

is not the case with the spiritual process of learning. The waste process and the restoration process do not belong to the spiritual process. The biological analogy does not hold good except so far as to indicate that the raw material of knowledge is assimilated to the body of knowledge already in possession. What is new is explained by what is old and the old store receives an accession or supplement from the newly assimilated knowledge.

In the case of new knowledge the old knowledge is not destroyed. But there is an assent on the part of the mind to a new unity or aggregate which contains the old explained in part by the new and the new explained in part by the old. The explanation is clearer and gives us more insight. When we study this carefully we see that the including totality which contains the old and the new reveals a deeper principle of causality than the principle which organized the old knowledge. Hence the new principle is better able to explain what we already knew before by reason of the fact that we explain with this principle both the old and the new. Hence instead of a waste of matter which needs the addition of new matter to restore the loss we have to admit that the matter of the old knowledge as well as the matter of the new knowledge is better explained than it was before the act of apperception. Hence there is less waste of the material of knowledge. There were some phases of the old knowledge which were not so well explained or understood before as after the act of apperception, hence in apperception considered as mental digestion there is not only no

waste but a considerable change of what was superfluous and unorganized matter of knowledge into more thoroughly organized and digested matter. The spiritual digests without waste and hence it is not a process of restoration like the biological process.

All figurative language may stimulate the first stages of apprehension but it retards the final stages of apprehension. The symbolic knowing has always in it this defect. Starting with the idea that sense-perception has its analogy in the seizing of facts and following up the analogy with the supposition that apperception has an analogy to digestion, this biological view may go on to assume further steps of analogy which do not aid psychology, but on the contrary, mislead the student. For example, the particles of food that have been converted into animal or vegetable cells by the plant or animal are preserved in the organism for a time as occupying space and as mutually excluding. This affords a materialistic conception of stored up facts in the mind. But the act of mental assimilation does not leave the fact as a space occupying cell; it explains it as an act of causality which has produced it, and a million products of a causality would not occupy any more space than a single fact. The mind in the apperception process slips over to the thought of the producing energy and drops out all of the dead results as summed up in one class-word, a common noun or general name. The process is capable of producing an infinite number of dead results.

The student who is beginning his study of botany takes some particular plant and commences its