Aurelius Augustinus was the last Latin father who fought Greek and Roman Paganism. When he died, the Vandals were in Africa, and swiftly, the Roman Christians joined the battle of ancient civilization against the pre-city tribes. The new battlefield produced a union between Christian, Roman, and Greek elements. Soon, the monasteries became the archives of the whole ancient world.

When we read Augustine, we see for the last time the Church sharply separated from the ancient "world." Augustine had been a fine specimen of classic antiquity, and later he was bishop of Hippo for more than thirty years. In his "philosophical" student days, he had begotten a son—he had been seventeen years then—and now this son, Adeodatus was nearing the same age. Father and son were baptized on the same day. Legend has it that Ambrosius and Augustine alternately intoned the

Te Deum Laudamus
Te Dominum confitémur
Te æternum Patrem omnis terra venerātur...
Sanctus, Sanctus, Sanctus Dominus Sabaoth...

Augustine, the unlawful father, invoking the Holy Father of creation!
The legend is magnificent. Unfortunately, it is silent about the son. On the other hand, Adeodatus did not live to see his father become a bishop.

Between Augustine's conversion and the son's death, these two people found themselves in a social situation for which neither Greek philosophy nor Christian doctrine had to offer much. For, here was physical relationship of a father to a son, born out of wedlock. By the act of conversion, this relationship was admitted to be based on sin. Here was religious contradiction, by simultaneous baptism of a thirty-three year old father and his adolescent son. And there was the intellectual giant and roaring lion Augustine, and a young, inarticulate boy. Obviously, this situation was not harmonious. And no logic could harmonize it.

The father, however, seized on this bizarre situation. Adeodatus, at that moment, seems to have appeared to him as the new situation: the Lord had entrusted now to his passionate soul ... and he decided to write a library, a collection of books or pamphlets for the benefit of Adeodatus.

This was in contrast to Christian usage... Flesh and blood shall not endure the spirit, was a fundamental axiom of the Church; and the day of the Virgin Birth, the calling of Paul, he had never met Jesus in the flesh, the institution of baptism and confirmation, were only a few of the principles of this foundation. Sonship and discipleship, hence, the priesthood, here we strictly severed in the new Zion as they had been maintained in the old. Adeodatus, then, was faced with the dilemma of becoming the Christian teacher of his carnal son.
Augustine saw the paradox of his task: He plunged right into the center of it. The De Magistro was the preamble of faith by which he tried to prove to himself that it could be done. The library never was written. But the De Magistro allows us to relive this peculiar station on his way through life on which the separation of flesh and spirit for which the Church stands, was to be reconciled. This is very modern. We are faced with exactly this issue. Can parents teach their children? We have broken up families on the one hand, and horror of Galilee complexes on the other. Pressure from power-seeking mothers, helplessness of waversing fathers, unarticulatedness of all the members of the family on questions of faith, are mentioned so as daily.

The preamble of faith for any parent today must make answer to this: By what authority do I teach the children when I have begotten physically and who are called my children legally? For, neither the physiological bond nor the legal relation explains the scopes and limitations of a father's intellectual authority towards his son. The title De Magistro raises exactly this doubt. "Who is your teacher when I, your father, seem to teach you?" would be the full title.

In other words, the booklet tries to elucidate between the roles of father, companion, hero, teacher, sinner, which all five were united in Augustine and might well confuse the son. We do not know if this son was as hotheaded as his father if so, an early death might have saved him from an intolerable quandary. In his Confessions, the father ponders about the sin of begotting this son, and the innocence of this fruit of sin, a rather uneasy declaration one might feel for a son to hear or even to sense. What a weight was laid on this son: the illegitimate child, the co-convert, the pupil, the follower, of a truly lion-like man.

If the waters of truth could pass through such a strange channel and yet be pure truth, this certainly deserved some clarification. The dissertation before us, then, is not an academic investigation on the merits of teaching in general, but a searching of hearts on the merits of this father's right to teach his son. In particular, the dialogue, I cannot help feeling, bears the great question: Did Augustine have the right to have this son baptised with him? That had been done. The same deep which in Augustine was the climax of a passionate love, had been taken by Acacius because he was this man's son.

This, then, is the significance of this booklet. It originated in a unique situation when Augustine paused between "world" and ecclesiastical hierarchy and came nearest to our own institutionalisation. Outwardly, the anecdote has been adjudicated to philosophy or to theology. But it belongs to a third type of literature. Of this third type, we usually only recognize biographical writing, letters of autobiography. The De Magistro may draw our attention to the fact that these writing, which are not in so many personal problems, are not merely current history. Genuine ecclesiastical sources being few, too. And this, a letter is sure of a correspondence. And an important correspondence constitutes a history. A wandering between two souls. The correspondence between Acacius and Augustine is not a philosophical or theological treatment, neither is it autobiographical. It is
because it is a correspondence, a sociological phenomenon. Strangely enough, sociology has shied away from this phenomenon. A pair of lovers seemed perhaps too close to each other to be considered specimens of the social and group process. But the dialogue between Father and Son which is under our consideration now, cannot be classified correctly as long as we do not widen our categories. In this dialogue, father and son fight out the battle of fatherhood and sonhood. Now, what kind of literature is this? To call it personal, is quite as unsatisfactory as to call it biographical. For the two do not wish a personal solution; they are looking for a definite, for a true, and even for the scientific solution.

The exciting thing about the De Magistro is that it challenges our idea as though we could have a science of social affairs without this personal, biographical basis, at their root, or that we could enjoy letters and diaries, without the social truth and universal solution as their crown. We think for our personal salvation. And all social forms result from this fight for the salvation of persons. Of this, the De Magistro, is a telling example.

And this brings the book into sharp contrast to the usual literature on education. If it is true that it is written not by the famous professor of rhetorics Augustine nor by the bishop of Hippo, but by a father who felt uneasy about his prerogatives as a teacher, father, Christian, with relation to his son, student, fellow Christian, if it is true that he tried to find the truth and nothing but the truth not because he was in a scientific and detached mood, but because he was violently attached to his role in society - if, in other words, Augustine wrote this because he wanted to remain rooted and integrated, then it is possible that social science springs from personal bias and passion and belonging. Then, it is true that we do not teach others to do good but because we, like Augustine, are compelled to teach by our own life's forces, even with the odds as in his case, against our qualification to act the teacher.

An objective advisor might have counselled Augustine to send his son to a public school or to an Episcopal school, and thereby to ease the strain put upon the younger man. Not so Augustine. Even he, who had sinned when begetting Adeodatus, wished and desired to teach this same son. Handicapped he well might consider himself. But teach he must. Teaching as an integral requirement of the right way of life, as a necessity even when the teaching is bad - that certainly strikes a new note in our discussions on education: Man must teach.

When we compare John Dewey's writings on education, and they are numerous and influential, we see the contract. Never once does Dewey tell us why he must write his books or go on teaching. In discussing the foundations and underlying principles of education, the only regard he shows, is for the little victims of our educational activities. The teacher is simply taken for granted. Thus he might be just as vitally affected as the student, injured, ruined, shellshocked, perfected, in no concern of most educational discussions.

Is this lack of reciprocity result from the idea that a teacher is a paid employee and that his salary is his reward? But if
the pay is all he gets out of teaching, then teaching would be nothing in his life; and then, he can't be a good teacher. Nevertheless, educational theory modestly treats the sufferings of the teacher as pudenda not to be mentioned in good society. The parents, the pupils, the alumni, the public, are told why such and such a treatment will give the boy or girl the best possible education. A wire is sold. And this discredits our theories of education as advertising.

Any realistic approach would have to show how and why and that an adult can be induced to fool around with young people in this business of teaching and learning, some sporadically, some professionally, but all passionately.

The fact that John Rockefeller taught Sunday School all his life, that he did it, why he did it, how he did it, and if he should have done it, belongs as much in a scientific investigation as how and why and that John Doe should be taught the ABC. But the difference of these two questions is obvious. Question two can be debated in the absence of little John Doe who is too little to understand. The student's part in education lends itself to all kinds of abstractions, vague ideals, wonderful systems, statistics. But John Rockefeller or my first cousin, or an illegitimate father - their authority and qualification to teach piety and religion and history, must be debated in full view of their individual personalities and deficiencies and idiosyncrasies.

These people are real people, adult people, members not of the playgrounds of the schools, may, taxpayers, adult social phenomena themselves. If the teacher's problem would form the basis of educational discussion, if we would ask: Can anybody teach? Must everybody teach? Should nobody teach? education suddenly would become politics and social science. But as it is, education is a humanistic and even humanitarian specialty since it is mere giving to somebody, with the teacher receiving a salary, in reward.

A sociological treatment of education must explain the lives of deans, scholars, assistants, janitors, alumni, college presidents just as much as of boys and girls.

Now, it would seem that Augustine was compelled to focus on the one point where all agencies involved in the educational process are fused. The overflow that is teaching and the influence that is learning, appeared to him as meaning one and the same energy. And man's relation to this energy stumped him.

Augustine is inexhaustible. He gave the Middle Ages and the Modern Times their clue. And now he seems to be able to fuse the two separated streams of our own consciousness, education and politics, into one new beginning. How might we call this third role of the man?

He gave the Middle Ages the basis of its ethics on faith and reason. Akenside took from Augustine his Creed of Intelligence, his method. For a metaphysic that truly may be called when I am informed for what to use my logic. Akenside used, and all the schoolmen followed him, the power of his logic to rethink all the experiences
of man with his maker.

Augustine gave to the modern ages their metaphysics, through Luther and Descartes. The world of nature was demonized and as a created world lent itself to infinite rational inquiry. This complete severing of the ties between man and nature, mind and body, made possible the progress of science. In back of it is Augustine's metaphysics because Descartes could quote his doctrine that God was extramundane and man his rational agent with regard to the world if man purified his mind from all worldly attachment, if all scientists cooperated as one mind.

In both cases, of metalogic and metaphysics, Augustine placed the processes of logic and of physics, into a wider realm, into the life of the human soul. A certain soul, he taught, was capable of using its logic about God with impunity and usefully. A certain soul, he also said, was capable of using its physics about the world, without error and progressively. Under the condition that man loved his neighbor as himself, he could indeed know all these things without ending in witchcraft or gnostics. Hence all our science is universal and open as daylight since it is Augustinian.

