

Borough-road was such a success that its supporters wished to see its "picture in little" in various parts of the country. But schools on Lancaster's plan could only be conducted by teachers trained by him; and the demand for such teachers made him, with a characteristic disregard of where the money was to come from, start a training institution. The students were mostly lads from the school, and very badly educated they must have been, but they had caught from their teacher his all-mastering enthusiasm; and, young as they were, they succeeded wonderfully. By the year 1805 the fame of Lancaster had gone forth through all the land, and the king desired to see him. An interview took place at Weymouth. The following is an account of its termination:—"The king said, 'Lancaster, I highly approve of your system, and it is my wish that every poor child in my dominions should be taught to read the Bible; I will do anything you wish to promote this object.' Lancaster said, 'Please, thy Majesty, I can go through the country and lecture on the system, and have no doubt but in a few months I shall be able to give thy Majesty an account where 10,000 poor children are being educated, and some of my youths instructing them.' His Majesty immediately replied, 'Lancaster, I will subscribe a hundred pounds annually; and' (addressing the queen) 'you shall subscribe fifty pounds, Charlotte, and the princesses twenty-five pounds each.'... Lancaster observed, 'Please, thy Majesty, that will be setting thy nobles a good example.' The example was dutifully followed, for in a list of subscribers, published in 1806, I find the names of the king and queen, followed by those of four princes and royal dukes, six princesses and royal duchesses, seventeen peers, and various peeresses, honourables, members of Parliament, &c. Soon after his visit to the king, Lancaster became ill, and was forced to go into the country to rest. While at Watchet, in Somersetshire, it was suggested to him that he should give a lecture on his system. He gave the lecture, which only proved to be the first of many, for in the course of the next two or three years he travelled through the whole kingdom explaining his scheme. Of the effect of his addresses one may judge from the fact that he found it necessary to publish a book of instructions as to the best routine to be observed in starting a school on his plan.

The success of Lancaster raised him troops of enemies. These may be divided into three classes—the friends of ignorance, the friends of the Established Church, and the friends of both. His patronage by the king and nobility, while it increased the acerbity and excited the envy of his foes, made them very circumspect in their method of attacking him; and as "the law was against his being operated upon by fire," some other mode of assault must be found. They accordingly asserted that Lancaster had stolen the details of his system from Dr. Bell, and (as Sir Fretful Plagiary says) had served them "as gipsies do stolen children—disfigure them to make them pass for their own." The system had merits (how could it fail to have when it was invented by a clergyman?) and these it was which caused his sacred majesty and the hardly less sacred nobles to patronise it. It had however, one great and damnable fault—it did not teach the dogmas of the Church. As to this same fault I have nothing to say, but I must examine how far the charge made against Lancaster of plagiarism from Dr. Bell is true.

Dr. Bell was a chaplain in the service of the East India Company, and in 1789 he became head master of a charity school—the Male Asylum—at Madras. He had been much struck with a mode of teaching by writing in sand practised by the natives of Malabar, and he

determined to introduce it into his school. His assistants, of whom he had four, being grown up, did not take kindly to the innovation, and so he had to teach the new plan to the elder boys, and employ them in turn to teach the younger ones; in other words, he introduced a system of monitors. His monitors, however, did not supersede the assistants; they were created to meet a special difficulty, and used for no other purpose. In 1797, Dr. Bell returned to England, and published, in a pamphlet of forty-eight pages, an account of the methods he had used. He then retired to a living at Swanage. His tract received very little attention, and he did nothing in the matter of education for eight years. Lancaster did not see Dr. Bell's pamphlet till 1800—that is, till he had been carrying on his own experiments for two years. He acknowledged frankly the aid he got from it. He says:—"From this tract I got several useful hints. I beg leave to recommend it to the attentive perusal of the friends of education and youth. I much regret that I was not acquainted with the beauty of his (Dr. Bell's) system till somewhat advanced in my plan; if I had known it, it would have spared me much trouble and some retrograde movements." In 1805, when his system was perfected, and had been displayed at work on a large scale for over four years, Lancaster brought out a third edition of his book. Dr. Bell appears to have been a worthy man, but he seems to have allowed himself to be persuaded that all the credit of Lancaster's work was due to him. He, therefore, after the publication of the third edition of Lancaster's book, brought out a second edition of his own. He suppressed several material facts, and made considerable additions, and in 1809 he published a third edition, when, in spite of suppressions, the pamphlet had swollen to 144 pages. Joseph Fox now wrote—"A Comparative View of the Plans of Education as detailed in the Publications of Dr. Bell and Mr. Lancaster," with the epigraph, "*Palmarum qui meruit ferat*," and maintained that the palm should be borne by Lancaster. This called out a fourth edition of Dr. Bell's work, in which the original 48 pages had become 348. In the following extract, from the number of the *Edinburgh Review* already quoted, the dispute between Lancaster and Bell is calmly and judicially summed up:—"The merit of devising it (the new system) belongs to Joseph Lancaster, although one of its principles had been previously known to Dr. Bell, and exemplified in the school at Madras, but without those other principles which, when taken together, constitute the new system..... To Joseph Lancaster alone belongs the praise of introducing the new system into practice, and enabling mankind to benefit by it, and preparing the way for its universal reception..... The plan pursued by Dr. Bell..... has no one peculiarity which can entitle it to a preference; while, on the contrary, it is deficient in many of the most important points, and especially fails in the article of economy." In another part of the same article the writer says:—"We deeply regret to find that Dr. Bell has not had the prudence and good sense—we say nothing of generosity or courage—to allow this simple-minded and most deserving man (Lancaster) a merit which he cannot by any stretch of self-complacency pretend to dispute with him. And herein lies the charge which we are unwillingly compelled to admit has sunk most in our minds against that reverend person. We could have pardoned the senseless distinction between teaching writing and reading, and passed over the alarm lest the minds of the lower orders, 'who are doomed to the drudgery of daily labour,' should be too much elevated by instruction..... But when we find Dr. Bell printing book after book to explain his system—years and years after Mr.