

AN

G3429  
25.2.86 MOR

# ASPIRATION OF SCIENCE:

“On Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men”; rescued from  
the New Testament Revision.

---

A Lecture

DELIVERED BEFORE THE

SUNDAY LECTURE SOCIETY,

ST. GEORGE'S HALL, LANGHAM PLACE,

ON

SUNDAY AFTERNOON, 19th FEBRUARY, 1882,

BY

A. ELLEY FINCH.

---

London:

PUBLISHED BY THE SUNDAY LECTURE SOCIETY.

1882.

PRICE THREEPENCE.

# SUNDAY LECTURE SOCIETY.

---

To provide for the delivery on Sundays in the Metropolis, and to encourage the delivery elsewhere, of Lectures on Science,—physical, intellectual, and moral,—History, Literature, and Art; especially in their bearing upon the improvement and social well-being of mankind.

## PRESIDENT.

W. B. CARPENTER, Esq., C.B., LL.D., M.D., F.R.S., &c.

## VICE-PRESIDENTS.

PROFESSOR ALEXANDER BAIN.	THOMAS HENRY HUXLEY, Esq., LL.D., F.R.S., F.L.S.
CHARLES DARWIN, Esq., F.R.S., F.L.S.	BENJAMIN WARD RICHARDSON, Esq., M.D., F.R.S.
EDWARD FRANKLAND, Esq., D.C.L., Ph.D., F.R.S.	HERBERT SPENCER, Esq.
JAMES HEYWOOD, Esq., F.R.S., F.S.A.	W. SPOTTISWOODE, Esq., LL.D., Pres.R.S.
Right Hon. SIR ARTHUR HOBBHOUSE, K.C.S.I.	JOHN TYNDALL, Esq., LL.D., F.R.S.

---

## THE SOCIETY'S LECTURES

ARE DELIVERED AT

ST. GEORGE'S HALL, LANGHAM PLACE,

*On SUNDAY Afternoons, at FOUR o'clock precisely.*

(Annually—from November to May.)

TWENTY-FOUR Lectures (in three series) ending 23rd April, 1882, will be given.

Members' £1 subscription entitles them to an annual ticket, transferable (and admitting to the reserved seats), and to eight single reserved-seat tickets, available for any lecture.

Tickets for each series (one for each lecture) as below,—

To the SIXPENNY Seats—**2s.**, being at the rate of **THREE-PENCE** each lecture.

For tickets, and for list of the Lectures published by the Society, apply (by letter) to the Hon. Treasurer, WM. HENRY DOMVILLE, Esq., 15, Gloucester Crescent, Hyde Park, W.

Payment at the door:—**ONE SHILLING** (Reserved Seats);—**SIXPENCE**;—and **ONE PENNY**.

*The Society's Lectures by the same Author, are—on*

- “ERASMUS; his Life, Works, and Influence upon the Spirit of the Reformation.” (Now out of Print.)
- 
- “CIVILIZATION: a Sketch of its Rise and Progress, its Modern Safe-guards, and Future Prospects.”
- “THE INFLUENCE OF ASTRONOMICAL DISCOVERY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE HUMAN MIND.”
- “THE PRINCIPLES OF POLITICAL ECONOMY; their Scientific Basis, and Practical application to Social Well-being.”
- “THE ENGLISH FREE-THINKERS OF THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.”
- “THE SCIENCE OF LIFE WORTH LIVING.”
- “THE VICTORIES OF SCIENCE IN ITS WARFARE WITH SUPERSTITION.”
- “AN ASPIRATION OF SCIENCE: ‘On Earth Peace, Good-will towards Men;’ rescued from the New Testament Revision.”

*Price of each of the above Lectures 3d., or post free 3½d.*

- 
- “THE INDUCTIVE PHILOSOPHY: including a Parallel between Lord Bacon and A. Comte as Philosophers.” With Notes and Authorities. (pp. 100, cloth 8vo., price 5s., or post free 5s. 3d.)
- “THE PURSUIT OF TRUTH: as Exemplified in the Principles of Evidence—Theological, Scientific, and Judicial.” With Notes and Authorities. (pp. 106, cloth 8vo., price 5s., or post free 5s. 3d.)

---

Two vols. of Lectures (3rd and 4th Selection) cloth-bound, price 5s. each, or post free 5s. 6d., contain nearly all the society's Lectures still in print, and some out of print. Tables of contents of these vols. and lists of the separate lectures, sent on application to the Hon. Treasurer.

---

*The lectures can be obtained (on remittance, by letter of postage stamps or order payable Porchester Road, W.) of the Hon. Treas., W. HENRY DOMVILLE, Esq., 15, Gloucester CRESCENT, Hyde Park, W., or at the Hall on the days of Lecture, or of Mr. J. BUMPUS, Bookseller, 350, Oxford St., W., or Messrs. CATTELL & Co., 84, Fleet Street, E.C.*

## SYLLABUS.

Origin and history of the English authorised text (A.D. 1611) Luke ch. 2, v. 14, before quoted, and its Greek and Latin source<sup>s</sup> since the invention of printing. Erasmus (1516). Tyndale (1534). R. Stephens (1551). Geneva-English Version (1557-60). Beza (1580).

Our authorised form of this text not found in the great uncial Greek nor in the Latin Manuscripts, nor in the printed Latin Vulgate (decreed as authentic by the Council of Trent).

Ambiguous evidence in support of this text as embodying an actual utterance by the heavenly host.

Its inconsistency with the declaration of Christ (Matt. ch. 10, v. 34): "Think not that I am come to send Peace on Earth," &c.

Its want of fulfilment as a prophecy. Hence probably expunged by the Revisers.

Divergent aims of Theology and Science—the one regarding the Glory of God—the other the Well-being of Man.