Now, in his De Magistro, Augustine describes a third start. Here, he does not write the preamble to all reasoning about God by showing that he who makes any true statement, already must believe in the power by which we overcome our selfish interest and blind spots. He does not recommend detachment from the world before examining its facts. He writes the preamble for any member violently attached to his society, and trying to remain attached to it, despite the full use of his rational and critical faculties. In the search for a realistic sociology, we are beleaguered by abstract theories of education. Augustine says: that sociology must include the passions of the sociologist himself, his need for salvation. I the writer of this paper and you the reader, John Dewey despite his quest for impersonality, and all the students, both must receive functional satisfaction in a truthful order of education.

Augustine gives us the metaethics of utterance and communication. Before we can use our ethics of human relationships, we must be told whose life may use the functions and roles offered in these relations. Who is to become a father or a son, or a student? It is a certain being only which can escape unscathed from all those overwhelming formative influences and habits without being vitiated. He who enters into any correspondence, is to have certain qualities if his correspondence shall be worth anything.

Metalogic, Metaphysics, Metaethics - truly a giant the man from whose light may be derived three times, for three tasks, for theology in 1100, for philosophy in 1500, and now for sociology or social thought in general, in 1800.
The Distemporarity of Education

It is not difficult to determine more closely the principle of Augustine's metaethics. And this will explain why he sponsors a science of society which puts education into the very center of all social processes and facts.

No thinker saw deeper into the riddle which "time" put before man, than Augustine. His remarks on "time" in the Confessions are rightly famous. But we will be able to quote many other usually neglected passages, on this subject.

Now a thinker who has something to say on the topic of "time" is ultramodern. The most energetic thinkers of our days, fret under this mystery of time. They are confounded by the fact that the mind may be thought of as observing the bodies in space, but that this same mind takes time to function at all. True enough that the mind observes the facts of the world of space. But we seem to be unable to observe time since our own thinking takes time. The subject of the thinker is subject to the time stream, is conditioned by time. But how can that which is conditioned by some force, ever be empowered to understand this same force? If we are the products of our time, we shall never know this same time as we may know a fact of outside nature.

Thinking takes time, education takes time. We send our children to school for a dozen of years. But modern scepticism has dissected time and found that it consists of disconnected atoms, seconds. The largest school of thought in this country teaches that time knows of past and future only, that the present is of a razor-blade short-livedness, and that when we speak of "the present period" we are handling a fiction. They call all usage of a present in this larger sense, a "specious present," a fictitious unit of time. An hour in the classroom, a war, a revolution in which we find ourselves, are all fictitious, according to these logicians. And logic seems to be on their side.

But if this is so, then farewell to education. If a class consists of disconnected split seconds, education is impossible. For, all education plans a curriculum of years as though time stood still, in a certain sense.

Augustine suffered from this contradiction. And he pointed out the direction in which the solution may be found. And the snobbery of the modern sceptic which declares the present as not existent and believes in past and future only, melts like a snow flake before his scrutiny.

The De Magistro would be too fragmentary if we would not read it within the framework of Augustine's philosophy of time. And vice versa, our reasoning about time receives a sound basis, if we fathom the depth of the fact that our own thinking about time takes time.

For nowhere is this more in evidence than in the classroom of educational institutions. Teaching is not peripheral for a science
of time because it makes transparent the fact that thinking takes time. In any act of teaching, time is of the essence.

So much is this the case, that time appears there in at least three qualifications at once. First, there is the schedule of the whole curriculum, second, there are two kinds of people, one older, the other younger, both with a time of their own, and yet thrown together into this identical schedule.

It seems that we have here in a nutshell the time-compound of all social relations. The teacher and the student are not contemporaries; yet they are synchronized. Hence two "times," two lifetimes, seem to be able to join. Without this basic belief, teaching would be impossible. Whatever else teaching may be, if we restrict its aspect to the purely chronological skeleton in it, it always shows two people at least one of which is, with regard to the subject matter taught, ahead of the other. Now to be ahead here simply an expression for the teacher's pre-acquaintance with the matter. Five minutes earlier than his student, he must have come to know it at least. Whereas in all other cases, the difference between old and young may be glossed over or forgotten, in teaching, this discrepancy is made the cornerstone of the whole process. Here, a difference in time is necessary to make the flow of experience possible.

Teaching is based on a succession in time, willy nilly. And the reason why the teacher should give his time to a young brat and why the young should place his faith in an old ass, remain to be explained.

Augustine does exactly this. He sees that a social itinerary must link together the young and the old, the primitive and the educated.

Indeed, in teaching, the social system reveals itself to be based on a harmony of innumerable times. People of different age are made to coexist. But different age also means different ideas, different interest, different outlook, different taste, different beliefs. And yet teaching? Yet a flow of light from the representative of one time to the representative of another? This is not an academic question. How many parents actually did say, during the last decades, that the times are so different that we can teach little to our children?

Yet, as long as anything is taught, the collision between various times and their different truths is considered to be superable. The relative character of all differences in time-truths is therefore the basis of all teaching. But this means that all teaching makes definite assumptions about our relation to time and submersion in it.

And this is indeed true.

The difference in age between coworkers may be accidental; the time difference between teacher and pupil exists by establishment. They are, therefore, distemporaries, not contemporaries. Two times exist of which one is embodied by the teacher, the other by the pupil. In learning, in teaching, in education, the miracle is achieved of bringing both together in a third time. This bridge is called the present.
Now, I cannot find that anyone except Augustine has pondered over this situation. I have looked up, for the purpose of verifying this proposition, a long list of books on ethics, medieval and modern. Nowhere did I find that they saw a problem of the first order in the time abyss between teacher and pupil. Here, the darkest division of man stares us in the face. And our handbooks on ethics deal with justice and property and crime and labour and government. Education comes as an appendix, with all the optimistic colours of the easiest part of the ethical system. And the teacher in us is mentioned nowhere, with his rights.

Augustine saw that all our troubles spring from the educational task. For, to him, we small men are expected to form together one great man through the ages. From Adam to the end of times, man is one. The ages die. The generations die; the individual passes through at least seven ages during his little life. And yet the spirit’s bloodstream survives every one age. For this grandiose task the different times and ages of man must be made co-existent although every one of them only lasts a short time. Augustine says in De Genesi ad Manichaeos I, 43, ‘The age of the mature man corresponds to the fifth day of creation when fishes and birds are created. Hence, this man must teach, pervading the air like a bird, with the winged words of celestial teaching. And he breaks through the waves of time, like a whale, with the power of contempt. His students, on the other hand, and their aetas, compare to the second and third day of creation. For, whereas as infants, they are bathing in the undivided light of the first day, the boy and girl begin to remember and to distinguish. And the very first distinction is between heaven and earth, high and low, carnal and spiritual. In this way, the ages may imitate eternity by their co-existence.’

It is, therefore, in line with St. Augustine to put the process of teaching in the centre of all sociology. This is the only important distinction between a Christian sociology that is based on the word, and a naturalistic sociology. Usually, people derive the authority of a teacher merely from his expert knowledge. When we do this—and St. Thomas does it—we fall into the abyss of departmentalisation. When people deduce the right to teach from the ‘State,’ they fall into the abyss of propaganda and lying. It is only when teaching is based on no other, external or logical, process outside itself, when education is recognized as an original and irreducible situation between two souls that we escape the hell of –, isms, of inquisition and propaganda. We all need an answer to the simple question: How can people who are not contemporaries live together successfully? And Augustine’s answer is: They succeed if they admit that they form a succession, if they affirm their quality of belonging to different times. If the time difference is admitted, they may build a bridge across the times, in corresponding acts. By these acts, that which is called “the present,” is produced. The present, is not a given data

* Tempora fabricantur et ordinantur aeternitatem imitantia. Orbis temporum numerosa successionem quasi carmini universitatis associat. (The times are manufactured and ordained as to imitate eternity. The periods of the times by numerous succession organise themselves as parts of the song of the whole.) De Musica, XI N. Patrologia Latina, Opera Augustini I, 1179.
of nature but a fruit of social efforts.

The teacher's unrelated lifetime before he acts the teacher and the student's unrelated lifetime before he becomes this teacher's student know of no present except as the razor blade between past and present. When the two converse, the man A by acting the teacher, concedes that he represents the past, and the man B by acting the student, volunteers to represent the future, between them. And by taking upon themselves these two roles, a present emerges which stands above the past and the future as their common ground.

Analysis of the Text

In two chapters, we have dealt with the situation of the dialogue between Augustine and Adeodatus, and with the problems of time and education which it raises and against which it should be pitted. We now proceed to an analysis of the text.

The text consists of fourteen chapters. We shall sum them up, one after the other.

1. By speech, albeit prayer, song, or teaching proper, we cause the very things to come into the mind of which the words are signs.

2. In commenting on poetry, we are expounding words with words, signs well known by signs equally well known.

3. In as far as man asks questions by means of words, he usually must put up with words as his reply. He may, however, get his answer through other signs or gestures, or the act itself may be performed.

4. A sign may point to things or to other signs. The word 'noun' or 'conjunction' points to signs; horse and river point to realities.

5. Every sign is both: sign and meaningful. Words are signs with regard to the ear, and meaningful nouns with regards to the soul. Any word (for instance: 'if', 'because') can be used as the subject of a sentence, i.e. as a noun.

6. Some signs signify themselves like the word "word." Others are reciprocal like vocabula and nomina. Some signs are synonymous. Words from different languages differ acoustically only.

7. Adeodatus sums up: All speech is teaching.

Words are signs.

Signs need not be words.

Acts may be shown without a sign.
8. Augustine himself sees these points clearer now quam cum ea inquirendo ac disserendo de nescio quibus latebris ambo erueremus. (Tourscher: by questioning and arguing we both were drawing them from some unknown obscurity; Leckie: we unearthed them from unknown hiding places.)

The goal of this discussion is difficult to explain. Adeodatus may either consider this to be a game or expect some small result or he may become impatient because he is hoping for a big result. Augustine although playing is not aiming at a toy thing: "On the other hand, it may seem rather ridiculous when I pretend that it is some blessed and eternal life to which I wish to be led with you here under the guidance of God, and that is to say, of truth, namely by some steps that will be appropriate to our poor gait. For, I have entered upon this highroad not by studying the objects that we signify, but their signs only. Yet, this prelude exercises the very energies by which the warmth and light of the region of the blessed life may be not just forborn but truly loved."

9. The two syllables ho-mo may mean a real being, or these two phonetic fragments. Generally, the presumption is in favour of the reality of which the word is a sign. When we ask about the word as a word only, we should qualify our question. It is legitimate to answer an unqualified question as though the real thing was the object of the question. Sophists are abusing this righteous attitude.

