in Welsh in the home by a literate family member, assisted by the altruism of men like Hugh Lloyd, vicar of Mold, who loaned his own books to his parishioners.

Jenkins acknowledges that more work needs to be done to gauge the true development of literacy in Wales in the eighteenth century, but in addition to the take-up of elementary school places he finds further evidence in the success of Thomas Jones’s first Welsh-language printing press in Shrewsbury, and in the growth of subscription lists and book ownership among yeomen and the ‘middling sort’. Yet, as in the Isle of Man, ‘the unlettered and unpropertied poor’ who lived below subsistence level (more than half the population) were at risk of remaining trapped in illiteracy. It was a situation lamented by David Maurice in his advocacy of religious reform in Wales in 1700, and fifty years later it seems that little had changed. In the 1750s 54% of men in Wales marked their marriage certificates with crosses, compared with 40% in England; in the south Denbighshire village of Cerrigydrudion, of 105 parishioners who made wills between 1662 and 1812 only 21% wrote a signature. Glannmor Williams describes a steady rise in literacy, in Welsh more than in English, through the second half of the century, but notes that in official illiteracy statistics as late as 1851 Wales lagged behind Britain as a whole by 6%.

An accepted orthography and the availability of printed religious and cultural Welsh texts suggest that Wales should have had a significant advantage over the Isle of Man in the development of literacy. But it may be that the presence of both Welsh and English languages...
dissipated the aspirations of many and hindered the process of reading and writing. Literacy progressed much more strongly in the Lake counties, an area comparable to much of west Flintshire, north and west Denbighshire and Montgomeryshire, but without the complication of two languages; there a long-standing educational tradition of village charity, endowed and grammar schools led to far more widespread literacy by 1800 than in the rest of the north of England and Wales.\textsuperscript{951}

The Manx did not have the benefit of a vernacular orthography and a range of Manx Gaelic books as an incentive to the attainment of literacy.\textsuperscript{952} On the other hand they may have benefited from the absence of linguistic confusion, which Barrow was able to exploit. Yet the learning experience of Island children today at the Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, who are taught at primary level wholly in Manx Gaelic, suggests that Barrow’s strategy ‘to acquaint the people with the English tongue [in] an English school in every parish’ was not in itself an obstacle to the acquisition of basic literacy.\textsuperscript{953} By the end of Year 6 (age 10 to 11) Bunscoill pupils are fluent in Manx Gaelic and English in speaking, reading and writing, and in all skills and subjects they are equal to or ahead of achievement levels reached by their contemporaries in other schools.\textsuperscript{954} Marie Clague has shown that bilingual immersion education has no adverse effect on overall development and is no more difficult for receptive children than learning a single language.\textsuperscript{955} Most Bunscoill children’s parents speak only English. The experience of their children differs from those in Barrow’s schools in a number of ways: most parents in the late seventeenth and early eighteenth centuries were illiterate, there were few, if any, books in the home, children would have learned to read and write consecutively as two separate skills (whereas today’s children learn their language skills concurrently) and their teachers, whether clergy or lay, lacked the advantages of today’s professional training. But the learning process is fundamentally the same: Barrow’s Manx Gaelic-speaking children were taught to read and write English; the Bunscoill’s English-speaking children are taught to read and write Manx.


\textsuperscript{952} See Jenkins, \textit{Foundations}, pp. 205-10.

\textsuperscript{953} MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, \textit{Hildesley}, p. 305.

\textsuperscript{954} Julie Matthews, headteacher, Bunscoill Ghaelgagh, 31 March 2014, \textit{pers. comm.} The school has seventy-two pupils (March 2014); most begin at Reception level (Year 1: age 4+ to 5); entry is by parental choice and is non-selective; some current pupils are in ‘special measures’ and some are from economically or socially disadvantaged backgrounds.

\textsuperscript{955} Marie Clague, \textit{The developing Manx of immersion educated children} (unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Liverpool, 2007, p. 8.)
Gaelic; and the outcomes are bilingual children living in interlingual home environments who can read and write both languages.

