mere formal lectures by the living teacher. So long as a knowledge of this sort, not the power to acquire, to investigate, to understand, to interpret, to illustrate truth, not the power to vitalize others and cause them also in turn to do the same kind of work, not the habits and tastes that should be possessed by an effective teacher, by a leader and manager of others, is made largely, if not entirely, the legal condition of admission to the teachers' profession; so long as this state of things exists, so long must our system of educating teachers be, necessarily, one-sided and very defective.

In the views just stated, while holding that the acquisition of knowledge is given too much prominence in systems of education, it is not intended to maintain that this acquisition is not a very important educational factor. It is important; but its importance does not depend so much upon the knowledge acquired as upon the mental discipline necessarily involved in the act of acquiring. Hence the knowledge to be acquired, however important, should never be made the chief end, as it is in many cases, of the teacher's effort. But to be more explicit, let us note just what is meant by knowledge in the language of the schools. Does it mean an actual consciousness of existing entities, of existing relations, of existing phenomena; does it mean real, personal experiences of what is, whether in the form of entities, relations or phenomena? Or does it not rather mean, chiefly, if not altogether, the consciousness simply of the symbolism without any consciousness of the reality which the symbolism, whether composed of words, characters, signs, or diagrams, is intended to bring before the mind? We are strongly of opinion that this latter meaning is the one which applies to much of the knowledge acquired in our schools. A careful examination of the facts warrants this opinion. Can any other meaning, for example, be attached to the word knowledge, when applied to the acquisitions of a student in trigonometry, who passes successfully his examinations by fixing in the memory in the course of three or four days a few demonstrations and important formulas without attempting to gain any clear perception of the quantities and relations expressed in these demonstrations and formulas? Such an example in this age of cramming is not peculiarly exceptional. Neither is this course confined to the mathematics. The sciences, philosophy and languages share the same fate. In these subjects, too, the possession of such knowledge as may serve to pass examinations with high honors does not always mean that the realities of which the subjects treat have been clearly construed in the consciousness. No, far from this. A knowledge which means a vivid and well-defined consciousness of the realities themselves is not required to pass examinations. All that is required, in many apparently very formidable examinations, is to have fixed in the memory what some text-book or lecturer has said *about* these realities. Questions pertaining to the most profound problems in science, philosophy and language are thus answered, while the realities which enter into and constitute the very essence of these problems have scarcely come, in any form, within the sphere of the consciousness of the person giving the answer. Instances verifying this statement are familiar to all who have had experience in conducting examinations, and particularly the examination of persons who have prepared their work without the help of an experienced teacher, whose questions, tests and probings make it impossible to fix in the memory the statements of others, without entering fully into the experi-