9. A sign may be equally or more valuable than the reality signified. But our cognition of the sign is less precious than our cognition of the reality signified. Examples are "filth" and "vice."

10. The assumption in chapter III and VII that certain acts like walking are self-explaining, is refuted. Result: Nothing is taught without symbols. Adeodatus feels uneasy. Augustine, in fact, turns the tables now and shows that everything under the sun may teach us without the use of signs. We even understand new words only when we see the object which they signify.

11. "To give the maximum of credit to words, words challenge us to seek reality." We may and shall believe words. Understanding, however, should follow as frequently as possible. And understanding is not produced by words. It is not even achieved by the speaker although his words may challenge us. Tantum cuique panditur quantum capere propter proprium sive malam sive bonam voluntatem potest. (Leckie: there is revealed to each one as much as he can apprehend through his will according as it is more perfect or less perfect. Tourscher: It is opened out so far to each one as each one is capable to grasp by reason of a good or a bad habit of life.) See our criticism on page 17.

12. Sensations and mental perceptions are the two classes of our perceptions. Sensations never are replaceable through words of others, except on faith. In a case of more belief, nothing is learned. The same is true of mental processes. "The auditor
when I tell that I saw a flying man, will answer: 'I don't believe you.' In the same way, he will deny the spiritual truth which he is not fit to know." Any auditor will either accept on faith, or deny, or consent by his own spontaneous testimony. In no case, then, will he have learned, properly speaking.

13. The listener is the speaker's judge, or at least, he is judging his speech. The speaker may quote texts in an attempt to refute them, and the listener still may approve of this very quotation. Sometimes, it is true, we succeed in speaking our minds. However, we are talked to by as many lying people as by truthful men. Besides, by inattentive talking, slips of the tongue, etc., any number of quarrels and misunderstandings may be produced.

14. Nobody sends his children to school to let them think the teacher's ideas. They ought to get the objective knowledge. This they only learn by spontaneous consideration inside themselves. That we should call the man who speaks to us, 'magister,' springs from the fact that no time seems to intervene between the moment of his speaking and the moment of our cognition. Because this time element is overlooked, the students think that what they learn from the interior truth, has been learned from the external admonisher.

The general usefulness of words which, well considered, is not small, we shall investigate elsewhere. Here, however, I wish to restrict their importance. I only have admonished you. We should not only believe but also understand why it is written with divine authority that nobody is our master on earth since one master is in heaven. Matthew XXIII, 8: "but be not ye called Rabbi; for one is your master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren. 9. And call no man your father upon the earth; for one is your father which is in heaven. 10. Neither be ye called masters: for one is your master, even Christ."

With all my questions, with all your answers, you have not learned from me. Confirm me, Adeodatus. And Adeodatus affirms:

Words from outside are admonitions. He only teaches that dwells inside. And I have experienced this during your talk which I have enjoyed. All doubts were dissolved by the inner "oraculum."

Some discarded digressions in De Magistro:

Ch. I. What is the intention and value of music?
II. "Nothing" is a difficult problem.
III. The words of prayer are not the essence of prayer; still, they have their proper social function.
IV. It remains unsolved how a term like 'ex' should be defined.
IX. A thing that serves another object need not be inferior to that object, Adeodatus thinks. Augustinus holds the opposite view.
XIV. The positive usefulness of words is not to be discussed in this dialogue.
Reconciliation for a social situation.

The dialogue deals first with the meaning of speech, and then with the origin of truth for the boy who is spoken to. The dialogue takes place between father and son after they have left Italy and wish to establish themselves as baptised Christians in Africa again. As a dialogue, it still preserves the technique of that academic life that Augustine and his friends, including the son, had led together in Italy. On the other hand, this is the only piece in which father and son are on their own resources, without anybody else. The instinctive loyalty to the form of production that the life in Italy had asked for, is obvious; on the other hand, the death of Adeodatus left this dialogue as a mere fragment. Augustine's life in Africa soon followed a new pattern, of public and ecclesiastical character. Thus, the De Magistro is the obituary of a boy who must have been full of life and wit. And the boy no longer was a boy. He was seventeen; at that very age, Augustine himself had begotten Adeodatus! Adeodatus is on the verge of independence and maturity.

At the end of the last chapter, Augustine hints at the situation in which the dialogue is written. It is meant to be the forerunner of more to come. The intervening death of Adeodatus has kept from us the sequence of De Magistro. And what does Augustine plan as a sequence? This is very important to know when we wish to interpret that what we have and what is a fragment only of what we would have without the loss of the son. For, if Augustine announces what he is going to do later, we may be sure that he does not think to have given this same thing in De Magistro. And this indeed is the case. Augustine promises to write on the usefulness of words "which when rightly considered is not small." The De Magistro shows how the use of words should be "rightly" considered, without being itself the positive treatment of this usage. The De Magistro is not concerned with the positive teaching of grammar, speech, etc. as the modern significationists would like to find. "Foundations" are laid. Today, the use of the word "foundations" is handled so loosely that the meaning of this word is forgotten. Mr. Leckie thinks that the first chapters of De Magistro contain Augustine's final ideas on the subject. The whole dialogue, however, moves away from these introductory chapters. And any "foundation" has to do so. Why is that so? Foundations wish to get away from a surface that is unable to carry a building. We go against the surface and away from the surface not by building a skyscraper, but by excavating the ground when we lay foundations.

In the Liberal Arts community, in the situation existing between Augustine and Adeodatus, between any teacher and any student, there is danger, there is abuse. The foundation must be laid anew for the rebirth of the school. Everything will sound in the reborn school differently from what it now seems to be in the unregenerated school. None, all the grammatical and rhetorical arguments in the first part of De Magistro only serve the purpose of describing the processes in the unregenerated environment without passing any judgment on their social value. The purely descriptive character of the first part of De Magistro as a specimen of what people used to talk in schools removes our book from the Platonic pattern. It is not imitative of a
Platonic dialogue. A social and scholastic situation is described and enacted so that it may do repentance and be lifted upon new foundations. The first half might be compared to Abraham's attempt of sacrificing Isaac. We are told this because at the end, Abraham instead sacrifices his own will. In the same way, the first half is narrated by Augustine so that it may be jettisoned in the second! The dialogue is a biographical event in the life of the two partners. Thought is political; this dialogue does not dwell in the realm of theory; it is an act within the practical life of Augustine and Adeodatus. Guitton has some very beautiful remarks on this difference between Greek and Christian thought; he says (Le Temps et l'Eternité chez Plotin et Saint Augustin, Paris 1933, p. 359), "The unsurmountable abyss between Greek and Christian thought is the Christian rehabilitation of the unique and temporal event. The moral order is general and abstract to every philosophical or Greek mind. In Christianity the time of every human existence receives a superior quality in its smallest fragments." One of these smallest fragments is the hour between 6 and 9 in which I am writing this essay or the classroom lecture in which logic is taught. By the Greek mind, or as we call this mentality today not quite as sharply, by the academic mind, this fact is ignored; a lecture was thought to be a theoretical display of thought. Hence, it would seem that in the classroom, the events, the ideas, the people that the teacher mentions enter into a merely Platonic realm of ideas. In imitating the ancients, the classroom, the teacher and the students feign to have timeless minds. On these minds, the events, people, ideas mentioned in class leave an imprint, as a movie does on our imagination, with the movie moving and ourselves sitting unmoved. In the dialogue De Magistro, this academic atmosphere and disposition disappear. Here, we have no difference between theory and practice. Augustine and Adeodatus think out their salvation as chapter 3 clearly says. The dialogue is not academic but biographical for both. It is a social struggle.

The whole dialogue and especially the break in chapter 8 remain ununderstandable as long as we think in academic terms of a difference between theory and practice. However, a dualism is here too; the book is obviously made up out of two parts. Only, this is another dualism, the only dualism admitted by a Christian community. It is the dualism between play and seriousness. This dualism is at the bottom of the dialogue, and Augustine says so himself. We never are "academic." but we alternate between play and struggle.

The dualism of one non-commital and one definite part divides the dialogue right in the middle into two sections of chapters. Out of fourteen the whole consists. In chapter seven, Adeodatus sums up the results of the first six chapters: "What do we do when we speak?"

Many sides of this question have been mentioned and left unsolved. They are listed at the end of the summary as unfinished digressions. The father has freely avowed his ignorance in some cases; and the son has been as often right against the father as the father has been against the son. They have cracked a number of jokes. For instance, in discussing the word "nothing," they discover that it is a wonderful sport for sophisms on "nothing" when one of them may mean the word "nothing," or the difficult concept "nothing."
Augustine gives up after a while, jokingly: Come on lest "Nothing" us deadly.

The whole first part is remarkable for its good humour and its poor results. And no wonder. For, we learn in chapter 6 that this was a play, a prelude, and an exercise only. And to prove that he means what he says, all the dearly bought results of part One are re-futed or given up in part Two. At the end, we do not know what is true in this respect; and what is more, we do not care. What has happened? Augustine says explicitly that he wishes to lead both into a quest for the good and blessed life; however, he has taken an unusual start. Mostly, when a moral issue is involved, we plunge directly into the material problem involved. Instead, this time, the conversation begins with a reflection on the means of discussion, of speech and the signs used in speech. These very signs may be taken too seriously. And that is why Augustine wanted them to be shown up in their relative importance. The first half of the dialogue plays with the unimportant; the second is seriously concentrating on the essence.

Some of the modern Augustinians will dislike the idea of dismissing a part of the discussion as less important. To the logicians, a difference in importance is a foreign idea. They are serious all the time; and so they become ponderous. I suggest that just this has happened to Mr. Leckie. The conditions of play and work are nearly unknown today to the philosopher. Yet, it is a fact that people who live together must play and work together, both. We play together in our state of innocence. We must work together for our sins. 75 years ago, Horace Bushnell wrote an essay on play and work in which he said that play was the normal thing, and work should be lifted up to the level of play. And the church holds that the liturgy is a play of humanity in the face of their Father. In heaven and so far as we are in heaven, we play; on earth, and in so far as we must work out our salvation, we struggle. The dualism that divides human activities, is the dualism between play and struggle. The difference between theory and practice is a fallacy. Thought is struggle as much as any other doing. Of course when we compare leisurely thought, irresponsible talk on one side, and responsible labour and toil on the other, the division between mere theory and realistic practice is very tempting. We are misled by the fact that in this case the act of thought is a play, the act of our hands is serious. Serious thought and diligent practice would be divided the other way round: the practice of the player is quite irresponsible, purely "theoretical," the thought of the doctor who tries a diagnosis, is strictly responsible, hence the most real practice. Let us replace the futile division: theory versus practice, by the realistic: play versus struggle.

