

CT 154

THE TENDENCIES

OF

MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.

BY THE LATE

REV. JAMES CRANBROOK,

EDINBURGH.



PUBLISHED BY THOMAS SCOTT,

MOUNT PLEASANT, RAMSGATE.

Price Threepence.

THE UNIVERSITY OF

THE UNIVERSITY OF



LIBRARY

THE TENDENCIES
OF
MODERN RELIGIOUS THOUGHT.*

THERE can be no question, I suppose, that there is a much more demonstrative and widely spread earnestness in matters of religion than there was some thirty years ago. In the more early part of the century, the great wave of religious excitement which had thrown up on its surface the Methodists, had begun to retire, and the usual apathy and indifference had succeeded amongst the masses, whilst routine and formalism had taken possession of the sects it had called forth. Here and there spasmodic efforts were made to get up revivals; but they all failed, and what the evangelicals called the Laodicean state seemed all but universal. I say seemed, because I by no means suppose that the want of a demonstration which attracts attention and makes a great deal of fussy noise is a real indication of a want of earnestness; and, as a matter of fact, we know that whilst this outward coldness prevailed there was a number of thoughtful minds pursuing their course very

* This discourse was delivered by the late Mr. Cranbrook, in the Hopetoun Rooms, Edinburgh, on the evening of Sunday, February 24, 1868,—one year after he had resigned connection with the Independent Church. This explains the references in the concluding paragraphs, which were specially addressed to those of his audience who had left the church along with him.

earnestly, and to whose quiet, unostentatious labours we owe very much of the greater zeal which characterises the present day. It was about the year 1830 that the first signs of a revived earnestness began to manifest themselves. A number of scholars connected with the University of Oxford became alarmed at the wide-spread influence of Dissent, and the prevalence of Latitudinarian views within the Church of England. They united together to stem and stop the adverse current. They began to preach Christ, and in every way within their power to propagate high-church doctrines. Their teaching awakened antagonism in the evangelical party within their church. It aroused the opposition and indignation of the Dissenters, who resented the denial that was given to the efficacy of their sacraments, the ministerial character of their pastors, and their right to be regarded as a part of the Christian Church. The controversy called forth the attention of the outer world. Statesmen, merchants, tradesmen paused in the middle of their secular affairs to listen to the ecclesiastical din. The working classes looked on sometimes with a sullen indifference and sometimes with an intelligent contempt. The questions debated became more and more vital. Philosophers and men of science began to mingle in the fray. The controversy passed from the learned halls of Oxford, and the pulpits of Evangelical clergymen and Dissenting ministers, from religious newspapers, magazines, and tracts, to the sphere of general society and the current literature of the day. We are now living in the midst of it, but, I expect, shall scarcely live long enough to see its close.

I have spoken of these manifestations of earnest religious life as a controversy. They are so, inasmuch as they assume the form of discussion, proof and counter-proof, antagonism of thought and feeling, divines railing against their brother divines, and churches pitted against each other and divided in their own midst. Yet the word controversy is insufficient,

defective, and unable to express the true character of this great religious activity. For it affects the whole life of men; brings out their deepest, inmost thoughts and feelings—nay, is the coming out of their inmost thoughts and feelings; is the striving of man in this our day to adjust his life, himself, to the great facts of the universe revealed to him. It was not the desire of Drs. Pusey, Newman, and the other Oxford men to save their church which truly gave rise to it. That was only an accidental, though most marked expression of it under a form determined by special circumstances. The real causes lay much deeper and were more general. Nor is it the mere rivalries of sects and parties which keep it alive. Its abiding cause must be sought in the midst of the great changes which the last few centuries have been producing in society itself.

And I have no hesitation in saying that cause consists almost entirely in the most wonderful progress which has been made in physical science. Through all the history of thought you will find that physical science in past times exerted scarcely any influence in determining any of the great questions of life. Philosophy, comprehending within itself theology, was the sole mistress of the human mind. And the philosophy I mean was metaphysical, at the best psychological. The physical sciences were deemed poor, despised, beggarly elements, informing one of nothing but a few facts relating to dead and inert matter. Those who cultivated them were esteemed as poor in spirit as were the sciences in their subjects. No one cared to listen to them; no one honoured them. If a man succeeded in making any great discoveries which gave him a control over any of the forces of nature, so much the worse for him; he did it, not by research but by converse with the evil one, and he might bless his fate if he had not to answer before an ecclesiastical tribunal the charge of dealing with the black arts. Within the last few centuries

only has a change come over men's notions in this respect. By slow degrees at first, science won for itself a hearing, then inquiry, then respect; within the last hundred years it has made rapid progress, and at last within our own day has obtained a position which enables it to assert an equality to, if not a superiority over, the philosophy which so long kept it in the shade.