Illustrations from some of the chief Theologies of the world, showing that the Well-being of Man is therein subordinated to the Glory of God.

Hence the conflict between Theology and Science. Its rise and nature.

The text explained as an Aspiration of Science.

Illustrations of the primary care (good-will) of Science for Humanity from its discoveries, deductions, and teachings in reference to (*e.g.*):—

1. The Order of nature.
2. The Constitution of Man.
3. Health.
4. Education.
5. Morality (Virtue, Happiness).
6. Aversion from War.
7. International Arbitration.

Concluding inferences.

---

### EDITIONS OF THE SCRIPTURES SHOWN IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE LECTURE:

The Editio princeps of the Greek New Testament, by Erasmus, in which the text 'good-will towards men' (*ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκία*—*hominibus bona voluntas*) is first met with in print (Basileæ, 1519).

The first Bible in which the Scriptures are separated into verses, and the text "towards men good-will" first appears in the *English* language. (Geneva, 1560.)

The Greek and Latin New Testament of Beza. (Editio tertia, 1580.)

## AN ASPIRATION OF SCIENCE:

“ON EARTH PEACE, GOOD-WILL TOWARDS MEN”;  
RESCUED FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT REVISION.

---

IT is a remarkable circumstance connected with the origin of the Christian Religion, that no authentic record of the Life and Doctrines of its founder should now exist, or ever have existed, written in the language of the country where Jesus lived and talked; the only language in which he could have been listened to and understood by the majority of his disciples, or the common people, who, we are told expressly, heard him gladly.

This reflection must often have occurred to, and more or less embarrassed, the numerous scholars and critics, whose investigations into the authenticity and genuineness of the New Testament Scriptures form so considerable a portion of the vast library of Christian theology and history.

It is a reflection, moreover, that must be borne in mind when considering the value and authority of the various translations, commentaries, and revisions that appear from time to time, and whose production indeed follows a natural law, arising as they do out of the necessity of accommodating these ancient writings to the continuous, however slow, progress of human thought and intelligence; that is to say, the spirit of the age requires to be read into them before it can be read out.

This view of the function of the commentator, translator, or reviser is not indeed quite obvious, nor is it the

ostensible reason put forward for undertaking their work; that reason is invariably alleged to be, in order to make the translation or revision in question more accurate in reference to the original; a task which, if we only had the original as a standard to refer to, might be a not unprofitable proceeding, but any such original, in the sense I have adverted to, is not now, and never was, to be met with.

For the New Testament Scriptures were at the very first written in a foreign tongue, that is, the Greek language. We cannot even except the Gospel according to St. Matthew, for, though there is a probable tradition that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Syro-Chaldaic dialect (the colloquial language of the Hebrews in Palestine), this supposition can hardly be accepted as more than a tradition, since we have not only no positive proof of it, but not even such a consensus of biblical critics as might warrant our receiving such supposition as an admitted fact.

Now the Greek version of the sayings and discourses of Jesus and others narrated in the Gospels, however ancient, can no more be regarded as the original of such sayings and discourses, than an Italian report of one of the splendid speeches of Mr. Gladstone could be regarded as the original of what that great English orator may actually have spoken.

These reflections are especially applicable to the consideration of the narrative which St. Luke gives in the second chapter of his Gospel, part of which, as English Protestants have hitherto understood it, I have taken for the subject of the present lecture.

St. Luke, probably a Grecian, at any rate writing in Greek, tells us (according to our authorised version of the year 1611) that, shortly after the birth of Jesus in Bethlehem, 'there were in the same country shepherds

abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night, and lo! the Angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them, and they were sore afraid. And the Angel said unto them, fear not; for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy which shall be to all people, for unto you is born this day in the City of David a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord. And suddenly there was with the Angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God, and saying—Glory to God in the highest, and on earth Peace, Good-will towards men.'

We are now told, on the authority of the eminent scholars and divines constituting the company of the New Testament Revisers, that Luke's relation of this remarkable supernatural occurrence is not accurately given in our authorised version. That what Luke really wrote must be translated or rendered into English thus—'Glory to God in the highest, and on Earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.'

This correction, or corruption, of so venerable a text will be variously regarded, according to the critic's point of view. To the pious mind, accustomed to revere the Scriptures as inspired Oracles, the shock must be great on finding that he has been imposed upon in being taught to believe that so sublime an utterance ever formed a genuine portion of the Gospels, and his dismay will hardly be diminished on finding further that it has long been, and will still remain, notwithstanding the revision, a matter of dispute amongst biblical experts what it really was that St. Luke actually wrote. The critical scholar, uninfluenced by dogmatic or doctrinal prepossessions, will still probably retain his sceptical opinion on the subject; whilst the man of science must consider that what Luke may himself have written, if not a matter of conjecture altogether, can be of very little real importance,

seeing that he is no authority whatever for what the heavenly host did really say. For Luke was not present on the occasion, he does not allege that he received the report from those who were present, his account of it is therefore simply hearsay, and, whatever the very words were, it is morally certain they could not have been spoken in Greek, that being a language utterly unintelligible, an unknown tongue indeed to the shepherds of Bethlehem, so that, putting it at the highest, if we were sure, or were agreed, that we were in possession of the exact language of Luke, it would only in itself amount to a version or translation of a non-existent, and long since vanished original.

The man of science, however, will not care to reject the reviser's alteration, for he knows that the sublime aspiration of our text enshrines a truth having higher intrinsic value than ancient manuscripts, or biblical critics can confer, and, that though it may henceforth cease to be received as part of authentic Scripture, it will live, where in truth it originated, in the noble inspirations of the human mind, yearning in its benevolence to ameliorate the lot of man. That it is one of those scientific forecasts which, flashing from human genius, are found in history sparsely strewed along the path of human progress, not confined to creeds, but illuminating the entire earthly highway towards that goal of human happiness which all good men are now striving to attain, for others as well as for themselves.

