

ences which these statements represent.

Again, we ask, should not knowledge mean an actual consciousness of existing entities, of existing relations, of existing phenomena? Should it not mean a real personal experience of what is, whether in the form of entities, relations, or phenomena? We think it should mean, at least, this. But thinking so suggests several questions that affect vitally the teacher's work and the preparation necessary to perform that work. Let us note some of these questions: And, first, can the teacher communicate, impart, or transfer his own knowledge to his pupils? Using the words communicate, impart and transfer in their ordinary sense we must answer no, to this question. This may appear to some to contradict the clearest experience of the teacher. Nevertheless the answer is correct. Knowledge involves three things: a *being* who knows, an *object* known and a consciousness of a determinate relation between the being and the object. This relation constitutes knowledge. To put any one, therefore, in the possession of new knowledge means to place the mind in such connection with the object to be known as will produce a consciousness of a determinate relation between the mind and the object. This is what the teacher must do; but this does not mean to communicate, to impart, or to transfer his own knowledge to his pupils. It means rather that the teacher must aid or guide the pupil in getting his mind into such relation to the things to be known as will necessarily give him real and true experiences or consciousnesses of these things. Just here other important questions arise: How can the teacher do this work? Can it be done by the use of words, however skilfully handled? Is it the office of words to put the mind in possession

of new experiences, of new consciousnesses; in short, of new knowledge?

The answer to the first and second of these questions depends upon the answer to the third. And to this we must answer yes and no. Yes, it is the office of words to put the mind in possession of new knowledge, if by *new* knowledge is meant only such knowledge as necessarily grows out of *new combinations* of the objects, entities or realities of which the mind has already a clear consciousness. But we must answer emphatically no, if by *new* knowledge is meant knowledge which necessarily grows out of objects, entities, or realities which have never been present to the consciousness. The correctness of this answer is evident from the very meaning and office of words. Words, whether spoken or written, are only signs or symbols which serve to recall into consciousness a certain number of ideas, objective realities or experiences, which, by common consent, have been associated with them. The full meaning of a word consists of the aggregate of these ideas, objective realities, or experiences, which it serves, through the law of association, to recall. A word, therefore, when used can bring before the mind only what has been there before, and what, when there, was consciously associated with the spoken or written symbol. Incorrect views, or perhaps the absence of any view of the true nature of the meaning and office of words, prove the source of a large amount of wasted effort upon the part of teachers, and make much of the so-called *new* knowledge of the school room, a mere sham and deception. The meaning of a word, for example, is supposed to be acquired when two or more words, called a definition, are associated with it, so that they are recalled when ever the word with which they are thus associated is present to the mind. This is regarded as acquiring *new* know-