

the hovel ; but the great thing to be aimed at is to keep these glorious sports of Nature from being either corrupted by luxury or starved by poverty, and to put them into the position in which they can do the work for which they are specially fitted. . . . therefore, as the sum and crown of what is to be done for technical education," says Professor Huxley, "I look to the provision of a machinery for winnowing out the capacities and giving them scope."

Let us look more closely into Huxley's notion that genius should be detected. The question has often been asked, "What forces have acted most powerfully on unfolding genius?" Not a few philosophers have tried to find out how much or how little the recognized apparatus of education has effected in the case of the preternaturally gifted.

Some have traced the influence of the parents, father or mother, others that of the schools. Long lists have been drawn up of eminent men who have distinguished themselves early by their capacity for learning.

Lists of public-school men have been arranged to justify the public-school system and to glorify the schools. Thus one writer, speaking of Harrow, boasts that this school "produced in one half century, among its five Prime Ministers, a Palmerston, a Peel, a Spencer Perceval, and an Aberdeen; and among its statesmen a Dalhousie and a Sydney Herbert; and among its soldiers and sailors a Rodney and a Codrington; and among its poets a Byron and a Proctor; and among its scholars a Parr and a Sir William Jones; and among its divines a Trench and a Manning; and among its common crowd of *alumni* a vast multitude of honourable and useful men." Similar exultations can be declared for other public schools.

But Sydney Smith maintained that

"the most eminent men in every art and science had been educated in private schools." From the time of Sydney Smith we have had a greater and ever-increasing list of great men who have received all their early education in private schools, and it is not difficult to find support for the view that in private schools individuality is safer of discovery and careful nurture than in public schools.

But again, lists longer than any others have presented a terrible array of instances of complete failure. Those whom the schools branded as dunces and blockheads, or expelled as intractable rebels, have subsequently achieved greatness and fame.

But yet a fifth list has been prepared, of the so-called self-taught geniuses, who owe no debt of gratitude to any school system, except that which led them to thank their stars that they were subjected to none.

Shall we say then that genius is independent of educational arrangements, and need not be considered by them? All know this would be a disastrous conclusion. The systems have often succeeded; they have often failed; therefore they need amending; but the right conclusion is that of Professor Sully. He sums up the question as follows: "Does it follow that because the possessor of genius is not well fitted to reap the particular benefits of our pedagogic system he is really independent of educational forces and influences altogether? This is not an uncommon view, and it has much to support it. But such an idea is clearly an exaggeration of the fact. However keen and strong the impulse towards knowledge in a boy, his attainment of it obviously depends on the presence of humanly appointed sources. More than this, it is indisputable that the greatest of men will be the stronger for a wise intellectual and moral