Before finally parting with our text from the Scripture record, it may be interesting very briefly to trace its origin and history, to see how and when, in point of fact, it came to get into our authorised version of 1611.

At the time of the birth of Jesus Christ the language of the Jews, the Hebrew language, had long ceased to be



current amongst the inhabitants of Syria, and their vernacular speech was that known to scholars as the Aramaen or Syro-Chaldaic, a dialect very little used as the vehicle of literature. Hence it happened that the written accounts or narratives of the life and discourses of Jesus Christ came from the very first to be composed in the Greek language; that language being not only the language of the learned, but, dispersed through the conquests of Alexander, was very generally familiar to educated people of the ancient civilised world, even amongst the Romans, though their vulgar tongue was Latin, St. Paul, for instance, when writing his grand Epistle to the Romans, using the Greek and not the Latin language.

In the earliest churches established after the death of Jesus and the spread of a knowledge of his religion, in the churches, for instance, of Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria, and Rome, the Greek manuscript gospels had not only to be copied for the purpose of their dissemination, but, as regards Rome and Alexandria (Northern Egypt being then a province of the Roman Empire), as the religion became dispersed amongst the people at large, the gospel had to be translated into the latin tongue, and such translation took place so early, and to so great an extent, that of the at present existing ancient manuscripts of the Scriptures the Latin are not only more numerous than the Greek, but it is by no means a matter of agreement amongst scholars which of such manuscripts are the highest in point of authority for what the original writings or autographs of the Apostles (long since utterly lost), actually contained. Protestant theologians and critics consider the Greek to be the higher authority. On the other hand, the Roman Catholic Church consider the Latin to be now the more reliable source.

Amongst other arguments relied upon by the Roman

Church is this, that the most ancient existing latin manuscripts, even if not more ancient than the existing greek ones, are known to be recensions of a text that was revised in the 4th century by St. Eusebius, and also by St. Jerome, through comparison with greek manuscripts confessedly more ancient than any now existing, or of which we have now any other knowledge; and from that early period up to the time of the Reformation, that is for upwards of 1,000 years, the only Bible of western christendom was a latin book, generally known as the Latin Vulgate, the text of which was decreed to be authentic by the Council of Trent (in the year 1546).

The first English translation of the New Testament of any note was that executed by John Wiclif (the gospel doctor, as the people called him) about the year 1380. This was evidently made from the latin version, such appearing to be the case, not only from internal evidence, but from the fact that at that time greek manuscripts were scarce in Europe, and a knowledge of the greek language rarely possessed by englishmen, and almost certainly not by Wiclif. His translation therefore simply followed the latin.

Previously to the next stage in the history we are following there occurred two memorable events. The one was the invention of the printing press in the year 1440, and the very first book that was printed was the splendid latin bible of the Cardinal Mazarin. The other event was the taking of Constantinople by the Turks in the year 1453. Its immediate consequence was the diffusion of greek manuscripts, and greek scholars throughout the chief European cities.

The first published New Testament in the greek language, the *Editio princeps*, was compiled and edited by the illustrious Erasmus, being printed for him by Froben of Basle in the year 1516. Erasmus's second and

greatly improved impression (which I possess here) being printed in the year 1519.

Now it is observable that in none of the latin manuscripts, nor in the printed latin version of the Scriptures do we find the text "good-will towards men." The text of the latin version invariably runs thus: "Peace on earth towards men of good-will." The meaning of which, as seemingly held by the Roman Church, being, "Peace of mind amongst true believers"; such being of course Roman Catholics.

When Erasmus published his New Testament he gave to the world a version from Greek Manuscripts that could not be so rendered. Along with the Greek text he printed a literal latin translation of his own, differing greatly in many important particulars from the Latin Vulgate, and, in reference to the text we are considering, he gave in latin, more plainly to mark his meaning, the words '*hominibus bona voluntas*' 'good-will towards men.'

It is really then to this illustrious scholar, who, I venture to say, was, in learning and scholastic accomplishments, in liberal-mindedness, in large-heartedness, in love of toleration, and in disrelish of dogma, the very prototype of our late lamented Arthur Stanley, Dean of Westminster—it is to Erasmus we really owe our first distinct knowledge of the sublime expression 'On Earth Peace, towards men Good-will.'

To those of you who are not acquainted with Greek it may be surprising to hear that the whole difference between the two renderings turns upon a single letter of a single word. That is to say, if the Greek word were *εὐδοκία* ending with the letter *a*, as it is found in some manuscripts, then the literal translation would be 'towards men good-will,' but if the word were *εὐδοκίας*, having the letter *s*, as it is found in other manuscripts, then the rendering would be 'towards men of good-will' or some

equivalent phrase, even so far fetched, and apparently strained as that formulated by the Revisers, viz. : " among men in whom he is well pleased."

From Erasmus we may at once turn to our great countryman and reformer, William Tyndale. He had probably become personally acquainted with Erasmus on one of his visits to this country. Tyndale being at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, whilst Erasmus was at Magdalen College. Tyndale had great admiration for the erudition of Erasmus, and had read his Greek Testament, for we find him paraphrasing the *paraclesis* prefixed to this impression of 1519. Tyndale, in his English Translation of the New Testament (first published in 1526), had evidently the Greek text of Erasmus in his mind, for his translation widely differs from the Vulgate Latin, and he renders our text thus—' Peace on Earth, and unto men rejoicing.'

Erasmus was more closely followed by Robert Stephens of Paris, who in his fourth edition of the Greek New Testament (published at Geneva in 1551) not only reprinted the Greek text of Erasmus with slight variation, but adopted his latin version verbatim. This Edition of Stephens is noticeable also as being the first in which the Scriptures were divided into verses, that is so numbered, not altogether broken up into verses; that was first done in the Genevan-English version which I am now going to mention.