Now, this science affects modern thought in two ways:—1st. By its actual discoveries it puts facts into antagonism with many old and cherished opinions, compelling those who are of a truth-loving nature to give them up, and thus causes their whole system of opinion to be shaken. Such, *e.g.*, are the facts of astronomy and geology, which no one can reconcile with the explicit statements of the Bible; the facts of ethnology and philology, to say nothing of criticism and history. Now these facts, established by science, coming into direct collision with the long cherished notions, compel men to re-examine and seek to re-adjust their whole system of which these notions are a part; and the process of re-adjustment occasions the agitation and earnestness of religious life in the present day.

But I have mentioned what I consider the weakest influence of the physical sciences first; the second is much more powerful, *i.e.*, the method which physical science pursues is directly opposed to the method of the old philosophies with their theologies, and so far as it prevails over the mind, must necessarily tend to weaken the conclusions derived through their method. The method of the old philosophies was subjective; the method of physical science is objective. The method of the first made clearness and consistency of ideas the test of truth; the method of the second depends entirely upon verification. Philosophy dares to comprehend heaven as well as earth, the infinite as well as the finite, within the range of its knowledge; science modestly confines itself to the pheno-

menal, and denies the possibility of all knowledge beyond the sphere of experience. Now, I must not stay to explain in full the antagonism thus created between the older way of investigating truth and the new; but you will all readily see how this scientific method goes to the very roots of the long-cherished philosophies and theologies and destroys them—scatters all their beautiful ideas woven by fancy and born of tender feelings; challenges to the proof of their claims sentiments, opinions, and doctrines which had been held as the most sacred verities.

And this antagonism, be it observed, is by no means confined to religious questions, it pervades the whole life. The scientific method is striving to bring every thing under its control—politics, morals, government in the family, education, all that comes under the cognizance of man. That controversy, *e.g.*, just now agitated respecting the relations of science and the study of the classical languages to education is one form which it is taking. But, at this time, we must confine ourselves to religious aspects.

Now, it seems to me, in looking attentively upon the manifestations of this newly-awakened religious life, with its controversies and divisions, that there are two, or perhaps I may say three, distinct tendencies clearly in action which will necessarily determine the future; and if we can accurately ascertain these tendencies we shall go far to foresee that future, as well as to comprehend the present. I shall mention them successively:—

The first is a tendency which is purely and uncompromisingly conservative. It falls back upon ancient prestige and refuses to yield one iota to modern innovations and methods. It finds its embodiment in the Roman Catholic Church. The tendency is seen in active operation all over the continent as well as in England, and, if I am not forgetting, the re-action which indicates its energy began in

France before it was inaugurated at Oxford. Speaking, however, just now only of this country, the number of conversions made within the last thirty years to Roman Catholicism sufficiently proves to the observer its strength. For, we must recollect whilst a great number of the working classes (and of those a large proportion was educated in Scotch Presbyterianism) have gone over to that Church, there have also been converts made from the ranks of men of great literary attainments and position, and of acute, cultured, logical minds. And the tide is swelling instead of diminishing, and I believe will go on swelling for very many years to come. Amongst other evidences of it I might quote the great height to which the High Church and ritualistic movement in the Church of England has come. It is originated by precisely the same cause, and is in precisely the same direction; and merely seems to differ because accidental limitations restrain an advance into the Roman Catholic Church. I shall have to refer to this again; but assuming the identity of tendency which carries some into the extremes of High Church doctrine and ritualism, and some others on into Roman Catholicism, we cannot but recognise the great strength of the tendency operating in all classes alike and proved by the numbers borne along by it.