Conclusion

There have been no previous attempts to provide a comparative analysis of the development of literacy in reading and writing in the Isle of Man and in the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph. The task is made particularly challenging since there are no in-depth studies of evidence in the selected counties of north-west England and north-east Wales, in contrast to the pioneering work of scholars like Cressy and Spufford, for example, in London, East Anglia and Cambridgeshire. But some aspects of regional evidence from other areas of Britain may be used to sketch a likely picture of contemporary trends which adds significantly to our knowledge and understanding of social change in the late seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

If Barrow had adopted Griffith Jones’s model of circulating schools in the Isle of Man many more children and adults might have been educated to a basic literacy. The Welsh had two linked advantages, however; the itinerant schools were taught in the vernacular, and this was only possible because by the mid-eighteenth century there were plenty of printed books in Welsh. Yet it is estimated that no more than 50% of the Welsh population had learned to read by 1761, and written illiteracy a century later was still as high as 54% in Wales, compared with 35% in England and Wales combined. Furthermore, as many as 70% of the Welsh still spoke only their vernacular in 1800. The continuing preferred use of Welsh by such a large majority may well account for a marked contrast with the situation in Ireland, where literacy skills were increasingly acquired in English, reflecting rapidly changing socio-economic forces largely absent from Wales. In parts of northern England, too, where

956 See Brush, ‘Literacy in the Eighteenth Century’, which touches briefly on some evidence in Denbighshire.
957 Jones and Roderick, Education in Wales, p. 57.
reading literacy was considerably higher, 51% of men and women were able to sign their names by the mid-eighteenth century.960

In the Isle of Man, where the general poor made up a greater proportion than the wider socio-economic groups of northern England, 51% could write a signature by 1770. If the assumption that many more could read is accepted, then significantly more Islanders had acquired basic literacy than their Welsh and rural English contemporaries, and the only significant factor which may account for this is that elementary education was available to every child. If Stephens’s figures for attendance at day schools in 1818 are taken as a guide to the situation fifty years earlier, then only 4.8% of children in Wales and 6.6% of children in England were benefiting from educational opportunities in 1770, a hundred years after Barrow made primary schools freely available to every Manx boy and girl.961

960 Houston, ‘The Development of Literacy’, p. 204.
Chapter 10

Conclusions

‘At my coming into the Isle of Man’

The impoverishment of the Isle of Man at the Restoration was no different from the general condition of England and Wales, but the negative consequences of James Stanley’s lordship, economic stagnation during the interregnum, and, above all, the Island’s isolation, compounded its wretchedness. Barrow arrived in 1663 at a time when the long neglected domain and its church were in desperate need of investment, legislative and social reform, and strong, effective leadership.

Barrow’s civil and ecclesiastical reforms

The first aim of this thesis is to evaluate the civil and ecclesiastical legislation enacted during Barrow’s episcopate and governorship, and to question the purpose and effectiveness of the new regulations and practical measures he brought in to reform the diocese, looking especially at his strategies to improve the quality of the clergy and enhance the moral and spiritual life of the Manx people by giving them the benefits of education.

The civil legislation enacted during Barrow’s governorship was primarily designed to preserve good order in the community. In some of the new orders Barrow supported the conservatism of the Keys in safeguarding the interests of leaseholders, to the disadvantage of the majority poor, but other secular reforms instituted beneficial changes to conditions of service for those in domestic and labouring employment, and new indenture regulations addressed weaknesses which had hitherto obstructed economic development. It is not possible to determine whether these were Barrow’s initiatives or entrepreneurial promotions brought forward by others, but they had Barrow’s support, since he commended them to Charles Stanley, and his authority as governor carried them through. Whatever the provenance of this legislation, the pattern of slow growth from 1664 described in Dickinson’s extensive survey of the Island economy must owe something to social changes enacted under
Barrow’s patronage. Walton notes a long period of stagnation in manufacture and enterprise in Lancashire which lasted well into the eighteenth century, whereas the Island’s internal and external trade continued to expand up to 1700, despite the adverse effects of restrictive off-Island legislation, the Dutch Wars and the growing impact of the running trade.963

Barrow’s extensive reform of ecclesiastical legislation was equally important, not least because the secular and ecclesiastical statutes were interconnected. He defined the authority of episcopal officers in order to secure the efficiency and probity of administration, and rationalised and codified the old breast laws, which were ‘wrote fair into a Book, and made the Rule of Proceeding in all Cases’.964 Through these changes and other practical initiatives he ensured that ecclesiastical officers would have the confidence of those they served, particularly in court procedures, and that parish ministers would be able to support the poor and needy for whom, in the absence of a secular Poor Law, the church alone could provide.965 Barrow’s use of the church courts matched practices in other English dioceses, but whereas in England the power of the courts was fading in the later seventeenth century, the Manx people accepted the courts’ spiritual and judicial authority which had been strengthened by Barrow’s reforms.