The Greek and Latin texts of Erasmus and Stephens are the foundation of the valuable translation of the New Testament executed by the English Exiles at Geneva in Queen Mary's reign (in the year 1557). This, together with their English translation of the Old Testament published in 1560 (the second year of Queen Elizabeth) formed for many years the favourite popular household Bible in this country (I possess it here). Erasmus and Stephens

were also further followed on the Continent by the weighty authority of Theodore Beza, the eminent Genevan Reformer, and discoverer of the ancient uncial Codex Bezae, presented by him to Cambridge University, and whose Greek and elegant Latin Testament of 1580 I also have here.

In the Anglo-Genevan version we meet with the text under consideration for the first time printed in the English language as it was subsequently given in the authorised version of 1611, the translators of which were commanded by King James to show especial regard to this Genevan-English version. Now such as we there find the text it has ever since remained, and been accepted by the Protestant English nation and all english-speaking protestant peoples, until the revision of the New Testament published last year, that is from the year 1557 down to the year 1881, when we find this time-hallowed text expunged, and in place of it the strained expression I have already quoted, that the Peace on Earth, instead of being for all men, is only for those in whom he is well pleased; and thus we have the angelic announcement of 'good tidings of great joy to all people' cut down and narrowed by the utterance of the heavenly host (as interpreted by the revisers), to some portion only of the great human race.

Now I must not be understood as dissenting from, or in any way presuming to criticise what the revisers have accomplished. From a doctrinal point of view, there were doubtless many inducements tempting them to tamper with the text, and to get rid if possible of the elevated conception primarily presented to us in print through the critical acumen of Erasmus. In the first place 'Peace on earth, Good-will towards men' as general christian sentiments, are strikingly inconsistent with the subsequent declaration of Christ himself. (Matt. ch. x. v. 34.)

“Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell ye, Nay, but rather division. Think not that I came to send peace on earth. I came not to send peace but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law.”

Then again, if regarded in any prophetic sense, the announcement has had no fulfilment. Indeed the history of the world since the coming of Christ fully and fearfully contradicts it. Not only has there been no increase of peace on the earth, there have probably been more wars and bloodshed arising out of Christianity, or since its birth, than ever took place before. An eloquent historian has remarked ‘That from the very commencement of the Christian era the sword has accompanied the Cross, a sword that has never found and never will find a scabbard, till superstitious creeds and immoral dogmas shall be abandoned as things invented in the dark ages of the world, as things directly calculated to sow the seeds of discord in society, create feuds between man and man, and perpetuate those animosities which turn the sweets of life into wormwood. This dogmatic christianity has done in every age and in every country into which it has been introduced. Wherever the Cross has been raised thither have followed fire and sword, horrid burnings, brutal massacres. All history teems with accounts of its savage wars, its deluging bloodshed.’ Even at this very time our common humanity is being outraged by the atrocities of the christian persecution of the Jews now being carried on in ‘Holy’ Russia!

From a theologian’s point of view therefore the authorized text of 1611 might well be considered as a stumbling block, and the reasoning above adverted to may not improbably have contributed, even unconsciously, to

the decision which has now expunged, or attempted to expunge, the text entirely from our English Bible.

If however we are to lose the sublime sentiment of 'good-will towards men' from the gospel, it may be worth while to consider whether we are compelled to part with it altogether. If it be not inspired Scripture, and if dogmatic theology disown it, may it not find its true home to be with Science? Let us consider shortly how this may be.

The conspicuous conflict between Theology and Science which characterises our transitional progress from the age of Faith to the age of Reason, when looked into with the object of ascertaining its less obvious causes, will be found to arise out of the divergent ends which each of these great systems of thought appears to be aiming at. Theology will be found to have for its ultimate realisation the Glory of God. The Aspirations of Science, on the other hand, are wholly directed towards the well-being of Man.

I could give you abundant illustration of the aim of Theology taken from any of the great book-religions of the world enumerated in my lecture of last year, showing, as they unmistakably do, that the glory of God and the well-being of Man are very often not altogether consistent; but it will amply suffice for my present argument to confine my illustrations to those two great Theologies the Jewish and the Christian, which are embraced in the single volume of the Bible, and in the creeds and confessions of faith that have been deduced from its pages, and which are supposed, more plainly than Holy writ itself, to explain its meaning.

In the very first book of that volume we find the Deity represented as cursing man and the whole human race his descendants on account of his having partaken of the forbidden fruit. The fearful fate thus decreed to man-

kind universally, though subsequently a comparative few termed "the Elect" were excepted, is better known through the adroitly devised and necessarily subdued tone of it that has been evolved through ecclesiastical subtlety, such, for instance, as we find it moulded in that authoritative theological standard the Westminster Confession of Faith, presented by the Assembly of Divines to both Houses of Parliament in the year 1646, and wherein it is thus expressed: "By the decree of God, for the manifestation of his glory some men and angels are predestined unto everlasting life, and others foredoomed to everlasting death. God hath appointed the elect unto glory. The rest of mankind God has pleased, according to the unsearchable counsels of his own will, for the glory of his sovereign power over his creatures, to pass by, and ordain them to dishonour and wrath for their sin, to the praise of his glorious justice!"

I need hardly quote familiar passages from the book of Psalms and other books of the Old Testament showing the many fearful human calamities ordained or practised, even to the sacrifice of the lives of human beings, all for the glory of God! If we turn to the New Testament Scriptures the awful idea we are contemplating culminates in the appalling announcement of the everlasting punishment of Hell!