In allowing Adeodatus first to play with him, Augustine prepares for the full warmth and light of that region where the blessed life is lived. Today when we work with one kind of people and play with another, our best thoughts remain our private property. Why has everybody today a private religion only? Because we cannot find the truth together when we do not play together. For that reason, we find little truth together; most truth that we find remains our private affair. The dialogue itself, in its method, is a specimen of how

\* See my Socialiose 1925 on these two points.
people may find the truth together.

By this method, Augustine is able to lift Adeodatus from one level of thought to another. This shift of level is the real goal of education. As long as people think of teaching merely as the instruction of facts, this shift in level is overlooked or even denied. Many teachers would say that we move on one and the same level during a lecture. That this is not true is proved by the simple fact that even they cannot help cracking a joke once in a while. If they would analyze the impact of this one little fact they would face the real educational mystery which is that man meets his fellow man only when he meets him on different levels. This is not a logical proposition; and it is not a psychological proposition. It is a social and historical phenomenon. And this is Augustine’s problem all through the De Magistro. The student plays, the teacher struggles with the truth.

The student is faced by a question in the classroom which to him has not yet become personal. For, we anticipate life’s experiences by going to school and by learning from others. Hence, the things to be learned even by the best and most eager student, are faced from afar, and this gives the student an attitude towards these questions as though he might toy with them. He, every adolescent, plays with ideas. As a friend of mine said to me; "Never take a man up on what he has thought before he was thirty." Hence, the play situation is represented by the student. The teacher, it need hardly be said, is the more entitled to the function of teaching, the more he has wrestled with the question in dead earnest. He may not struggle any more; but at one time, he must have struggled with the truth he is going to propound.

The past though past is serious. The future though approaching can still be played with. And the student’s playing with ideas, compared to the teacher’s convictions, compare like regular current and power current. We need a transformer, to bring the truth from the form of conviction to the form of play. Otherwise, it will not be accessible to the student. Hence, Augustine did play with Adeodatus first, and was quite willing to jettison part of his truth as having not much weight.

But this is not the whole process of teaching. For, the student must be made aware that the teacher is in earnest and that he, too, one day, will have to be in earnest. The transformer must work in the other direction, too. The playboy-attitude must be stepped up to seriousness. In the same manner in which the teacher shifts from his own plane to the student’s level, the student will have to move from his lukewarm and aloof attitude to earnestness and enthusiasm. He must be aroused to two acts. One, he must recognize and respect that the teacher is reporting a struggle, not a play with truth. The other, he must follow him into this struggle himself. Good teaching begins with a joke and ends with a challenge. They represent the two levels which await to be equalized by the transformer called teaching or education.

To degrade teaching into humility or to sublimate it into crusading, are the two dangers of teaching. Joke and struggle, low voltage and high voltage, shall be equalized. Then they are, all that which education can do, has been done. Both partners enter into this
process as completely as electricity enter the transformer. Neither the teacher nor the student are master of this free process. It has an elementary character. It may succeed or it may miscarry. As long as we overlook this aspect of teaching, the relation of struggle and play, of conviction and idea, we may think of education as a sale trade in which some were exchanged hands. And our recipes on "techniques" betray this evaluation of education as a thing which can be mastered by the teacher and of learning as a process to be mastered by the will of the student. And it is true, instruction can be drilled in by relatively safe methods. Knowledge and information can be imparted by round techniques. However, nothing of importance about man himself can be transmitted without the full investment of two real lives in a situation which is and remains risky. The more important the topic of teaching, the more risk is involved. The struggle and seriousness may be misunderstood, the jokes of the teacher may be misinterpreted. And when Hegel said: "I had one student who understood me, and he misunderstood me," he had the courage to crack a joke which was much more than a joke. He who has never been misunderstood, may be sure that that which he had to say, was not important.

The truth, conveyed by play and struggle both, must emerge beyond these two forms in which the student and the teacher conceive of it.

And this is the text of the second half of the dialogue. Since teaching miscarry so often, Augustine tries to eliminate some frequent causes of the miscarriage. The simple fact that we get involved into any kind of conversation and social intercourse, inevitably exposes us to the danger of misunderstanding and of being misunderstood. The signs and words used in speech, learning, teaching, seem to be "owned" by the interlocutors. We credit them with their meaning. We view them as the masters of the situation. The term "original sin" is not used by Augustine with regard to this situation. And it is well known that he never was able to solve the mystery of this concept of original sin to his own satisfaction. But the situation in which we find ourselves by conversing, is not far distant from the dilemma which the church described by this term. We are near it when we see Augustine attribute the indecisive and arbitrary plays of mere sagacity and dissimulation and how they conceal the moral issue which paves up in every conversation. As soon as we are unaware of the risk and consider the partners of a conversation as less overlooks and act as elements in an unforeseeable risky event, of which they are mere subjects subjected to undergoing it, we attribute to them a power which they do not have. What happens when we have played together? What does it mean when we become serious? Does it mean that we become thinking machines? Understand the decisive turn by which the teacher's role is transferred from a rational, logical, pragmatic, scientific, and scholastic role into the realm where it really belongs and within which it becomes clear that every man must teach, and why human beings are by nature obliged and authorized to teach as much as we assume that every child should take the opportunity to learn.

The teacher is stripped of his logical ways. He may be a good teacher or an educator, but not a logician or a scientist. But in the use of the concept of education, the teacher may become a thinker, a scientific thinker, a logician. In the process of teaching he gets involved because he has a
soul. In Augustine's metaphysics, it becomes obvious that the teacher must be considered with an ethical role. Any such... he is enabled not to the mind in us or by the intellect but by the little something without which the modern mind would like to explain education and teaching. William James thought that our rational explanation of the universe did not stand in need of this little something. And modern psychology and John Dewey's philosophy dismiss it with a shrug of their shoulders. William James, at least, admitted that the little thing might have to be allowed in again if a champion could be found who could show some pragmatic significance for it. Now, Augustine is this champion of the cherished term "soul" because teaching cannot be explained if the teacher has no soul.

For, the teacher is born between his duties to the truth and his love for the pupil. And he call "soul" the power which can order our thought and good between contradictory tendencies in us. The soul is the power to forbear conflict. The conflict which the teacher takes upon himself lies between his thought in his own time and the survival of this thought beyond his own time.

What is the situation? The man of good will learns, Augustine says (chapter 11). The boy of bad will fails. The teacher may inflect the will of the student by combining his love for the truth and his love for the student. If the teacher testifies to his membership in the fellowship of truth and at the same time keeps his membership in the play community which he has formed with the student, his testimony may raise the boy up into the serious fellowship.

Since this is the core of the dialogue, it is worth the trouble to consult our present day translations. We find that Leckie is uneasy when he confronts the bold sentence: Tantum cui eyas pan ditur quantum capere propter propriam sive malam cive bonam voluntatem potest. Leckie translates this: there is revealed to each one as much as he can apprehend through his will according as... As more perfect or less perfect. Augustine says, however, much more bluntly that the truth is spread as a linen or a rug, on our good will and cannot be spread if it would have to be laid upon a wicked will. We are so accustomed to the literal statement that a student's will might be wicked and that only on a good will the linen or the truth may be spread, that it is quite understandable to find our text watered down in the translation. This character of the modern mind is brought out even more sharply in the translation by Courrèges: "It is opened out so far that each one as each one is capable to grasp of a good or a bad habit of life." I doubt if the term habit of life, aroused in the modern reader the full sound of Augustine's word which sums up all our habits of life into "will." Habit of life, it seems to me, is used by us too much in the sense of specific habits. Augustine calls a spatial a space. To call wicked or evil will merely "less perfect," or the control direction of man's education a habit of life, confounds the anti-social character of the educational situation. The man of good will is the man who... open to the evil forces, guard in the teacher, and love of the truth, without which teaching cannot proceed. Reciprocally, the good habits have evidence in the pupil. If we want the teacher to teach in the student: either he will be emancipated in the teacher, but not insincerely. There where the student has good will, the teacher employs faith. There where the teacher is bound by his interest
in the student, the student is bound by his faith in the good will of the teacher.

The Correspondence of Human Beings

The second part of the Bo Nagyéro doth sanction the teacher from his Board. It is that the truth truth. The great Guru in India, the heads of the schools in antiquity were fountains of truth. Augustine

The modern reader will say: "Well, we know this. We no longer exalt the great teacher. We consider the teacher just one faculty like any other." The student is admired by our progressives who tell him to be creative. Behind the child, the teachers disappear today as hired men, as the impersonal tools of the child's growth.

However, if Augustine's analysis is right, the modern attitude although overly wryy compared with antiquity, is just as difficult to say. Neither the child nor the adult carry the process responsibly. They can carry it only corresponsedly. And their correspondence goes on in a manner common to book. Neither has the teacher a private claim to the truth which he has either heard or discovered nor does the child discover the world all by himself. When people think of a human relation as a purely dual relation, husband and wife, capital and labor, teacher and student, it nearly always seems to happen that the student soon is reduced by one faction to the half of the two, and by another faction to the other half of the pair. Labor says: I am everything, and we have communism. Capital says: I am everything, and we have exploitation. The husband says: I am everything, and we have the outcast at the breakfast table. The wife says: I am everything, and we have - but I shall not say what. Now, in education, after giving nearly everything to the Sutta, the teacher, we now hear people declare about the learning genius of the child. In our age of the masses, the labor hires behind the masses which he hies, the teacher hides behind the suckingness whom he incommodes. Another fiction. This time, the truth is as much distorted as it was before.

May I suggest that all over our social world, any definition runs the risk so be reduced to a onanism when and as long as it is not interpreted as a crisis? Therefore it is of the essence that we understand the relation as advocated by Augustine. Before I am "labor" or a "capitalist," I am a man. Before a man acts as teacher or as student, he is a human being. But what is a human being? How does the human being assert himself after I am disguised as a teacher, a husband, a capitalist?

