

for his portrait of Sir Andrew Macphail.

It is well to lay stress on this fact for there exists in this matter a great confusion of mind. The word "research" has acquired an inordinate prestige. It shoves aside scholarship and learning and creative genius. In many subjects it entirely reverses the proper order of precedence among men. It seats mere plodding industry in a chair never intended for it.

The essence of the argument lies in the distinction of subjects. Research in physical science is everything; "research" in political economy is but a small business; research in literature is next to nothing. In many instances "research" sinks lower than this. It becomes mere humbug, a pretentious presentation of a mass of little facts which are of no bearing upon anything. Research when endowed and equipped and subsidized runs easily to that sort of thing.

From what is said above it is meant to follow that research in the literary, social and historical branches is a secondary matter. Its results are not "inventions", but material. It does not represent achievement, but only the means by which others may achieve. Apart from the exact sciences, most of our great writers and thinkers, and most of our inspired and influential teachers had nothing to do with research. It played no part in the life of Shakespeare, Tennyson or Dickens. Neither Ricardo nor John Stuart Mill ever touched it. Kant and Hume and Bergson never thought of it. Neither Goldwin Smith nor Thiers nor Emil Ludwig dealt in it. In other words, in all the literary and social fields most of our eminent men have lived and died without it, and the great mass of scholars and teachers and cultivated men have had no contact with it. Here and there the transcendent genius of a Gibbon or a Macaulay may be at once applied to minute investigation of minute facts and the creative presentation of grand results. For the common run of us, this is denied.

The fact to be established is that research in the things spoken of is only