Such constituents of a civil society, ecclesiastical and lay, forming much of the framework within which a dynamic, modern nation might develop, required above all educated, conscientious parish ministers to deliver them. Although Barrow’s primary aim was to preserve good order and provide the best possible spiritual, moral and pastoral support for the people of his day, his initiatives secured far-reaching benefits beyond his own time.

‘The best way of cure’

Education was the key to everything that Barrow wanted to achieve. His ‘best way of cure’ for the pastoral care of souls in his diocese was to teach Manx children to read and write English in elementary schools, to make schooling free of charge for those who could not afford a fee, and to provide grammar and academic schools for the most able. The strategy

962 Dickinson, Lordship, appx. ix.
963 Walton, Lancashire, p. 77; Gawne, Controversy, pp. 43-50.
964 Statutes, I, p. 134.
965 Records, pp. 111-12; Statutes, I, pp. 133-34.
was not a product of English policy, as Peter Clamp has claimed, nor was the choice of English as the language of instruction the product of a narrow political agenda determined by Charles Stanley. Barrow’s reforms expressed spiritual and moral imperatives; his education policy was a pastoral instrument wholly beneficial in intent and rigorously practical in design, and these qualities ensured that what he began in 1666 would stand the tests of time and circumstance.

By 1669, when ill-health cut short his time in the Isle of Man, he had successfully established the principle of primary education for all; the inquest return from Santan, recording that ‘the minister of the parish keeps a constant schoole and teaches the children of the parish [. . .] according to our honourable lords order’, was the pattern in most parishes. Three years later schools were being taught for at least part of the year across the Island.966

**Authoritarian high churchman and enlightened reformer**

The second aim is to consider the extent to which the circumstances of Barrow’s life before 1663 might illuminate the paradox of his inclination to high church, royalist conservatism in political and ecclesiastical affairs on the one hand, and the enlightened, practical nature of his social reforms on the other. The positive interest in education of a significant number of Barrow’s contemporaries has been underestimated in the older historiography of the Restoration church represented by Lawrence Stone and others, and the importance of the influence of a number of his close friends, who were among the most forward-thinking churchmen of the day, is also considered.

In addition, the thesis explores the tension between Barrow’s reserved, autocratic personality and his compassionate understanding of the needs of the people he served, and suggests how this may have helped to force the pace and pragmatism of his programme for change and assured its success.

Barrow brought with him valuable skills in estate management, honed during his college fellowships, and the record of his service as bursar of Peterhouse demonstrates an expert knowledge of efficient accounting methods, which matched designated income and expenditure, and an astute understanding of how investments and endowments worked. He

---

was entirely at home in the processes of collegiate decision-making with colleagues of equal academic and social standing, where like-minded political and religious views guaranteed a consensus of purpose and policy. Consequently he was not accustomed to opposition, argument or any obligation to negotiate, and there is no evidence that he found it desirable or necessary to promote his policies in public debate or offer them for scrutiny in polemical argument. Such processes would inevitably take up valuable time; Barrow was a man in a hurry, both on account of his age and the urgency of the tasks he faced in rebuilding the church and civil society.

His autocratic character and uncompromising leadership in civil and church affairs were well suited to the Island, where the people were for the most part willing to conform to authority and the old orthodoxy of the established church was accepted without question by all but a handful of dissenting Quakers. Chaloner and Hildesley a hundred years apart commended the Manx people for their ‘great esteem and affection’ for the church and their ‘quick apprehension’. Barrow’s authoritarian assumption that his policies were unquestionably right led him into conflict with individuals and the Keys: Sam Ratcliff cursed him; the Keys took the part of John Lace when Barrow seized the lease of Hango Hill farm; and he reached no accommodation with the Quakers. But since the rationale of his case against Lace was that the appropriated income served the Island’s greater need, it may be argued that the policy, if not the method, justified his actions.