Now the God of Theology is an idea of the human mind. Like the Poet's, the Theologian's eye

"Doth glance from heaven to earth, from earth to heaven,  
And, as imagination bodies forth  
The forms of things unknown, the *theologian's* pen  
Turns them to shapes, and gives to airy nothing  
A local habitation and a name."

Even the ghastly conception of eternal torments, and the foredoomed fate of millions of human beings is all



declared by theologians to be for the glory of God. As the grim irony of Burns expresses it—

“ Oh Thou, wha in the heav'ns dost dwell,  
Wha, as it pleases best thyself,  
Sends ane to Heaven, and ten to Hell  
A' for thy glory,  
And no for ony guid or ill  
They've done afore thee.”

If we turn from theological theory to the practice of theologians, as exhibited in history, we plainly perceive how their treatment of mankind has ever corresponded with the cruel character of their credentials. The reproachful summing up of their conduct by the learned historian Buckle is only too true. ‘The theologians,’ he declares, ‘considered as a class, have in every country and in every age deliberately opposed themselves to gratifications which are essential to the happiness of an overwhelming majority of the human race. Raising up a God of their own creation, whom they hold out as a lover of penance, of sacrifice, and of mortification, they, under this pretence, forbid enjoyments which are not only innocent but praiseworthy . . . It must be admitted by whoever will take a comprehensive view of what they have done, that they have not only been the most bitter foes of human happiness, but the most successful ones. In their high and palmy days, when they reigned supreme, when credulity was universal, and doubt unknown, they afflicted mankind in every possible way, enjoining fasts, and penances, and pilgrimages, teaching their simple and ignorant victims every kind of austerity, teaching them to flog their own bodies, to tear their own flesh, and to mortify the most natural of their appetites.’ And Buckle emphatically warns us, ‘that we shall assuredly sink under the accumulated pressure of our high and complex civilization if we imitate the credulity of our forefathers,

who allowed their energies to be cramped and weakened by those pernicious notions which the clergy, partly from ignorance, and partly from interest, have in every age palmed upon the people, and have thereby diminished the national happiness, and retarded the march of the national prosperity.'

As we are now accepting it as settled by the New Testament Revision, that the text 'Peace on Earth, Good-will towards men' was no part of original Scripture, and is discarded by theology, it becomes the privilege of Science, with the right hand of fellowship, to bid it welcome. It embodies indeed her most cherished aspirations, for we shall see that, as the ultimate end of Science is to bring about the greatest happiness of the greatest number, 'Good-will towards men,' that is human well-being, and 'Peace on earth' have ever been objects Science has had nearest and dearest to her, are indeed of the very essence of her transcendent faith.

And here I call to mind that the leading idea of my lecture was a few years since, with almost prophetic foresight of the work of the New Testament Revisers, shadowed forth in the luminous and lofty language of a pioneer of progress, one of the bravest and soundest of our sons of Science. In professor Tyndall's Presidential Address on 'Science and Man,' delivered before the Midland Institute in October, 1877, he asks "Does the song of the herald angels 'Glory to God on the highest, and on earth Peace, Good-will toward men,' express the exaltation and the yearning of a human soul, or does it describe an optical and acoustical fact, a visible host, and an audible song? If the former, the exaltation and the yearning are man's imperishable possession, if the latter, then belief in the entire transaction is wrecked by non-fulfilment. The promise of 'Peace on Earth, Good-will toward men' is a dream ruined by the experience of

eighteen centuries, and in that ruin are involved the claim of the heavenly host to prophetic vision. But, though the mechanical theory proves untenable, the immortal song, and the feelings it expresses are still ours, to be incorporated, let us hope, in the poetry, philosophy, and practice of the future."

Now we seem to breathe the free atmosphere of Science; Science so variously defined, so differently understood in the past ages of the world. To us, Science, in its general sense, is simply real knowledge—knowledge that may be tested and known to be real by verification through, or comparison with, the facts of Nature.

This is no mere verbal definition, for, side by side with real knowledge has always existed the persuasion of false knowledge. This distinction helps to explain, too, how it has come to happen that Theology and Science are so often seen in conflict. To say, as is sometimes done, that Theology is based on supernatural knowledge, whilst Science is limited to knowledge that is natural, does not really solve the problem. It might account for difference in their respective degrees of knowledge, but not, if both be true, for downright contradiction between them.

The conflict, in its present proportions, has really arisen in comparatively recent times, and we shall best get at its source and nature by glancing at it historically.

In the ancient world, and throughout what might be termed the golden age of Theology, Science was very differently conceived to what is now regarded as its right meaning. In that subtle dialogue of Plato,—*Theaitetos*, which is a discussion concerning what is meant by Science, (written nearly 400 years before the Christian Era,) we find that Socrates could only define or conceive Science as being the inmost perception of the mind, or inner consciousness, concerning any matter. He thought that there could be no external standard, and that what the

individual mind arrives at through pure reflection as true, must be regarded as the truth by that mind. Such was the only conclusion that consummate thinker could come to as to the nature of Science. In Plato's more mature Dialogue 'The Republic' we again find the nature and end of Science repeatedly referred to. Thus, with reference to the Sciences of Arithmetic and Geometry, Plato thought nothing of any worldly use they might serve. The object of the study of the properties of numbers, he says, is to habituate the mind to the contemplation of pure and abstract truth, and so to raise us above the material universe.

In these writings of Plato we have then distinctly stated the end of Science, and also its method, as he regarded them; such method being, in the majority of instances, utterly fallacious, viz.:—That the intuition of the mind, or the idea which is subjectively conceived, is to be accepted as the equivalent or correlative of an objective fact. This fallacy may be detected underlying those metaphysical systems of philosophy that so authoritatively prevailed until they were displaced by the modern inductive method of research, which is based, not on mental intuitions, but on material facts, ascertained through the senses, and so marshalled as to constitute an objective criterion, to which speculative propositions may be referred, for the purpose of testing which are true and which are false.