The human being, not the teacher, is human. As a capitalist, a "even" today or I "social" today may be a human being, I cannot. As a teacher, I can argue an argument that will my terms of which this the necessity of and for love or the - human being, I cannot. In education, a Community a Christian society why a spritely, my Capitalism is not the same thing, it is another, it is in another, as as a hidden people as the society, what? I shall not say what. We must overplay their social role, and we see them abuse it often. But is it not strange
that the abuse do not range much farther? As a boy, I always pastor-
ed my sister who had been to Russia and reported on the bribes and
conventions under the Czar; with the one question: How can a country
live in this way? How does one know that the tribe buys the goods?
Why don't people accept the bribe and then simply refuse to make their
peace in good? I must have asked the question a hundred times. And my
Father always replied: It costs you from 15 to 25% of the sum under
consideration; but do this expense, you are perfectly sure of the outcome.
The abuse is in itself limited and restricted to this margin.

Now I understand what I failed to understand then. Even the
corrupt judge, it seems, - and he is I suppose the worst social weed
of all - is bound by the little claim which he makes himself. He
wishes to be called a human being. Even Richard III while he has re-
solved to become a monster, expects to be loved, to be called a human
being by some woman. This terrible dependence of man on being called
man, is the whole sense which prevents him from going mad with conceit,
or drugs. As long as I pride myself of being a human being, I make
two claims which are extremely difficult to push and to put over. One
is that I have being, that I am real, and the other that I really am a
human being. These two claims are just as bold as a claim to a gold
mine, and as difficult to protect. Incidentally, others brush me aside
as having no real importance, and that is, no being. And all the
gossip in town, at one time or another, makes inroads on my claim to
being human.

There exists an algebraic equation of a severity as 2 and 2
equals 4, whenever a man claims to bear a name. I call myself A, then
I am to be called A, by others. Speech is a severe business. It is
based on the golden rule that the name which I use shall be applied by
others. When I say A, I start an algebraic operation in my commu-
nity. I set out for an algebraic equation, holding on to my name A and
the operation is going on until either the community has done round to
my nomenclature and that: the equation reads; my A equals your A. Or,
my may abandon my claim, and be satisfied with the name B or C conceded
by the rest of the world.

Now I may abandon all particular names: American, Christian,
teacher, lieutenant, and yet survive. But I cannot survive the loss
of my two titles as "being" and as being human. If I lose my claim
to the second, I am proscribed and treated as an outcast. If I lose
my claim to the first, I am put in a humane asylum, as hopelessly
unsound. So any human being, to his ending day, holds onto these two
titles: from me as being real and as being human, and waits for the
social algebra which bears him out. All specific social functions are
more surface roles compared to this underlying lasting role. This
role consists of a correspondence between my names for myself and so-
ciety's names for me. This correspondence binds us. Without it, we
lose our being and our humanity. Most nations take this correspond-
ance so much for granted that its matter was needed to prove to them
that it was a personal method that this correspondence could make
itself heard and felt. Thomas Carlyle, born in 1808, in the year of
being a been on the occasion of the annexation of Denmark by the
Napoleonic France, wrote to his friend: "I am astonished, my sufferings, his
puzzlement, and his reputation all over the world; that when we read his
books on education, the humanity of teacher and pupil and their reality are taken for granted. We only want to see them grow, and see them grow intelligently. But grow into what? Into chauffeurs who are to drive at 100 miles an hour that they break all speed laws? Into women who decline to have children because it does harm to their complexion? Foxes are intelligent, and weeds grow tall.

Nowhere in modern education is said about the roles which precede social action and intelligence and growth. The roles of being real and of being human, as a claim and a response, as a hope of the society, and an acceptance by us, as a name bound on us, and in equation of self-consciousness and social reputation. Because is all was quite safely assumed to be taken care of, in 1909 when John Dewey was born, and the struggle for survival was proclaimed.

But a human being does not struggle for survival; man goes to war. This is the very opposite of the struggle for survival. The struggle for other things than for our own survival. Why? because we hold on to the mistaken claim that we are real, alive and dead and that we are in a conversation in which we make claims or give answers to claims made on us. I know of course that the survival of our social group is today identified with the Darwin theory, but this is not true either. However, this is not the place to prove the fact that a man who goes to war fights and dies without this hope. He may be content with the obvious. A human being is not primarily interested in his own survival. No marriage, no childhood, no war, no religious persuasion, no order, no not one of all these events could take place ever, if man were primarily interested in his enlightened self-interest. Growth and intelligence do not suffice to change our lives. Both are too self-regarding. No man has ever lived by them, except the victims of progressive education. But we do live by the great human bondage which precedes any division of labor in society, and which stirs us into action and suffering and adventure and risk, all our life. This correspondence is like an unending conversation which is carried on with us. Elsewhere, I have shown that we do not start this conversation ourselves; the first thing we know about it, is a claim made on us. We are called long before we call him. On the other hand, since this conversation keeps us alive, we are for ever curious about the next answer, in this correspondence with the universe. It makes all of us thirsty for some witness outside our transitory social function. Teacher or student wish to correspond to society outside the classroom because they wish to secure stemmed against the loss of their human reality during the hour. The correspondence must get them outside their "roles."

It is of great historical interest to see Auguste unfold this primary relation of the man in the teacher and the man in the student to a third, corresponding voice. As long as either the teacher or the student think too highly of what our role in the process of communication, they will deny "use" to talk. In Auguste there are expressions of relief in correspondence. The human nature of which he speaks and "lives" this means he is not concerned with your this is almost a central atmosphere in the corresponding untrammelled face preceding
their own specialties. "Atmosphere" as one of those wonderful teaching attributes of religious education..."Atmosphere" means for common spirit; for what people breathe together, in as well as out. Atmosphere seems to be a natural fact; but since the term is nothing but a translation of "Spirit" it now to us becomes transparent as a social fact. The two, teacher and pupil, already form a "we" before they split into two "I's." Their possibilities of convoking at all is conditioned by this common spirit which makes them meet with pencils instead of with shot guns. Hence the two "I's" must be made to perceive this common basis, background, condition of one spirit.

So quotes from the present teacher the very words from which later A. J. Alexander of Canterbury took his "I believe so that they understand" and which reads: "Unless you have given credit, you shall not understand." Augustine says: the student must first believe the teacher - modern theory notwithstanding - and then there go on to come in touch with the truth directly. We begin patiently by trusting our elders; in as far as they love us; they deserve our trust. Love is a claim to being trusted. But we must go on from there because God is not love alone. He also is Truth and he asks us to make Him as truth as much as before we may have met him as love. As truth we shall not meet Him through other people's glasses.

All our qualities of a human being must be brought into play one after another. The teacher should not overlook His love, the student not overlook His death. They must obtain their greater part; God, in their relation. Then, teaching is regenerated and converted and "similarly" treated. In teaching and learning, both parents undergo a process of reciprocal nature. We are cleansed of our contemporaneous the teacher by sacrificing to the future, the student by sacrificing to the past. Then, they have remained human, despite the moral risks of childishness and authority implied in teaching.

The Ethical or Religious Meaning of F. Nietzsche

Let us stop here and raise once more the question: What does this dialogue achieve in the personal life of the two people involved in it?

A great teacher of the world, Professor of Theories in the Roman Stoic, is speaking about himself in his mature age, as advanced as he might and nature. He is a true student besides being a man. This means that wise as much as the man on the boy's shoulders and on the average boy who has to deal with the spirit of his puberty with a teacher here and a father there. Nevertheless, he is his father's student for years now. And this is not all. This same teacher and teacher has become a moral hero. He has dragged the son from one corner of the moral by telling him /where/ is the place of the conversion of Christianity, inserting need to discuss with his teacher... "I was an honest child, before when the pressure, according..."...This is his father's son, and he, his teacher, and more... the pressure the father and he, together, and the son had been depressed. However, the student and teacher was also most youthful. So the young and the old, Christian; Stoic was a Christian. Their understanding and concluded.
were as before. Usually, a godfather and godmother take care of a child against the bodily parents. In our case, this was out of the question. Aodatus was far too old, and had lived with his father all his life. The baptism happened far too late in life to protect Aodatus against his father’s spiritual despotism.

And here was Augustine, only 35 years of age, and his boy 17, both in the stage of fighting still. All the odds are against Aodatus.

In this dilemma, Augustine himself served in the argument of spiritual emancipation to his son. And this is achieved by the dialogue. The dialogue ends on a tone which is unusual, personal biographical. “I am not your real father, I am not your rabbi, (= teacher), I am not your master and hero,” these verses from St. Matthew XXIII become so eloquent in the mouth of Augustine. And he felt it; for in his Retrospection, he sums up the whole dialogue after this quotation from the Bible.

He first chose his summe materials together with Aodatus in his respectful role of grammar and rhetoric. He places him at his authority as a grammarian and rhetorician. And then, he steps down or up to his real and serious role as loving father. Through he complicates his boy’s spiritual emancipation. The history of the world hardly contains another case in which the words of the New Testament, these verses 5, 9, and 10 against teachers, teachers, and bosses, resound with more meaning, more judicious, more urgent than in our dialogue where they are made to save the soul of Aodatus. I do not know of any other case where a son was going to have his spiritual liberty sponsored and warranted by so imposing, so violent, so colossal a father. Would you or I have liked to be the son of Aurelius Augustinus?

Also, his later students had no envy such. The desire for De Magistro is proved by the baseness, that he said in Augustine’s own chiasm of De Magistro. “Teaching is the choice of a teacher and the whole class can deny that anyone ever was not in the same mood which Augustine so violently refuted in De Magistro.”

“Erat Quod Vivit Vivitum;” in neque homo plausum, non qua sum qui sunt plurima divinae, quoniam nunc est. This is the language in which our Saint might speak of God and himself, but which repelled between mortals. The father and teacher of the bishop. This depressing change. It is a question where the couple of the still was and how very practical Augustine’s considerations were. The contrast between magister and magistri can be taken as the test for the very character of De Magistro, and our right of interpreting its true sense. Augustine’s own promise to give the positive definition, is also a valuable testimony in this direction since it prescribes the programme character which he decided to our sons.

Let us ask the question: what is 1887? It is the year in which the in 1887 by the means of photography that we have been able to see and interpret precisely the inside history of the world, so

“Forgive me when I wrong you, in my frenzy, recognize as being, forgive my anger when you become, forgive as being mine.”
him to his autobiography. The Do Magistro is truly Augustinian. When we look to the level of a sacrament that purifies his last natural and pre-Augustinian loyalty, its form and content both are perfect. All other interpretations are at a loss to explain parts of the whole charismatically. When looked at biographically, the dialogue says: the Christian democracy is re-established; Teacher and student move on one level of spiritual equality.