But now, what is the meaning of this tendency, its soul, its real significance? It is easy to sneer and put it all down to the love of millinery and parade, childish pomp and glare, as many do; and to denounce it all as hypocrisy and a love of priestly power, as many of the evangelicals do; but it is nothing of the kind. Doubtlessly some are brought into sympathy with it through their æsthetical tastes. They cannot believe that the eternal God who has made this world so beautiful and full of delight is or can properly be worshipped where the senses bear no part, and everything which is beautiful and grand in its sensuous effects is excluded. They turn, there-

fore, with weariness from the cold, bare, abominably ugly forms of the old Protestant worship to that which, by the sweet perfumes of its incense, the rich harmonies of its sublime old ecclesiastical tunes and music, and by the gorgeousness of its ceremonial satisfies the cravings of the taste, and reveals the divineness of sense to the soul. And in thus turning to what meets real wants of their nature, no one can say that they are wrong. The taste for art is re-awakened everywhere, and it would be strange if it did not show itself under religious forms as well as others, since art has always been allied with religion. It is true that with much that is beautiful a great deal which is absurd (to us) is mixed up in the Roman Catholic forms; but the earnest mind gets the knack of disregarding the absurd and of resting with joy in the beautiful. Whether as the æsthetical tastes of the country become more thoroughly developed and cultivated something truer and more real than the Roman Catholic forms will not be required, is a question I cannot now stay to discuss. But, at present, I can have no doubt that the æsthetical culture which has re-awakened the love of Art in this country is bearing many along the path which leads to Roman Catholic forms of worship.

Strong as this influence is, however, it is not the principal one which is causing the great conservative religious reaction. There is one which is affecting the most earnest minds more powerfully still. I mean the longing after *intellectual certainty and rest* in those great questions which relate to God, the soul, and eternity. The rise of the scientific spirit and method having, as we have seen, undermined the ground upon which men had rested their theological beliefs, has compelled them to seek a more solid basis. Many a one discovers that, after years of search, no such solid basis is to be found, excepting in an absolute submission of the intellect to divinely inspired living authority, such as is presented only in

the Roman Catholic Church. The attempt to make the Bible such a basis entirely fails them, as it must fail every one of logical and analytical habits of thought. The evidences of its divine inspiration are too imperfect to deceive persons of such habits. And then the process of interpretation is too uncertain to meet their wants. They are therefore shut up to the alternative of renouncing all hope of obtaining a basis for absolute beliefs, or of submitting their intellect to the only church which pretends to have authority from God to teach absolute, positive truth. Several conditions determine them in embracing the latter alternative. 1st. The assumption that absolute certainty is necessary, and that God in himself, the soul and its eternal destiny must be known. You will find this most impressively illustrated in that strangely painful and instructive book published a few years since, the "Apologia pro Vita sua," by Dr Newman. You there learn, that in the very beginning of his career he started with the supposition that absolute certainty in such solemn questions is essential to the soul's salvation, and that this supposition inspired his inquiries to the end. At first he thought he would find it in the Bible, but increasing knowledge and the development of his reasoning faculties undeceived him, and enabled him to see that certainty is not to be had there. He then turned to the Anglican church and hoped to discover in it a divine authority which would meet his wants. But the assaults of his opponents from the evangelical side drove him back from one position to another, until he found himself contending for principles which demanded an unqualified surrender to the claims of Roman Catholicism. His was too honest, too noble, too logical a mind not to make the surrender. A few sentences have summed up his autobiography; but it was a long process of heroic struggle, of agonizing doubts and difficulties, of ardent efforts and aspiration, towards the highest object that can

call forth the desires of man. No nobler, because no more truth-loving soul of man has revealed itself to us in this generation than is revealed in that book, sacrificing itself to the conclusions of an irresistible logic and abandoning all the fruits of its culture and all the advantages of outward position because absolute certainty of faith can only be had upon such terms. And Dr Newman represents a whole class of minds which have gone through, or are going through, a similar experience. They cry for certainty, and it is nowhere offered to them with any show of consistency, excepting in connection with dogmas which often at first horrify them—transubstantiation, the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and such like. But in proportion to the intensity of the cry, and the logical consistency of their minds, will they be compelled to modify their horror, and accept of the only conditions upon which they can possibly find the rest they seek.