Now the Platonic idea of Science was very early pressed into the service of Theology. The late Bishop Hampden, in his learned lectures on the Scholastic Philosophy, has acutely explained how this arose, and he remarks that its abstractedness from the visible world was one chief reason why Platonism became established as the orthodox system of the Western Church. This Platonic notion of Science, having thus become combined

with, or subordinated to the dogmas of Theology, with its universal panacea of prayer, really continued, not always in practice, but, in intellectual theory, until the advent of our illustrious countryman Lord Bacon. Bacon, by the exercise of his marvellous insight, penetrated to the very core of real knowledge, showing, especially in that latin casket of scientific gems, the *Novum Organum* (published in 1620), that the first thing necessary in the search of truth is intellectual light—'*lumen siccum*' pure light, unobscured by the mists of superstition, passion, prejudice, or interest. But then he at once points out that the intellect left to itself, like the naked hand, can effect little, that it must be assisted by helps and by instruments, and that its intuitions must be corrected, or duly verified by the observation, or interrogation through experiment, of the facts of Nature. That '*vere scire esse per causas scire*'—we only truly know anything when we know its cause.

Utterly ignoring the jargon of theology concerning the Kingdom of Heaven, Bacon avowed his object was to establish on Earth the Kingdom of Man, whose sovereignty would rest on Science, which was not a thing to be demanded back from the darkness of antiquity, but must be sought from the light of Nature.

That Science was not derived from human authority, but is the offspring or fruit resulting '*commercio mentis et rerum*' from the intercourse of mind and matter, or, as he quaintly phrases it, 'the happy marriage between the mind of man and the nature of things.'

But Bacon's sagacious discovery, or, at least, his vigorous presentment in clear and cogent logic of the right method of arriving at the source of real knowledge, was only a portion, though a magnificently grand one, of the services he has rendered to mankind. He proceeded further, and showed that the speculations of the ancient Philoso-

phers were comparatively worthless, as not having in view the true end of Science, which was not, he averred, an intellectual pastime, or 'web of the wit,' woven merely to amuse or mystify the dialectical faculties of the human mind, but was an investigation into Nature, in order to establish the well-being, and bring about the happiness of the human race. The end of Science was to consist in the multiplying of human enjoyments, and the mitigating of human miseries, concisely it was, to use his own pregnant words, 'the relief of man's estate'; and this is the sense in which we are to understand his often-repeated aphorism '*Scientia est Potentia*,' real knowledge is power—power enabling man to grapple with and overcome the evils of life.

And thus, through the exhaustive exposition of Bacon, Science was no longer limited by the definitions or ideas of Plato, the human intellect became liberated from the bondage of verbal disputation, and was turned to the consideration of useful truths. Science came to be seen as we now know it, that is, as the process of discovery, by man's natural faculties, of the order or laws of Nature.

The laboratory of Science being, according to Plato, the inner sanctuary of the mind, and the materials of Science being, according to Bacon, facts, acquired through the senses, from the outer World of Nature. So considered, the sphere of Science comprehends everything that, by the constitution of the human faculties, can be positively known; the region of reality, as distinguished from the realm of visionary knowledge, that has been built up, by means of unverified mental intuitions, into theological and metaphysical systems.

Now what the genius of Bacon was so powerfully propounding in precept, others were almost simultaneously performing in practice.

In our own country we find William Harvey, the

friend and physician of Bacon, discovering, by the aid of experiment, the circulation of the blood, and, in his concise '*exercitatio de motu Cordis et Sanguinis*', explaining this grand truth (published in 1628, two years after the death of Bacon), and also in his larger work '*de generatione Animalium*' (published in 1651) we may, I think, perceive many passages proving the extent to which Harvey was indebted intellectually to his great predecessor Bacon.

Another almost immediate result of the profound impression made upon thinking minds by the extraordinary brilliancy of Bacon's philosophical writings appears in the very striking treatise of Richd. Cumberland on the Laws of Nature, his '*de legibus Naturæ disquisitio*' (published in 1672). "In this work" (says Hallam) "the Fathers and Schoolmen, the Canonists and Casuists, have vanished like ghosts at the first daylight. The continued appeal is to experience, and never to authority, unless it be to the authority of the great apostles of experimental philosophy."

And thus piety was becoming purified from the dross of dogma, for with Science, '*laborare est orare*'—prayer consists in work, and the world was being aroused from the supineness of superstitious sloth to the activity of intelligent industry.

And now we may distinctly observe what is the relation which the Baconian or Inductive Science holds towards Theology. I pass by the attempts that were made by the Church to strangle it in its birth. The persecution of Science by the Church when it possessed power, and of scientific men, the great men who have been the interpreters of Nature,

"Their only crime that they should dare  
To think, and then their thought declare"—

is indeed a theme painfully familiar, but happily it forms no part of my present argument. We are now only

referring to the intellectual influence of Science, which is by Buckle thus tersely summarised, and contrasted with Theology:—

“Inductive Science takes for its basis individual and specific experience, and seeks by that means to overthrow the general and traditional notions on which all church power is founded. Its plan is to refuse to accept principles which cannot be substantiated by facts. In Theology certain principles are taken for granted, and it is deemed impious to question them. In England, the rise of the Baconian Philosophy, with its determination to subordinate ancient principles to modern experience, was the heaviest blow which has ever been inflicted on the Theologians, whose method is to begin, not with experience, but with principles which are said to be inscrutable. That is, they proceed from arbitrary assumptions, for which they have no proof, except by appealing to other assumptions equally arbitrary, and equally unproven. Over the inferior order of minds our clergy still wield great influence, but the Baconian Philosophy, by bringing their favourite method into disrepute, has sapped the very base of their system. From the moment that their method of investigation was discredited, the secret of their power was gone.”