One cannot speak highly enough of the scientific potentialities emerging from Do Magistro. Many pre-Christian, pre-Augustinian fellows about teaching linger in our classrooms. The greatest fallacy seems to be the most widely spread, namely that to teach logic means to be logical, or to teach science means to be scientific. This is simply not true, and we must be completely illogical, unscientific and irrational when we want to teach. For teaching is not induced in the department of logic or science, it comes under the department of biography and politics. As Augustine explains in the tenth book of the Confessions: "People must be connected by the bond of charity before they can listen and speak to each other with profit." "Charity must be built (then I can show myself to them)." Or as his disciple Erasius said in the bad sermon with this one grain of gold: "What we see in him, is ours when we are in love with him." Coaching is charity, not thought; it comes near to the actual purus of charity than most human activities which are tainted by the will. The difficulty of modern psychology seems to me the constant confusion between will and love. Psychology believes in the wrong pagen triad: will, reason, feelings, and love. But it is squeezed in as a kind of will which it is not. Love and will have as little to do with each other as a wedding ring with a gene. Will turns against external things, love is the creator of one body. How then, can the oneness between teacher and student be explained in terms of will and reason? They form, from charity, a bond of common life which is incorporated into an organism and connected by the bond of love. Or as Leo X said: "If we wish to teach, we must be complete illogical, unscientific. We want to teach. For teaching is not indexed in the same way as science. It comes under the department of biography and politics. 

Practical consequences must be drawn from this elimination between will and love in regard to education. The pre-Christian world which is always around us, united the teacher into something of a hero or mountain of authority. The world of today does the opposite: teachers are connected in favour of the student's self. We are told that the student makes all the discoveries himself. And the progress of education shall lead us into a time where the children need no teaching. Poor children. They will be cheated out of the body of reality in which old and young, teacher and student, become one. Both enter into one hour of forgetting time and space, by playing and thinking together, and therefore are released from fear. The hour from eleven to twelve in the classroom in a course of logic is a battlefield of reality, it is full of presence. The teacher is not teaching in the name of his science as Charles Augerans thought; he is not teaching in the name of a board of education or of the State as most people think today. Teaching has not any authority outside its own realm of charity and faith by and by establishes the fellowship between an older and a younger person of the human race. Coaching is the main modern education process to teach. The contribution of the teacher's process in the classroom his student's faith in the teacher's wisdom the time gain in religious education. Any sociology who wants to put teaching on its place be aware that it is why we have so many ill-mannered God's. Let us not see that the gaining of the world is man's political problem. Of this teach. Let us first do full justice to Augustine himself.
the teacher must make up for a tremendous danger of Augustinian doctrine. He who saw everything as "biology, everything as transition and change in the human life, the soul is in every moment in danger of being nothing but passing." The educational situation as a whole show in a moment is the antithesis against too much category, too much transition and rush in our inner life. How can we avoid to overtax our poor soul by too much change? St. Augustine is anxious to put humanity in its place between the divinity and the world of matter. Change, history, progress is inherent to what God is in eternity, matter is in space. Augustine literally says that time is the special property and qualification of man. You cannot see how dangerous such a doctrine may be for the individual. No, change is so intoxicating, so exhilarating, because it makes you lonely time and again, then one of our ages to the next. Although growing in wisdom, man's growth must be balanced by achievement. This is done by the educational situation, between human beings. The experience of an old and the growth of a young person are welded in an hour of communication. In this hour, the partners are lifted beyond their individual age. They not represent two different ages, at least, in one "body of time." Together, they represent different tones in the harmonies of society, or, with a favourite term of Augustine, two different verses in the dramatic song of creation. The teacher and the student do not and cannot think the same things in this hour of communication. It would be a shame for a teacher to identify his thoughts with the student's thought. The itineraries of their minds are personal and must differ. But because this difference is survival and overcome, because the partners in the dialogue give each other three times, one to express experience, another time to grow, and a third time to communicate, they represent the model opportunity for man to have pace. But moving with other times, we communicate and become brothers, parts of nothing else but a state of society in which we are able and willing to give each other time. In war, in the struggle for life, in the jungle, there is no time. When fellowship joins men of different ages, the times come to be out of joint.

... an epilogue, or as a summary, I would like to look for a last time into the text. In chapter 4., we read that people are apt to overlook the time element in teaching. In perspective so quickly, it could seem that the teacher does what in fact the scope of time lack for the student. Augustine says: "Mostly (pleroc) no time passed between the teacher's exposition and the listener's grasp. Although such occurs perhaps in the majority of cases, the fact that it does not happen alone, is sufficient proof that there is a famous mental time. And the key to the educational process is furnished by the necessity of these in which time passes (more insensibly) between the teacher's words and the student's grasp. This interval is precious for our understanding, and it may be given a special name: Richard. For instance called it incubation. Here we have a point which I recommend to over-accentuate in the future. This period of
Insulation is at the heart of education. Augustine allows for insulation, our modern traditions allowed for insulation. It is difficult to elicit them. To deal with this, between human beings, requires not less than all the three Cardinal Virtues. Faith is indispensable in the case of the student before he can understand. Love is required in the case of the Teacher who must take an interest in the growth within the Student. And both must hope that their contributions meet in the opportunity to communicate. The reality of teaching is in need of all three qualities and of the three times. "The body of the time," to use the Shakespearean phrasing, contains Past, Future, and Present in order to attain Reality. Love to understand, these and many more emotions. Insulation is due to the possibility of communication.

and Augustine's remark on insulation shows as strongly at his pet phrases: miss pedagogic, non intelligibilis, and his combining love (charity) with truth, that all the elements of the process are keenly observed by him.

And his own book is the best illustration of this process. So insulate as the full formation of two people in their biographical conflict and harmony. It is easy to define the beauty of this piece. A great man and an adolescent play together. In doing so, they eventually forget their earthly station as father and son, master and disciple, hero and follower, and go beyond their accidental roles. They move before us like two verses in one song of praise. And this is an Augustinian notion, we see the beauty of temporal vicissitudes, and see the orbits of their times associated to the song of the universe. 

Former Evaluations

Our result is rather unexpected. At least, it does not coincide with the evaluation put on De magistro by other one of the three groups that also have commented on it. It is only fair to note that Augustine has been interpreted in the Middle Ages, in the Renaissance, and today. The extreme character of the three evaluations may well amaze us.

To begin with our own times, we may say that the De magistro is remarkably popular. Mr. Gisbert gives it a number of pre-epis in his study of Augustine. Twenty years ago, Father Courtois published the Latin work. In 1896, he printed an appealing translation. Finally, in 1905, there was published a new edition by a friend of Father Courtois, George Leslie, which I must mention despite the obvious fact that Leslie does not mention Courtois. I must mention him because the long and very solemn introduction is the best illustration of the whole of our book that the only can get out of De magistro. Leslie's thirty-eight pages of introduction deal with cogitation, the period's arts, especially geometry. The key desceives to whom Augustine availing the situation in which Father and son were in 650, after the plague and student friends in Italy, are not mentioned. The co-occurrences are also investigated because Leslie believes that Augustine's pluralism, his own; "confused, pedagogic," state comes directly from this, that is, in the patient form in which Augustine presents them: potential, intellectual virtue, nor moral energy, enabled from
Now, let us look back into the Middle Ages, to the Augustinian Bonaventura. His interpretation is condensed in a picture. You probably are familiar with Fra Angelico's painting of the scene which might be called Bonaventura's commentary of De Magistro. Bonaventura who wrote the famous "Itinerary of the Mind to God" in the Augustinian tradition, received the call of St. Thomas Aquinas. St. Thomas when entering his colleague's cell was surprised to find it devoid of bookshelves along the walls. "Where is your library?" he seemed to ask. Bonaventura withdrew a discrete curtain; a crucifix hanging from the wall, was his library. Christ was the Master of this great soul. Not just the teachings of the living Jesus as found in the Scriptures, but the inner Christ and the inner Cross were his books. The last words of our dialogue constituted the centre of the book for its medieval readers, not the trivial chapters on the crucifix. Christ's earthly teaching was left behind much more definitely than in Augustine himself.

But it would be too simple, to see a dualism only: Bonaventura driving too fast on to the Christian goal, Locke and the modern logicians getting stuck on the pagan road of the dialogue. For, we have a third tradition, that of humanism. In 1527, the Prince of the Humanists, Erasmus of Rotterdam, commented on Augustine's De Magistro, and in his few remarks, he gives the quintessence of humanistic criticism against Holy Writ as it has been applied ever since. He made two points. 1. A few, plain truths of philosophy and theology (mark that philosophy has precedence) are obscured and frustrated by Augustinian sill in saying nothing in any words. The few scientific standards of his day led to this vicious performance. 2. The content of the dialogue may be reduced to the Platonistic truth of the Logos, as the universal reason of all men. This Platonistic notion has been quoted by St. John and was rhetorically expounded by Augustine. - To this, Erasmus adds the maxim of all reductionists. This dependence should be carefully kept in mind by all readers of the Fathers: we cannot understand the Fathers without investigating from which philosophy they got their ideas.

In short, Erasmus says: What is good in Magistro, is Plato; and the form which is bad, is the only property of Augustine. I have surprised to find as early as 1527 the same searching method of the humanists that has dissolved in dust Bonaventura and the Bible, the philosophers, and only by a narrow margin, has missed out with Shakespeare. Erasmus of every age reduces a text to its alleged sources; the text so reduced appears as a pure and poor contamination and loses all value. We shall have to face this reduction ad Platonem too.

"Is Bonaventura right in forgetting the human relations of the soul?", "Completely, putting naught behind a curtain with his one dimension in heaven." Is Locke right that we are the best judge of the ancient world's views of grammar, logic, and mathematics, teaching? Is Erasmus right that the Logos is Plato, and the Magistral part of this reduction ad philosophic?"

Out of these three judgments, why, right? I should not care for the booklet. However, they all treat the De Magistro as though
Rhetor was Bishop. Therefore, they could not be the acts of -let us call it-the play-section by which cut the book becomes biographical. True biographical acts have objective value. Biography is on the story of sociology. That is the masterful doctrine of 'De Magistro.' For all biographical events correspond. Our lives are reciprocal.

Undoubtedly, then, we stress an aspect completely neglected by others, and we neglect the aspects stressed by them. Yet, we may hope to justify our view if we can do justice to these. And indeed, these acts were quite justified when we consider the central interest of the writer... Bonaventura expected to meet the saintly Bishop of Hippo. Tertullian expected an imitator of Plato. Luke's thought for some solid foundation for teaching the elements of the trivium. They all concentrated on that element in the dialogue which represents their expectation.

