

of knowledge for the teacher. The teacher must be always a learner; filled indeed with the love of learning, if he is to make his pupils learners and lovers of learning. But in extent and accuracy of scholarship, and in power of connected thinking, he must of course be far in advance of his classes. If, for instance, he knows only the four fundamental rules of arithmetic, it would be a perversion of language to say that he can teach these well. The reason is plain. To know a subject is to know the relations of its parts, and to know it in at least some of its correlations. If a teacher has not a fair comprehension of such relations, of and in a subject, his ideas are not knowledge in any true sense of the word. He does not know the subject and what he does not know he cannot teach. It is impossible for him to help the learner think relations which his own mind has never made. How few teachers know, for example, the real relations of the fundamental operations in arithmetic. How few see that all the common processes, addition, subtraction, multiplication, division, fractions, are implicitly present in the first number conceptions; and that therefore, in the direct teaching of these rules, we are simply leading the pupils to a conscious recognition of ideas that have long been freely used.

This suggests another fact: For effective teaching, clear presentation of the subject matter is essential. This, again, implies analysis into related parts as well as perception of wider relations, and the grouping of all the parts into an enlarged and more definite whole. Such presentation, it may be remarked, secures interest, which is only another name for normal mental activity. All this is equivalent to saying that the teacher must have a logical habit of mind; the power to think—the power of discriminating and identifying, which is developed by the acquisition of ample and accurate scholarship. Speaking generally, the

mind without scholarship is an untrained mind, the untrained mind cannot be logical, and an illogical mind cannot teach.

Again, if the teacher is but little in advance of his pupils, he can neither command their respect nor possess that self-respect which is no unimportant element of his power. With ripe scholarship, with a thorough mastery of a subject in itself and in its relation to larger wholes, with a clearness and precision of expression corresponding to his clearness and precision of thought, the teacher fills his pupils with admiration and respect, sets before them a high ideal, and arouses a laudable ambition to realize that ideal in the possession of like attainments for themselves. All his work is marked by the ease and dignity of conscious strength.

On the other hand, slender scholarship makes the feeble teacher. The feeble teacher moves with hesitating step and slow. Consciousness of weakness is revealed in all he does. Instead of sunlight views he has but twilight glimpses of the truth, because he is forever dwelling in the shadows of the unknown. He is further weakened by the feeling that he is subject to the sharpest scrutiny; his pupils are not scholars or logicians, but they have keen eyes and are quick to see that he is groping in a maze without a clue. The whole matter may be put in a nutshell: faculty, mental power, is organized only by the clear presentation of organized knowledge; the teacher, the co-organizer, must therefore have that organized power which comes only from the possession of thorough scholarship.

This logical habit of mind is a prime necessity. Disconnected thinking on the part of the teacher cannot lead to connected thinking and the development of power in the pupil. There is, to be sure, an ideal element, the element of thought—even in simple perception, the initial stage of mind development. But perception is not knowledge in the higher sense; it