Barrow was able to carry through successfully all his initiatives because he had the unquestioning support of Charles Stanley. The common historiography which offers a very negative view of the policies and contributions of most of the Stanleys to the Isle of Man is particularly critical of the eighth earl, and all the evidence considered in this thesis suggests that this assessment is justified. He never came to the Island and his preoccupation, after the execution of Illiam Dhone, was limited to the removal of intruded parliamentarian legislation from the Manx statutes and exploitation of revenues generated in the Island as a resource to finance the re-purchase of his sequestered Lancashire estates. Barrow won the support of Earl Charles in the first few months of his episcopate, and when he was appointed governor he was in effect given a free hand to implement his own programme of ecclesiastical and social reform. His friendship with Charles Stanley, which reflected their common faith and love of

968 Lib. Scacc. (MS 10071/12), 1670, pp. 11-12, Patrick: ‘Sam Ratcliff [. . .] fined in 5s. & a weeks imprisonment for cursing [. . .] B[ish]opp Barrow & calling him a cheat & sevrall other Expressions’.
the restored church, and the power he was able to wield as governor, provided Barrow with all the resources and authority he needed in the Isle of Man. In St Asaph he could no longer rely on civil power to back up what he wanted to do, and in consequence he achieved much less in the 1670s.

**Friends and factions**

Much of the evidence used to sketch Barrow’s life before 1663 is inferential. The independent-minded pragmatism of some of the Cambridgeshire Barrows may have found a resonance in decisions he made much later in his life, and the ideas and initiatives of the most prominent of his Cambridge and Oxford friends may well have influenced the forward-looking strategies he chose for his reforms in the Isle of Man. John Barwick, Gunning and Ward were among a number of enlightened bishops and senior clergy in the Restoration church who promoted school education as one of the surest means to achieve spiritual and moral regeneration; Taylor and Hammond taught the good practices of godly living in their writings, much as Barrow did in his exhortations to his clergy and the Manx people, while Hammond and Sanderson were active in promoting ecclesiastical debate, re-establishing the old church and re-writing the Prayer Book. At Peterhouse, in Oxford, ‘from place to place’ during the interregnum, and at Eton Barrow would have been able to discuss with these friends the great issues facing the church and its people, and to formulate his own ideas for pastoral and social reform.

These and other circumstances and associations reviewed in chapter 6 must have influenced Barrow’s thinking, but the lack of written evidence, particularly in personal correspondence, makes any conclusions largely speculative.

**The schools and the development of literacy**

The third aim is to assess the effectiveness of Barrow’s reforms, most notably in education, in changing lives and establishing foundations on which the Island and its people might build for the future.

---

969 EW, Barrow to Vicars General, 17 March 1663/4.
When Barrow left the Island in 1669 schools were available for every boy and girl in all the parishes and towns. Few parents were able or willing to send their children to school, however; there are no attendance records, but presentment sanctions issued by Levinz suggest that the take-up of places was very limited. Wilson addressed the problems of attendance and the quality and diligence of the teachers early in his episcopate, and by the 1720s, fifty years after the establishment of Barrow’s first petty schools, more children were attending school and literacy was improving.

There is little evidence that the changes of policy in primary schools implemented by Wilson and Hildesley or the socio-political crises of 1736 and 1765 hindered the progress of education and literacy to any degree. Schools were still held, whether taught by clergy or laity, and both bishops encouraged attendance by exhortation and sanction. Furthermore, they were still free for poor families, as Barrow had intended. Yet poverty remained the primary obstacle to the growth of literacy throughout the eighteenth century. The constraints of home and work kept many children out of school, at least for part of the year, and in this respect the Manx were no different from the rural poor in England and Wales. The Island’s leaseholding farmers, too, were slow to see the value of the schools because they did not need to read and write. Evaluation of documentary evidence shows that Barrow’s schools facilitated modest growth in literacy, both in reading and writing, which gathered pace through the eighteenth century. When he arrived in 1663 just 3.9% of document authentication was by signature. By 1770 the proportion of signatures had overtaken marks (51.5%), and many more could read. It is likely that only 4.8% of children in Wales and 6.6% of children in England were attending schools in 1770, whereas elementary education had been available for Manx children for more than a century. Anecdotal and secondary evidence in wills and other collateral factors support these conclusions.

In the cities and developing urban areas of England in the eighteenth century education was not the only contributor to the growth of literacy. The influence of family environments and changing conditions and opportunities in society also fostered the attainment of reading and writing skills, but these factors were largely absent in the Isle of Man. There the progress of literacy must be attributable to the schools.