And the present attitude of the Church towards Science is thus graphically portrayed by Dr. Draper:—  
“At length the Church has fastened its eyes on Science. Under that dreaded name there stands before it what seems to be a spectre of uncertain form, of hourly dilating proportions, of threatening aspect. Sometimes the Church addresses this stupendous apparition in words of courtesy, sometimes in tones of denunciation.” This mingled and trembling tone of courtesy and defiance, of welcome and of dread, may I think be detected in nearly all the great theological utterances going on around us.



We however may in Science recognise the spirit that has promised to lead us into all truth, and we may hail as the children of light those who are endowed with the intelligence enabling them to follow whithersoever such spirit may lead, and therefore, when the Bishop of Manchester asks, as he did in his somewhat singular sermon preached before the British Association in August last—"Is Science to tell me what I am to believe, and how I am to act," let us, however respectfully, ask emphatically, Why not? For it has now been demonstrated by experience, that only by belief in Science, and by acting in accordance with its teaching of Good-will towards man, can the great miseries of human life, its pinching poverty, its depraving intemperance, its demoralising vices, its agonising diseases, its premature deaths, with their attendant train of heartrending sorrows and corroding griefs, be banished, and life on earth rendered tolerably happy. It is only by belief in Science, and by following its teaching, that wars will ever be abolished, and 'Peace on Earth' practically realised.

I need not now dilate on illustrations of the primary care of Science for humanity, as manifested in its discoveries, deductions, and teachings in reference to the Order of Nature, to the Constitution of Man. The great astronomical and physiological discoveries are more or less known to every one. On the subject of Health, so essential to our happiness, I will dwell for a few moments. The theological theory of disease (explained in my lecture last year) has been completely exploded from the creed of the educated classes, and it is now acknowledged that Health is entirely dependent on the observance of immutable and imperative laws of Nature. Diseases are now distinctly traceable to infringement of these laws, and several diseases are indissolubly associated with the poisonous nature of some of the food we

eat, and the liquids we drink. But the scientific knowledge of the subject requires diffusing, to be more generally taught, and brought vividly home to the reason and common sense of the people.

Now, some of you may remember that in a former lecture I deplored the paucity of scientific tracts and texts or axioms disseminated amongst us, compared with the number of superstitious stories with which we are literally deluged by theological Societies. Yet I think that scientific teaching might to a great extent be carried on in a similar manner. Let me hazard a suggestion, illustrative of my meaning. Some of you I dare say have observed the scripture text that is engraved above a drinking fountain within a quarter of a mile from our doors: "Whosoever drinketh of this water shall thirst again, but whosoever drinketh of the water I shall give him shall never thirst."

Now, don't assume that I am quoting this text for the purpose of scoffing. I only now say, it is not Science, but it strikes me as pointing out to us a corresponding method of diffusing scientific knowledge, and that we might well have our fountains engraved with some scientific axiom or truth in connection with their use. Thus, we might have written over them some such scientific axiom as the following: "Whosoever drinketh of water polluted with organic germs shall be in danger of disease and death; but whosoever drinketh of water purified therefrom by Science shall escape taking thereby diarrhœa, dysentery, cholera, typhoid fever, diphtheria."

Going to the subject of Education I may point out that in our Great Schools and Colleges the curriculum of studies has been considerably changed since society has come to appreciate the educational value of the study of the Physical Sciences, not only as regards the real and useful knowledge thereby imparted of the material world

and our actual mode of existence, but in reference to the discipline of the mental faculties involved in learning their precise and accurate methods of investigating and verifying truth, and showing what concrete truth consists in. In the Parliamentary Report of the Public Schools Commission published in the year 1864 we find Professor Owen, the late Sir Charles Lyell, and Professor Faraday, our esteemed President Dr. Carpenter, Professor Tyndall, and other eminent scientists giving the most clear and convincing testimony to the value of such study in training a class of mental faculties which are almost ignored by purely classical and mathematical culture; such as the distinguishing things from words; the accurate observation, and classification of the facts of Nature, and the exercise of the reasoning faculties on such facts; the teaching to the student the principles of real evidence; and how, in the unprejudiced pursuit of truth, to estimate correctly the weight of such evidence.

But perhaps the greatest blow that enlightenment has publicly dealt to superstition in our day was inflicted by the Elementary Education Act of 1870—under which Board Schools have been so widely established for imparting some amount of really useful secular common-sense knowledge to the children of the masses of our people, in the place of the Bible reading and Hymn singing, in the learning of which their precious time was so much consumed in the old Church Schools. By Sec. 7 of that Act of Parliament it is expressly provided, that no religious observance, or instruction in religious subjects shall be given during the necessary school hours. That no scholar shall be bound to attend any religious observance or instruction, and that it shall be no part of the duty of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools to enquire into any instruction in any religious subjects given at such school, or to examine any scholar therein. Now, bearing in mind

that the term religious instruction used in the Act has especial reference to the jarring and discordant theologies of the rival religious sects, all of whom were contending to get the child under their special influence, and that the prohibition in the Act of Parliament of religious instruction was resorted to as the only practicable course of getting rid of the obstructive opposition of such sects; I don't think I am going too far in characterising the enactment in question as the greatest legislative blow dealt at superstition since the passing of the Act of the 9th of Geo. II. which repealed that astounding statute of James I., which had actually recognised as realities the theological delusions of witchcraft, conjuration, and dealing with evil and wicked Spirits, and authorised prosecutions, convictions, and the infliction of barbarous punishments, for the alleged commission of such purely imaginary crimes!