But this is not all. There is another influence besides this longing after intellectual certainty which is leading men in the same direction. What I have been saying applies for the most part only to the most thoughtful minds; what I now refer to applies rather to those of a deep emotional nature. I mean the sense of sin as a something not belonging to one, but which has yet taken possession of one's life, for which an account must be given, and punishment endured, unless pardon can be obtained from God. It is true that this sense of sin is founded upon very vague notions, but in some meditative religious natures, it becomes the deepest and strongest passion of the soul. Consequently all churches attempt to deal with it, and to find for their disciples terms of forgiveness. The protestant churches, by the necessity of their theological principles, can only offer terms which are purely subjective. To be delivered from sin you must come into the condition of faith. But how am I, wrestling, groaning, agonizing under the

sense of my sin, to know whether I have come into this condition? By certain signs and marks which it requires an analytical process of the intellect to ascertain; or by certain feelings of assurance which can only arise when the internal struggles are over, and having no authority but their own existence, may to many appear all delusions and snares of the devil. Both processes are purely subjective and can only satisfy the mind in a certain stage of its culture. But the tendency to objective thought, superinduced by the influence of physical science, is drawing the mind out of, and beyond this stage; and consequently is leaving the protestant churches without the means of appeasing this sense of sin. In its deep agony of remorse and fear, therefore, the sin-conscious soul is turning to the Roman Catholic church, which claims to have received authority from its divine head to forgive sins upon earth. Not by a subjective process impossible to the sorrow-stricken soul, but by a solemn declaration pronounced by the priest in the name of his God, that church sends home its penitents cleansed, forgiven, and in peace.

And thus we see, that two most powerful cravings of human nature are sustaining and intensifying daily the tendency which is leading people to Roman Catholicism, namely the cravings for rest and peace to both the intellect and the conscience. The one craving characterises the more masculine minds, the other the more feminine; but both alike lead to the one result, and swell that great conservative religious-reaction which is one of the greatest tendencies and characteristics of the present day.

The second tendency at work in society which we have to notice, is carrying people in quite the opposite direction, and seems to prognosticate a complete revolution in religious thought and feeling. It originates in those influences of the physical sciences and the method they have introduced to which I have

already referred. By rigidly insisting that every hypothesis, every belief, shall be brought to the test of fact, and that nothing shall be received as a part of our knowledge which has not been verified, it necessarily excludes a large portion of theological dogmas from the field even of our enquiries and places the rest upon a basis that gives them a character in which they are scarcely recognised as the same. In other words, it limits our knowledge to the phenomenal, and pronounces all which lies beyond to be nothing but the object of a vague faith and altogether uncertain.

The first form in which this tendency of thought reveals itself in connection with religion is generally in the questioning and the renouncing the validity of the christian evidences. Employing its method of rigid proof in the construction of the rules of historical criticism, and applying them to the evidences it pronounces them to be purely fabulous and untrustworthy; and thus, at one stroke, overthrows the whole system of christianity and leaves those needing a religion to find for it some other base.

But it does not rest even here. It must not be concealed that the scientific method re-opens the whole question concerning the divine existence, and necessitates the grounding of one's faith upon some other reasons than those which sufficed men in former days. It would be presumptuous in any one to say that the devout recognition of a personal God is impossible to those thoroughly imbued with the scientific method, and when one who is so great an exponent of it, and possesses so acute a mind as J. S. Mill, has seemed to pronounce the Argument from Design conclusive; but most certainly if we cannot transcend phenomena and have no knowledge beyond that acquired by our experience, that recognition of God is founded upon something which is distinct from knowledge and can never become absolutely certain. Accordingly it must be owned that a large number

of those who follow this method set aside the divine existence as a question lying altogether beyond the reach of their faculties. They do not deny it; but they say they cannot affirm it. They are not atheists, but they are intellectual sceptics, whilst on the other hand those of them who still cling to the belief in God, justify their position in tones which indicate they feel that their conclusions are not final. I hope to show you in the course of lectures I shall commence next Sunday night some real grounds for this recognition; but to-night I am merely the historian, and indicate what is passing around us.

Now that this scientific and revolutionary tendency in matters of religion is already strong and powerful, no one who knows anything of what is passing around him will deny. That it will become stronger and more powerful there are abundant reasons to lead us to conclude. Evidently science is only just beginning its successful career. We are only on the threshold of its discoveries and its triumphs. As it progresses it will take firmer hold of society and bring more and more of the people under the influence of its spirit. As people are brought under the influence of its spirit they will apply its methods to all the spheres of their thought. And thus religion itself must come more and more under its control.