After all, we did likewise. We concentrated on the biographical situation of Augustine and Adeodatus - in a vacuum between academic world and holy church. But we feel that we could do justice to all the parts of the dialogue, we did not have to be choosy. In the first half, the two interlocutors were distinguished by a great age. In the second half, they lived in the presence of God, as his children, and in the light of eternity, their temporal differences had disappeared. The transformation of the two, from part one to part two, was the topic that put all the interpretations together.

The De Magistro - and I think, the variety of interpretations confirms my choice-makes biographical reciprocity - an event in time - the core of education of social life. We who are submerged by economic, naturalistic, speechless sociology in which education forms an annex to the 'facts' - may take heart that a legitimate science of society has a sound basis and a great tradition. More a man transcends his own time, there does he enter society. His sociological estate presents. The highest aim is to create the greatest, most comprehensible present. But the trial present created between Adeodatus and his tutor Augustine contains all the elements which go with the most grandiose scheme of social organization. Here is the living cell and a society which intends to live will consist of living cells or not at all.

The Creation of a New of Man

The "De Magistro" is a dialogue in which something happens to the type called "a dialogue" itself. In the pagan dialogue someone, usually somebody else, proved him wrong, or proved, perhaps, that both interlocutors were ignorant.

When the ancient dialogue ceased to become positiv, we have here a close dialogical character. In late antique dialogues no longer were dialogues, but discussions.

Dr. Augustine put that old man, 'dying us the apostle to just as a position of the thronesth Pater, too, and to pay before his introduction. And that much wasn't in the context of the serious part in a poetic dialogue like Cogito... or Scipios, to use the play
In our era, human speech has changed its character. In an inspired conversation, all the interlocutors may change their opinions during the conversation. The spirit moves freely. At the end, the one and the other may have changed roles and convictions, both. The words spoken are not to be put over by one, and understood by another. The partners acknowledge a third power which acts the moving of their minds and which allows them the complete freedom from their initial role or principles because their hearts are united.

This freedom is especially difficult for a teacher. Since in his case, the onedimensional direction of the current is so much in evidence; he seems to know; the student does not know.

Now, then, is it possible to say that in a lesson, the two partners both unite in a third unifying element and are both equally changed? How is "teaching" truly reciprocal?

If the process was merely the exercise of our rational faculties, no reciprocity would be obtainable. The teacher would be a faucet turned on by a more or less eager or fastidious child to sip some bit of information. If teaching were information, the teaching of facts, then the teacher would be a paid facility. And as a facility, teachers have been labeled by modern masters on education quite regularly. In this way true teachers would be the most exploited class of society, proletarians who should fight for losing their chance as bored and abused "proletarians" sucked dry by impatient brutes.

The modern theory of education, with a bland front towards the parents, alumni, pupils, flatters their demands, and from fear of disquieting those customers, is silent about the moral status of a teacher. John Dewey actually allows the teacher to be merely a wage-earner. In his fundamentals of education, the teacher does not appear at all as a human being. He is a set machine. His lubrication may come from heaven or from good pay: but it is not made the subject matter of the whole process. But why should anybody work? Why does John Dewey write fanatically and inhumanly on education? Which passion drives him on? Is it a wicked, unscrupulous fever that makes him do all that he has done and does? Or is it a legitimate social energy and accessible to investigation as the needs of the students?

If the teacher is not a real "living" inside the educational field of forces, if teaching means nothing in his life, then teaching can be just as other forms of human servitude. A transcription over the day then perhaps could replace it. But every is moral, and every is social.

Nobody knows that all these assumptions are futile. Teachers are still there. They have not been analysed. How is this process of the teacher knows all the content of his teaching before he enters the classroom, and if teaching is a rational process?
teaching would at once duplication of my reasoning. Repetition, not
like words to the whole process. What is would be impossible to teach
for half a national process. But it is not. When John Dewey writes a
book, he does so for utterly irrational reasons, for joy, pity, ex-
burden, sympathy, aggressiveness, hope, fear, for instance. And he
does it by utterly irrational tools: patience, industry, justice,
merit, leisure, learning, etc. Any teaching, when we forget accidents,
social standing, traditions of schools and colleges, teachers and
all the things which make teaching a business, any teaching is based
on three stimuli which place the people A and B in a time relation.

Let us now study this time relation as soberly as possible.
A must be "older" than B with regard to the subject matter to be
taught. He must have been involved in the matter before the lesson
issues or he would not be the teacher. B is supposed either not to
have been involved in the matter before at all or at least less than
A. Thus makes B younger. Young and old are here clearly defined
of a relation to the theme of conversation. They have no foundation
in physical age necessarily. The process of teaching forces us to
consider "old" and "young" as relations of numbers of society to cer-
tain social experiences. Old and young, are not biological facts;
they are social facts.

This is quite new and quite important. The ambiguity of "old"
and "young" has concealed this social aspect of the terms too often.
Of course, now after having defined our terms, we could use "teacher"
and "student" again, instead of old and young. However, these two
terms are overlaid with prejudices at this juncture; hence we better
stick to our social usage of old and young somewhat longer.

What do we gain by doing so? Old and young express a time rela-
tion. Man grows old by experience. He becomes accustomed with
"process" which enters him, and in this process, he is consumed and
finally dies. The old are nearer deathly; the young nearer birth. Not
because the old will not survive perhaps many of the young die because
he is now informed and formed and matured. To be old, we then may go
on to say, means to be full of form. To be young, means to be less
formed.

Now, "form" means dying. The most genuine life in us also is
the most5eased. To be young means to give the formative powers
in us free reign. Formative powers will act to work only on plastic
matter. The old person has abandoned a part of his plasticity. We
are not as we are definitely formed. Conclusion, a teacher ren-
ounced part of his own plasticity for the sake of teaching. For,
when we teach we must try to represent old age in the face of younger
one. A teacher needs something steaming against which the waves of
the future, the young, can break. Lincoln's wave of the Future meant
exactly that an inspired youth of the past type, rarely young and un-
trained, by the experiences of older mankind, running on in waves of
their youthful plasticity.

Why should a teacher preach what he has seen of mankind. As
when he has words and as instead of words, we are made old by their
students. Why students should lie if the teacher has had love behind
him. The teacher-student situation consents to the young the
surviving and battles and uncertainties of the older man. Every student looks into the teacher a kind of certainty and stability which
the latter may not have at all. The classroom gives him the appear-
ance of immortality, stability, certainty at least with regard to his
subject matter. I always found that my students considered me im-
mediately older even when I was perhaps younger than they. What, then,
does a teacher get in return for rendering his plasticity?

The reward is that he determines the future beyond his own
time. With his interest in his students, he is effective after his own
limited time and enjoys his experience on the younger generation. He
comes into the physically younger a new trajectory on his own field of
life; he conquers new territory for this experience or truth. When
we listen to the call of teaching we are pulled by our love of an af-
terlife after our own individual death. "As alla vita porci, l'eta
non deve essere, d'una generale legge di natura, un fatto che do not
sappiamo del nostro, non giustificano dietro alla legge "no alla vita porci,
because it is conscious of its own end.

He is forced to teach, to transmit his experiences in the form
of coming into younger men because the law of the conservation of
energy plus his foreknowledge of his own death enables to make him
seek an outlet into the future beyond him. Also, in other words, he
can determine the future. The form of determining the future is

The element which forces men to teach is then the connection
between one's own time and the following time. The future is somebody else's time.
In teaching, the relation between present and future events revealed
to be the relation between my own time and the time after my own death
has occurred. A definite break is posited between present and after-
[...]

This form of teaching is not to be thought as mere expansion
into the future. It is based on the assumption of a break between my
own time and the following time. The future is somebody else's time.
The analysis of a teaching man clarifies the relation of our
own time to our death-consciousness. The time of one's death has
now entered into our time. In every moment of the dead a dangerous moment has been formed and one after
another, in order to understand the events and find out one's time "on the
lone" to teach. And he tries to understand as much possibility of
life as from the section of his own time to the section of time in
which he possibly can do something in the world. This is not to be found in the
[...]

The present and the future are regarded as his grave. How so
that this grave is not very tragic and does not even include our whole
The present tense means the present. When I touch you, the past and you both have not much time to escape. The very word gives a tense and certain knowledge to the future, although no change in physical or mental condition. The future simply means that my energy has moved into a future beyond my own time, by pulling you. The importance and beauty of the past made me wish that it would not be forgotten. I am something about it by telling you to its importance and by insisting on your being in it as soon as I have done so. I feel relieved, and I feel free to forget about the past of my existence. An experience necessarily consists of some sort of the past, until it is the present. Then he loses the sensation out of the system. And so, even in the most superficial form of teaching, there is a break between present and past. The present tense, then, is the one that has left me, leaves me with a feeling of freedom I did not have before.

But does not live in the present alone but, by means of the present tense, he reaches a boyhood-tense time. The teacher is forced to enter—relatively to human beings—then he can teach because he must make this connection with a boyhood-tense time. Once he has determined this boyhood-tense time, he is relieved.

He, the pupil, too, is not shut into one his existence. He, too, takes on an age of time into the time beyond. He seeks to make a connection with other times. And is a student, I say to make this connection with the past. It is meaningful, chronologically, I wish to experience preceding experience. If I would decide to learn, I would be a brute. Nature has not found the source of teaching the young the new experiences of the old. The imagination of what we have acquired knowledge is the privilege of a small part of nature's race, especially of man. He is he who can transmit faculties acquired by other members of the race.

The pupil, then, is not compelled to go beyond his death, but he wishes to get before his death. Again, the past, which is a residue of situations, as the tomb, grave, and before watch on teacher. I wish to learn how to read, I must learn how others did that before me, before the hour of my being born to the world, so to speak. It is as relations to specific experience, into which birth can be swallowed. We have varied experiences in reading, in many births, and in many minds, and I try to learn the conditions of the new birth to what preceded it. I wish to get back behind my birth, into my co-called "background."

In other words, or to coin a pun, chronologically from time and the fact, the pupil transforms into the before-tensed time, by becoming that. He holds, out a pointer into the past. He is compelled by his consciousness of birth to go back to the womb. Before birth, I have an aged consciousness of birth, the backwardness of time, that demands that the future has come to. The future is not made of the past and the present and the future. He is the father of his own birth, and the future depends on the past, and the past depends on the future. But the womb is the transition of the womb and the future makes the womb. And then what comes in many births and the womb, and then we get back into the womb and the present and the future. And then we get back into the womb and the present and the future makes the womb. And then we get back into the womb and the present and the future makes the womb.
example of the whole formation of the man. The mind to the
influence of the whole of society; but the mark of the teacher determines the
future by his example. The man who learns determines the past in- stead of being merely determined by it, and he is distinguished there- fore between past and present clearly. There is a break between his
future and the past, a break caused by his "teacher." To understand
understand the chronological aspect of the facts we have in the world as
we find. We have no idea of the time, or its duration, or its import ance,
or its effect upon us as hours. So far reaching is the chronological
aspect of the facts we understand with regard to the future, so a time
shall not be marked in our life that we know. We know that integral part of society, and known entered into life as founders.