It was the ‘middling sort’ of people, the professional men and the Island’s growing number of merchants and entrepreneurs, who were most ready to take advantage of educational opportunities. Yet other parents, too, came in time to see the value of schooling for their children, and since in the Isle of Man the instruction given in schools played the primary role in the acquisition of literacy, the significant growth in the number who could read and write by 1750 testifies to the eventual success of the educational programme which Barrow put in place. Although many of the poorest remained illiterate right through the eighteenth century, it became the aspiration of the majority to be able to read their Bibles and ‘books of devotion’.  

The grammar and academic schools were no less an integral part of Barrow’s educational strategy. For the most part the masters were conscientious and capable, and although at times the schools were combined, they produced able scholars. Following the extension of grammar school opportunities to Douglas and Ramsey, paid for out of Barrow’s funds, the benefits of further education became widely available, and Barrow’s founding principle of free places for poor boys at the grammar school in Castletown, together with his provision of scholarships for academic students, ensured that those most likely to benefit were admitted on merit. Wilson and Hildesley commended the competence and diligence of most of their clergy. They were the scholars educated in Barrow’s secondary and tertiary schools; they made possible the progress of literacy, facilitated civil and ecclesiastical reform, and provided the pastoral and social welfare structures on which the Island’s majority poor depended.

**Endowments for the future – the Barrovian legacy in the Isle of Man**

Barrow’s educational vision would have been a hollow aspiration without sufficient funding and effective management. He showed considerable financial acumen in securing endowment funds from four different sources: the Royal Bounty was in the king’s gift; the Impropriate and Academic Trusts were independently financed and governed by separate foundation instruments. In the case of the Impropriate Fund, on which the salaries of the clergy and school teachers depended, Barrow’s astute negotiation of collateral security ensured that the schools survived the alienation of the original funds in 1736. No less judicious were his

---

971 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, p. 305; Craine, ‘Ballough’, *IMNHAS*, 4, no. 3 (1940), p. 463.
choice of the Island’s senior civil and clerical officers as trustees of the Impropriate and Academic Students’ Funds and his engagement of James Butler, first duke of Ormonde, as principal for the investment of the Academic Master’s Fund. The Impropriate Fund continued to finance elementary education, according to Barrow’s 1666 deed, through much of the nineteenth century, until public funding was made available for the first time in the Island’s 1872 Education Act. The grammar school in Ramsey was lost by 1822, but a successor to Wilson’s St Matthew’s school, re-founded as Douglas Grammar School in 1858, continued until 1920, six years after the Council of Education opened the Island’s first state secondary school at Park Road. Castletown Grammar School was funded by the Barrow endowment until its closure in 1931. (Figure 24)

The two Academic Funds financed student scholarships and the academic master’s salary until 1808, when the endowments were combined. Twenty-two years later Lieutenant Governor Cornelius Smelt, the Keys and Bishop William Ward used Barrow’s funds, together with public subscriptions, to found King William’s College, the first of the new independent schools of the nineteenth century, which offered a dynamic, liberal curriculum, and taught students at both secondary and university levels. Barrow’s vision of an academic university college for his diocese was realised, in part, one hundred and sixty-two years after the foundation of his Academic Students’ Fund. (Figure 25)

In the Isle of Man there was no public funding for education comparable to the Scottish tax on heritors instituted in 1696. At every level the Island’s schools and teachers were paid for by the funds solicited, collected and invested by Barrow. By contrast, the provision of schools, particularly at elementary level, in the dioceses of Chester and St Asaph in the later
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973 Rising Sun, 21 May 1825. See also MNH, D151/1/38, Carson, Report on Development of Secondary Education in the Isle of Man, 1921, in Debates in the Manx Legislature, XXXVIII, pp. 1028-32. By the Douglas Grammar School Act 1933, the assets of Douglas Grammar School (£4,000-£5,000) were transferred to the Council of Education to provide scholarships to King William’s College.
974 Castletown Grammar School closed on 31 December 1931. By the Castletown Educational Endowment Act 1931, £1,200 from the Impropriate Fund endowment and £200 from the sale of the school’s premises (St Mary’s chapel) was paid over to Bishop Barrow’s Trust to provide scholarships for southern area boys to King William’s College.
975 The combined academic funds constituted Bishop Barrow’s Charity: Charities, pp. 30-31; Hoy, Blessing, pp. 96, 18-22, 35. See also MNH, MS 06575, MD 441/165 & 166 (Stevenson Papers).
976 Act for Settling of Schools 1696 (c.26).
Figure 24 – J.T.W. Wicksey (master) and grammar school boys outside St Mary’s Chapel, Castletown, 1891.
Figure 25 – Academic students and secondary level boys at King William’s College, Castletown, c. 1863.
seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was haphazard. Endowments frequently failed to provide the schools intended by their benefactors and many of those that were established lasted only a short time. Very few provided free places and they fell far short of Barrow’s guiding principle. Grammar schools were more widely available in Cheshire and Lancashire than in Wales, but most levied fees and excluded all but the wealthiest. Educational provision at both primary and secondary levels in Denbigh, Flint and Montgomery was very sparse, and it was not until the advent of Griffith Jones’s circulating schools in 1738 that the opportunity to learn to read reached the poor in the diocese of St Asaph.