There are then two great tendencies at work in modern society leading to the consolidation of two great parties. The one is conservative and finds its full embodiment in the Roman Catholic church. The other is revolutionary, and finds its representatives in the Comtists, the Positivists, the men of scientific pursuits and studies, and all those who make experience the only source of their knowledge. The first demands the submission of your intellect; the second offers you proofs. The watchword of the first is, Authority; the watchword of the second is, Verification.

But now, between these two parties lying on the extreme right and the extreme left, there is another, scarcely the embodiment of a tendency, but the representative of a struggle—the party of compromise that organises itself into the protestant churches. Ever since the rise of protestantism its churches have represented the spirit of compromise. Renouncing the authority of the Roman Catholic church, they have endeavoured to establish an authority of their own. Conceding the right of private or individual judgment, they have restricted its exercise by anathematising those who did not affirm the orthodox conclusions. The living energies of thought which gave rise to protestantism have never long found shelter within the pale of its churches, but have from time to time been cast out as heretical and dangerous. These living energies have never served any good purpose within the churches but to create schisms, which when created generally leave those cast out to settle down as compromising and dogmatic as the churches they have left. In the meanwhile the men of real living thought withdraw outside the churches and look on with indifference or scorning.

In the revived religious life sprung up of late years, these churches have been true to themselves. To recede to the old ground of Roman Catholicism would be too humiliating after three centuries of schism. To advance upon the free, scientific ground, would be their utter destruction. So they attempt a compromise. This attempt is openly avowed by the more courageous and advanced (so called) Broad Church party; but not less is it made by others. Their chief difficulty is in dealing with scripture, and reconciling not only its historical and scientific facts, but its dogmas and morals with modern knowledge. The strictly evangelical sections endeavour to get over the difficulty by a disingenuous system of interpretation, in which, through a juggle of words, they would fain make it appear that all along the teaching

of scripture has anticipated modern discoveries and methods of thought. The Broad Church section distinctly owns that the science and history of the Bible are inaccurate ; and that it is only the religious ideas which can be deemed inspired. But with this inspiration of religious ideas they associate the stupendous dogma of the incarnation, and thus necessitate the belief in a miracle which is the most repulsive and incredible to be found in the whole Bible. And what makes the position of this party the more untenable is that they endeavour to sustain it, not upon the ground of objective proof, but by appeals to sympathies and subjective religious experiences. The criticism which they boldly apply to the historical and scientific facts of the Bible they lay aside when they come to deal with its religious and moral ideas ; and thus by an abandonment of the outworks of the old system of belief, they hope to retain the citadel. The hope, however, is fallacious. The system of Christianity is one complete whole ; it was the growth of many centuries, consolidated and established under special conditions and forms of thought, which gave a complete unity to its doctrines and facts, its theology and history. No one can separate the one part from the other, without the destruction of the authority of both. The Broad Church party is, in consequence, the weakest amongst all the parties into which the Protestant churches are divided. They are impotent against the evangelicals, because they dare not deny the incarnation and the supernatural authority of Christ ; they are impotent against the sceptics, because they dare not affirm the accuracy of the historical and scientific facts. Their existence can only last for a day.

But, indeed, that must be the fate of all parties participating in this compromising spirit, whether they carry it out boldly or timidly, consciously or unconsciously. Eclecticism is only the refuge of weaker minds that dare not adventure themselves

upon the consequences of principles. It is tolerated only so long as the period of indecision lasts. Whilst controversy is raging and victory is undecided many find comfort in adopting so much of the beliefs of both sides that when transition has to be made to the side finally victorious, it can be made without difficulty and apparently without sacrifice. Instantly however that one side has gained the victory all such eclecticism disappears. The victorious truth draws all thought within its own circle and all minds become subordinated to its influence. When therefore the Protestant Churches in the very first period of the Reformation gave themselves up to the spirit of compromise, and endeavoured in sharply defined creeds to amalgamate the old principle of authority and the methods of the subjective theologies with the new spirit of free enquiry and the method of objective proof, they doomed themselves necessarily to a temporary existence, and declared themselves incapable of serving more than the wants of the day. It is impossible they should last beyond the controversy between the conservative religious reaction and the revolutionary scientific spirit. These are so diametrically opposed to each other that there can be no final compromise between them. The one must conquer the other; and when such conquest comes, the Protestant Churches will cease to be. And which of the two great systems, between which the real strife lies, will ultimately conquer, I need hardly say. Those cravings of our human nature, that the system of Roman Catholicism alone can meet, are not necessary to us. They have been superinduced under special forms of culture. They arise out of misconceptions originated in the days of man's infancy, ignorance, and superstition. There are no facts in the universe known to us which justify them. They are the pure creations of a mind which has abandoned itself to its own subjectivity, and lost all power of distinguishing between its fancies and objective facts.

