

and drink that, that God intends for its food; it can have no life in it. *Eating* and *drinking* is the process whereby foreign substances are brought into a state and position where they can be transformed into the nature, the needs, and the life of the body.

Except the *soul* eat and drink it can have no life in it. Eating and drinking represents the process by which that that God intends for the soul's food is transformed into its nature, its needs, its life.

So with the mind Except *it* eat and drink, transform to its very nature, appropriate to its very being, according to its needs, it can have *no life in it*. Eating and drinking is the first step and consequently represents the process of assimilation. And assimilation is the law of life everywhere.

The mind should not act like a sponge that takes in water and ejects it again the same, or discolored by its own impurities; but should act like the amodipeba that takes in foreign particles, transforms them to its own nature, and builds up its own little being, or, like the human body itself. The mind has been called a storehouse of knowledge. It is no more a storehouse than the body is. It is something *more*.

If we are through marvelling how the mind can eat and drink, let us not turn away like some of old, but see how we can apply this process, experimentally, in our Bible Class work. The best way to induce the mind to appropriate anything and make it its own is to demand of that mind a *reproduction*, of the thing. If it can reproduce a thing, that thing has been eaten, digested, assimilated, appropriated, and has been a *part* of the mind. Acting on this theory I ask each one in my class to condense, in a sentence or two of their own, the substance or the leading thought, of the lesson. If they do this, I know that they have not simply studied at the lesson, but that they have mentally eaten and

drank the lesson. It has been, as was promised, *life* to the mind.

I have dwelt on this first hint almost too long to introduce any more. I did so because I felt it was vitally important, and perhaps new to some. I shall but briefly touch upon one or two others. Shall we teach *doctrine*? A great many say, no. It is apt to lead into unprofitable discussions, so they skip all the deeper things in the lesson. It is said of commentators that they explain the easy points, and pass over all the difficult ones. I do not believe in this method nor do I practise it. If there are any dark places in the lesson they are the very ones I pick out, that by directing the aggregate light of the differently constituted and experienced minds of the class into them we might see what there *is* there. A half dozen candles may lighten a dark corner where one cannot penetrate. I fancy the cry against teaching doctrine comes from our timidity. We are afraid our principles will not stand the test. Let us try them. If they will not the sooner they fall the better. *Whatever* they are let them not make cowards of us. But we need not be alarmed. I believe, and the more I see them come in contact with the world the *more* I believe it, that our principles are founded on the everlasting, indestructible truth.

I think moreover that teaching doctrine is not only our *right* but our *duty*. If we refuse to instil unceasingly into the minds of the members of our class the doctrine of the Inner Light, the principle for which our beloved society was called into existence to promulgate before the world, if we insist on shutting this doctrine out, I believe our F. D. Schools would become dead, and our Society itself would die. And this is the *only* doctrine I know of belonging to Quakerism. If any one believes that God communicated by immediate revelation, and *obeys* whatsoever is thus revealed to his soul, it is all that I, and I believe all that Quakerism asks.