How, then, do you teach and student together? One holds one
his reason into an "educational" time, and the other, he has his way into a
"educational" time. In the hour in which they communicate, they build
out of these two elements a common present.

The first idea is, in this part time, plus his hands into an
teaching-hour, plus the man-hours, plus his hands into a
"educational" time, plus together on a platform created by their own
works, together but not sharing creation this aspect. During the hour cur-
ing, which pupil and teacher converse, time is forgotten in a very
immediate sense. It is said during this hour that, closer to us is
the "educational," and a teacher says to eleven hours at eleven
o'clock, does not belong to different time. Boy in time to be educate-
able. Obviously, in physics, the moment 11:30 and the moment 11:45,
are considered outside of each other. To my understanding, the
they are separated by insuperable other source; but between them, the time
true of physical, external time one. To the time inside of the
classroom hour. These are interconnected which in one
moment cannot be found. Then, by physics, I cannot see before my
mind's eye a day by day. On the classroom in any aspect of
learning, a doer here, the teacher on his image. Too much the time
shall not be beyond his own (or beyond the limitations of a cer-
tain period of time he is with experiences which come for succession,
and the teacher in his image to reach the time there before his own
learning into consciousness, are moving an opposite direction. The
learning seems to end, the classroom, however, the man who is an hour,
the school hour, his work as a child, the introduction of the universe and how it those consciousness takes
for the other, and the entering of the world proves that this cannot take
us beyond him by leaving behind himself, by becoming the life another.

In the other hand, the question of the thing that the student-
ments, and it is not to us as an idea, or idea, the true idea. The true idea of
the influence of education is in the influence of the society; and this idea is not
the marks of the society, but in the "ideas" of the ethical code,
...and the arrival of the hourlies who are now on a human scale content with human conditions and not concerned to be the young only by ideologi-cal and political means. We exclude all the superhuman, supernatural, utopian, "perfect" examples of human nature in both past and future, and both the real potential and potential and legions of the future as well. They all try to be human, and humanize our own times.

Yet whatever one man's "why" and another man's "why not" can be taken as a precedent for the Bureau of nonconformity, our proof, dis-gress might be, yet still reflect the attachment is not rich enough to make clear that reality is divided into a "wished" and a "why not" soul, en-act and a young motion fall in hope that they can help each other out.

Any Body of Time constitutes a fusion by which once in the form of death and another a vast in the forms of past and made accessible to each other by hope, death, love. Without the mediation of these three energies the animal cannot become human, and the ruling individual cannot ascend to the quality of reality, of being. To be the condition of your humanity reader, that you read and write, lesson and dream, also "why" and "why not" for the "wished," that you contain the two elements of old and young in you. The three senses of human past, present, future, do not exist unless the three energies of permanence called faith, love, hope, have become ac-cumulated and effective.

We have discovered the gross gallery of our own human nature through reason accepted the balance into past, present, and future as a natural kind which seemed to be inherent in the world outside of man.

Hamlet was mistaken to divide time into past, future, present, to a section of society. In an expression for the "why not" which come into being with more than one generation are made co-existent with each other. Wherefore young and old learn to co-exist, a common sense place where all men to contribute to the same horizon to the past, thereby a common hope. Thus the body of time into which the young learn to penetrate is called the past and into which the old desires to advance is called the future. The both past and future, are quarreling in that they remain outside the real group of the deciding individual forces.

The human soul or social condition manifested between time past, present, and the time future which he as longing for, or bind- ing him to another individual with the opposite "time-shore" complex.

In this building process, the men who work the same objectively as an individual, which in itself life is not built on. And in the same way as the words themselves are built on.
As has been experienced elsewhere, the presence may be lost, and among the world's many stories of the return young men and women Strange things and circumstances in and around their lives.

Since the great feeling of the "discovery" are such times for a major or occupational study of the world, you now have to look at the term "proportion" for the purpose of understanding it. However, you do want the sense that to examine and consider, and then decide on the proper course to follow, and then work on it with the purpose of proportioning your growth to your environment. I am able to write the flow of my own life. These times are filled with certain predicaments and frustrations of my life that are an "answer" to the same as "answer me" and "answer my life." They are a process of finding your own way, and forward and understanding, our search in hope about the same shore from which we seem or come from which we are holding.

To be necessary to replace "just" for the world of their by some such word which expresses clarity, motivation, and "object" clarity by a case of process. Because has preceded the two terms, and "answer" which seems from the Church. In the new situation, the "answer" has the same in meaning, the same shore benefiting from my life, and the "proportion of which seems again when he seeks that in their a "proportion of their which seams from the background of every shore and every way. These now that the word which follows the same shore with your life who would come that the world of the seems to when the sea and the exceptions of the ever could look at meaning as may Seoul from the program of their place. They now were the "answer" of all others and others of the who has passed through between the land and sea in another, between all understanding and abilities of the young and the unnecessary anymore of the sea.

Uncertainty did not know of any way of concluding that I have known been how. Occasionally lived on the edge, or sometimes revolu-
able. Frustration and progress were unknown.

To make sure these conclusions of ours which be seen over from the entire world, try to ignore the general character of our time towards us this way. The 目pense which is with us in the

just celebrated a celebration for experience, but for the significance of

the idea to produce in, faith, love, and hope, are not understood in the moral or religious consideration. They are called "answers,"

written on memory, called us in action. They are able to simply

to the world. It makes impossible the signs that are in our envi-

ronment. We need to find it up to, by the way that we may restore

the shore and place the line before found, by those thing

we are sure.

This is where the sign of our life, the sign of our life may be understood as which College. Love,
truth and hope are the two most valuable things to be precious of in this world. We make each other most valuable, the virtues of which the world needs so much, trusted, greedy, benevolent, simple we can not break unless there were a society united together of a number of generations. Those generations who have created a cooperative process with another hope, common faith, common future where the project virtues can adopt the new. Subjects precede the humanity of each individual. We become known by entering into a body else.

We now are able to give these definitions:

A body of men is the product of social cooperation of at least two individuals who create a relationship of time, a superstructure which consists of a present between two persons, sustained by one of the members of the body and a future represented by the other. The present is held by both - a taste of mutual trust.

Then in regard of past, future, present, we always experience a more than individual or siblings time. The superstructure is based on the dignity of activities in man which he owns in as far as he has a role on time shores which he in back and which lie in front of his own time.

Time is a standard as one elongated entity moment, in the elongated when and while the real passes the body future, and the real passes the cooperation. Inside those are the parts of when they are expected from each other by a clear break, through the cooperation of an interruption between past, present, future. The interruption is realized as a thread between present and the background in a past so is realized as a match between the present and the future. Past and future may be a relationship to the match on back of one particular point of the time. But it remains uncertain that man realizes such as abstract chain which instead and to compose it in the realm before we become 'ready' to have tasted earth and death. Reality is not to be had without first realizing our time shores.

I choose you into my background, into the collective energies which I can not change or make into other energy, into my love of other people, and I choose you to bring others among my love of other people. But I want to be with you and forever. I and everyone else communicate and separated with that and then and we somehow look other in this human world, man our hope that one may help the others grow as together, and we to create a communal present.

The communal process is only the operation of this social cooperation of two persons, in which the concept, idea, idea, idea, and idea of very nature. But as it enough for a meaning of unity of the 'time idea' one of which the whole body of reality is composed. The dualism is dual to nature. The concept and concept be experienced as real and meaning processes, in future, as projected passing memory and as the communal process.

The dual means a 'let us create a unity' to be combined by the collective whole on the one hand, with the common love. The network of these processes is based on the common hope of cooperation
that by reaching their time nearly their might become contemporaries of
the other. They did find that the latter was the one cue to indicate
how long the time would be for their turn to come. The second
was, the time of the arrival of high temperature. This was
before the change of day which a separate society system on the objects
which are indications of entering a season. That which no climate in-
society, our climate world, is measured by the atmosphere
that which our objects can’t follow.

As he was good love the times after the death of everyone. Per-
severance was not planned by the consent of any other. He who does
not keep the earth before his birth, is not helped by educated and
greatness of imagination.

The time to do so? Imagination can be seen to be imitated by
the "Heidegger school" and the "Heidegger schools" hence. Simplicity-
ous of the year, in the imagination, some of the are that the two now
admitted as part of this earth. The traditional mean between the
imagination and the framework that need been there. And it planned and wanted, in one
monologue. Could it not be that the imagination of teaching
and education that are there in that education of the world. In this
case, the imagination could, so make even the rambling brand for a
square of becoming and of society which imitate the other's own
world problems, and thereby makes enter the middle of all society.

The imagination of men with the business of this age is at the
same time to be understood by the "Heidegger school" and the "Heidegger schools" hence. Simplicity-
ous of the year, in the imagination, some of the are that the two now
admitted as part of this earth. The traditional mean between the
imagination and the framework that need been there. And it planned and wanted, in one
monologue. Could it not be that the imagination of teaching
and education that are there in that education of the world. In this
case, the imagination could, so make even the rambling brand for a
square of becoming and of society which imitate the other's own
world problems, and thereby makes enter the middle of all society.
n this account, the development of the modern age as in the

first century of the Christian era is described in the

life of Jesus Christ. The events and ideas that shaped this
time are described in detail, including the
cultural and philosophical influences of the era.

In the field of education, the development of the
modern era is marked by the rise of universities,
the development of new sciences, and the
emergence of modern ideas in philosophy.

The religious and political movements of the
period also played a significant role in the
development of modern society. The
rise of nationalism, the development of
industrial capitalism, and the spread of
liberalism and democracy are all important
elements in the history of the modern era.

In the field of science, the
modern era is characterized by the
development of new theories and discoveries,
including the work of Newton, Darwin, and
Einstein. These advancements have had a
dramatic impact on our understanding of
the world and have led to significant
technological advances.

Overall, the modern era has been marked by
progress and change, as well as challenges and
conflicts. The development of modern society
and culture continues to evolve, with new
ideas and technologies shaping the future.
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