On the other hand, the progress of the scientific spirit is sure. Its advance is irresistible. It rests solely on verified facts. Once verified they can never become false. It can never, therefore, be compelled to recede from a position it has gained. Its method, too, takes entire possession of the mind when once it is understood, and imparts to it a culture which becomes universal. Then, all subjects come under its investigation, and every idea is subjected to analysis, testing, and proof. This culture, which the most urgent wants and principles of human nature will cause to be generally diffused, will thus gradually uproot those abnormal but powerful cravings which lead men towards Roman Catholicism; and the system which they necessitate and sustain will then of itself expire. It may take very many generations before the work is done; but the end is sure.

Now, I trust it is no egotism for me to say on this, the anniversary of the commencement of the services in these rooms, that it is because the tendencies I have described as at work in society have been working powerfully in our minds, we find ourselves occupying our present position here. In the midst of the old churches we sought for certainty to find out God's existence, our own destiny. We felt the pressure of sin; the sense of its guilt wrung our hearts with agony; we cried to the churches for succour. And what did the churches for us? They endeavoured to satisfy us with metaphysical dogmas, fancied facts, dreams of peace. But that would not do. We had come under the influence of the scientific method and spirit. We analysed their dogmas, and found they had no substance or base. We investigated the evidence of their facts and found it invalid. We endeavoured to realise their peace, and it vanished into nothingness, and only sorrow was left behind. Roman Catholicism, Protestantism,

failed to help us to the truth and give us rest of intellect and conscience. Unless we were to abandon ourselves to absolute scepticism, nothing remained but to boldly follow the path along which the scientific spirit led, and accept of its conclusions whatever they might be. The course was a trying one! Prejudices and old associations had to be rooted up; intense feelings had to be suppressed; dear friends wounded. But what could we do? We were perishing for the want of the truth. We saw it lay in that course or in none at all. We dare not give up the hope and duty of attaining it—no, by our soul's life we dare not. We resolved, not in the spirit of compromise, but in the spirit of holy daring, to follow it whithersoever it led. But the old churches could not tolerate this. Their superstitions became alarmed. Our earnestness disturbed their peace. In return, they troubled and vexed us sore. We had no heart for such paltry strifes. They had nothing to offer us as compensation for enduring such evils, so we left them to their fate and came hither. If I were a Hebrew of the olden time, this night would I raise an altar in this room, and inscribe thereon Ebenezer. The year has been to us one of happy progress. As soon as the first excitement had gone off, the congregation settled down in numbers far exceeding my expectation. It has not diminished since. A few have left us whose tardy steps could hardly keep apace with our advance, and are seeking now, I presume, by a futile compromise, to satisfy the want of their souls. But their places have been filled by others, whose sympathies are closer with us, and who, it may be presumed, have counted the cost the truth will incur. But our satisfaction arises not from those outward things. The absolute freedom we here enjoy has given an earnestness and a power to our enquiries we had never known before. We seem to ourselves to have been as travellers previously toiling with painful steps and wounded feet up steep ascents, through

bramble and through marsh, shut in by high hills or thick woods, and only here and there getting glimpses of the land beyond. Now, we have come on the open spaces and the rich plateaux; the light of Heaven falls clearly; far and wide the horizon spreads on every hand on closing scenes of God's beauty and goodness; we advance rapidly, and every breath is full of joy. Our essential principles, indeed, have not changed since the day we entered these rooms. But they have been wrought out to their conclusions. We have left, too, far behind us the cant phrases, the technical language, the accommodating forms of speech, the unmeaning shibboleths of the churches. We speak plainly the thoughts which are within us; and the thoughts in the new language sometimes themselves seem new. But whatever may be the form of truth to which we have attained, we do not hold it as final. We have learned that to us all truth is not absolute, but relative. As we ourselves grow, the truth itself is modified, and assumes higher and purer forms. And we hope, as long as life lasts, to grow. We enter, therefore, upon the second year of the services here simply in the attitude of scholars, not satisfied with the past, but crying unto the Great Fountain of light, More light, O God! give to our souls more light!