Barrow found few like-minded people to associate with in St Asaph, and as his health deteriorated he withdrew from public life. His achievements during his Welsh episcopate were limited, perhaps in part because he was no longer able to exercise civil authority to support his ecclesiastical agenda, and he was hindered by issues of language and geography. He regularised diocesan finances, saved the fabric of the cathedral and gave generously to assist the poor and needy, but in education his only contribution came after his death when St Asaph grammar school was belatedly established. In the later 1670s he became increasingly overwhelmed by the exigencies of managing the diocese and he lost patience with any who opposed him.977

Barrow was determined, decisive and independent-minded in applying himself to the tasks of civil and ecclesiastical governance in the Isle of Man. He acted with vision and practical good sense, and in his pastoral leadership he showed real concern for the spiritual and social welfare of the Manx people, not least the poor and disadvantaged. Yet he was an austere and distant man with few close friends. There are clues in a handful of letters that his relationship with such people as Richard Fox and Mutton Davies was more than formal, and he maintained long-standing friendships with colleagues from earlier years like Peter Gunning, but no diaries, correspondence or other records of his personal life seem to have survived.978

Barrow was not alone in adopting radical educational policies which were much the same as those advocated earlier by the Puritans. His friends John Barwick, Peter Gunning and Jeremy Taylor were among a number of Restoration bishops and senior churchmen who shared this vision of an educated people who would enrich, rather than threaten, the restored order of

977 NLW, Diocese of St Asaph Records SA/MISC/919, 28 May 1687.
978 Barrow’s lifelong friendship with Gunning may be inferred from his will, in which he bequeathed ‘to my Right Reverend brother and friend Dr Peter Gunning Lord Bishop of Ely Three pounds to buy a Ring in Remembrance of his friend or what he pleaseth’: TNA, Wills PROB 11/363/622, fol. 413’.

257
both church and state. Barrow’s schools were an effective and practical means to address the pastoral needs of the people whose ‘cure’ had been entrusted to him. He never married, and it seems to have been the ‘loose […] rude and barbarous’ people of his little Island diocese who became in a sense his family: in the endowment deed for his Academic Students’ Trust he commended ‘the good affection I bear to this whole Isle in generall, which I know no better way to express than in promoting and advancing learning therein’. His determination to improve the spiritual and social lot of the Manx people lay at the heart of everything he set out to do, both during his residence as bishop and governor, and in the years that followed. It is no surprise that his will set out further initiatives and benefactions for the Island.

In large parts of England and Wales the inevitable consequence of inadequate provision of schools was that illiteracy persisted well into the nineteenth century. By contrast, if the correlation between oral and written literacy determined by Cressy, Schofield and others is applied to the Isle of Man, then evaluation of a wide range of documentary, anecdotal and secondary evidence suggests that by 1800, although many were still illiterate, a greater proportion of the Manx could read and write, in Manx Gaelic or English, than was the case in many rural areas elsewhere. The opportunity for every boy and girl to acquire the skills and benefits of literacy was Barrow’s greatest gift, and on it the future development of the Isle of Man as a modern nation would be built.

---

979 MNH, MS 09782 (CRP), assorted ecclesiastical documents (Box 2 of 3 at 2014); Butler, Hildesley, p. 304; (Lib. Mon.), vol. 1 (1654-74), fol. 136, deed of 7 July 1668; Charities, pp. 32-34.
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