Now we are all taught in our youth to believe that Theology or our Religious System is the source or sanction of all morality. If Roman Catholics we are taught that in matters of Faith and Morals the Pope is the infallible authority; a dogma the more astonishing, inasmuch as it must be obvious to unprejudiced historical students that, as the power of the Pope has decayed, the moral tone of European society has improved. But, in the decomposition, or decline of theological belief everywhere going on, there must exist a danger that what has been supposed an essential part of its teaching may decline too. Hence has arisen the necessity of showing, as the fact is, that the true foundation of morality, or the right conduct of man towards man, is scientific or secular, and not essentially theological at all.

Now, that pure morality is absolutely independent of all theology has been known to Science from the time of Aristotle, whose demonstration of the doctrine is con-

tained in his profound and sagacious treatise the *Nicomachean Ethics*.

Turning then to the consideration of virtue, as the supreme moral end, we shall see what Science has discovered and taught us as the indestructible basis of the duty of doing, not only what is just and right, but what is calculated for the happiness of mankind, all of which are comprehended in that felicitously compendious expression, 'good-will towards men.'

It is to the illustrious Grotius (whose great work on the principles of human conduct I somewhat fully referred to in my lecture of last year) that we are indebted, according to his able editor the late Dr. Whewell, for the first clear enunciation of the true source of moral science. Man, says Grotius, following the lead of Aristotle, is by his nature a rational and social being. He can only exist in the society of his fellow-creatures, and he must live with them, not anyhow, but according to his instincts, his faculties, and his desires, that is, peacefully and happily. Human Nature then is the mother of moral right, and the moral guilt or rectitude of any action is determined by its agreement or disagreement with our rational and social nature.

These ideas of Aristotle and Grotius have been admirably developed by (amongst others) Jeremy Bentham, John S. Mill, and Herbert Spencer. 'Nature (says Bentham) has placed mankind under the government of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do, as well as to determine what we shall do. The standard of right and wrong is fastened to their throne. In words a man may pretend to abjure their empire, but in reality he will remain subject to it all the while. The principle of utility recognises this subjection, and assumes it for the foundation of that system, the object of which is to rear the fabric of felicity

by the hand of reason and of law. Systems which attempt to question it deal in sound instead of sense, in caprice instead of reason, in darkness instead of light.'

This scientific foundation of morals, general utility, or the greatest happiness principle (adds John S. Mill) holds that actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness. This utilitarian standard, however, is not the agent's own greatest happiness but, the greatest amount of happiness altogether. Utilitarianism therefore can only attain its end by the general cultivation of nobleness of character, and the multiplication of happiness is, according to such standard of ethics, the object of virtue. Thus it embraces not only our duties, but by what test we may know them. And the highest life, says Herbert Spencer, is that which includes the greatest happiness, and that happiness is the supreme virtuous end is beyond question true, for it is the concomitant of that ultimate end which every theory of moral guidance has distinctly, or vaguely in view.

Such shortly is the ideal of Science in regard to the true nature of virtue, but so backward is our present social state, that so far from our being able to realise such an ideal, the greater part of our present virtue consists in practising the duty of self-denial, lest the attempted gratification of our own faculties and activities should interfere with corresponding gratifications on the part of others. For (says Herbert Spencer) the maintenance of equitable relations all round is the condition to the attainment of the greatest happiness of all.

There is probably no subject respecting which the teachings of Theology and Science are more at variance than in their respective views concerning the dreadful ordeal of War. You know, if you consult the pages of the Bible, you find that War is treated as almost, under

certain circumstances, a normal condition of human existence. I will not stay to quote texts illustrating this conclusion, in which the Deity is represented as the Lord of Hosts, as the God of Battles, as a Man of War, over and over again taking part in and encouraging warfare, and even expressly commanding Wars to be undertaken.

What the human mind may be degraded into believing through the too exclusive study of Theology, and the too confiding credulity in all that we find written in the old historical books of the semi-barbarous Hebrews, may be gathered from a recent utterance of one of our learned Bishops, who declared that he believed War was one of the means by which the Almighty carried on the government of the world, and promoted civilization!

Now Science cannot conceive an Almighty power governing or encouraging a world of human beings through the dreadful horrors of war, and such power could not, in any scientific sense, be regarded as beneficent, if he were really capable of coolly carrying on human government by means of the atrocious machinery of warfare. According to Science, such an idea can only be a delusion of the morbid imagination, enfeebled through unreflecting faith in the senseless suggestions of superstition. Science can indeed show that it is quite unnecessary to attribute war to the intentional Will of an Almighty Supernatural Being, for it can trace its causes to the passions of human nature, acting in ignorance or disregard of those preventives of war which the human understanding, enlightened by Science, has succeeded in discovering, and by following which wars might be altogether banished from the face of the earth, or, at least, from amongst the Nations of Europe. Hence in nearly all such Nations have arisen Peace Societies, founded for the purpose of diffusing such intelligence amongst the people at large, that they, being instructed to recognise

that their true interest always lies on the side of Peace, may, through enlightened public opinion, bring pressure to bear upon their rulers, in order that Peace may be preserved, and the horrors of War avoided. That this could even now be effected, through the instrumentality of International Arbitration, can hardly be doubted by those who have considered the subject from a scientific point of view.

I may now then conclude by affirming that the sentiments 'Good-will towards men' and 'Peace on Earth,' though expelled from Sacred Scripture, and disowned by dogmatic Theology, are the inalienable heritage of Science, and under its guardianship will remain, to exemplify the sublime sympathies of those noble-minded men, whose fervent thoughts and dignified lives are devoted to the realisation of their spontaneous aspirations to improve, to lift up, and to sweeten the earthly lives of their fellow-creatures; aspirations which superstition has not succeeded in suppressing, because they are the natural promptings of the uncorrupted heart, and mind, and conscience of man, civilized through Science.

