



PROJECT MUSE®

---

John Robert Seeley, *Natural Religion*, and the Victorian  
Conflict between Science and Religion

Ian Hesketh

Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 79, Number 2, April 2018, pp. 309-329  
(Article)

Published by University of Pennsylvania Press



➔ For additional information about this article

<https://muse.jhu.edu/article/693306>

## *John Robert Seeley, Natural Religion, and the Victorian Conflict between Science and Religion*

Ian Hesketh

When the historian John Robert Seeley was knighted in 1894, less than a year before his death at the age of sixty, he was finally recognized for his lifelong work as a leading English historian who had helped establish history as a growing professional discipline of knowledge in England. In particular, he received long-overdue recognition for *The Expansion of England*, his slender but “epoch making” 1883 book that put into practice much of what Seeley had advocated for the discipline of history, namely that it pursue an explicitly political subject matter and be written with presentist designs.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, it situated the contemporary British Empire within a larger historical trajectory that famously debunked the absurd notion that the English had “conquered and peopled half the world in a fit of absence of mind.”<sup>2</sup> In showing that this was not, in fact, the case, *The Expansion of England* challenged contemporary politicians to learn from England’s imperial past in order to avoid being lulled into a sense of self-satisfied superiority and acquiesce to the status quo.

---

<sup>1</sup> Canon John Neale Dalton referred to Seeley’s “epoch making book,” in Dalton to Seeley, 26 March 1894, Seeley Papers, Senate House Library, University of London (hereafter Seeley Papers), MS 903/1B/18: 25. For Seeley’s vision of the historical profession as a “school of statesmanship” see Seeley, “The Teaching of Politics: An Inaugural Lecture delivered at Cambridge,” in Seeley, *Lectures and Essays* (London: Macmillan, 1870), 290–317.

<sup>2</sup> Seeley, *The Expansion of England: Two Courses of Lectures* (London: Macmillan, 1883), 8.

Much has been written about *The Expansion of England*, both for what it said about the state of the late Victorian empire and also for how the book made clear to contemporaries the importance of history in informing future imperial policies.<sup>3</sup> But its significance in this sense has overshadowed another book of Seeley's that was published one year before, a book that was central to Seeley's overarching historiographical commitments as well as to understanding and conceptualizing changing relations between science and religion at the time. If historians of the British Empire have long recognized the relevance of Seeley's *Expansion of England*, historians of historiography, science, and religion have much to gain by considering more thoroughly the publication and reception of *Natural Religion* (1882).

*Natural Religion* was written about most recently by the intellectual historian Duncan Bell in an attempt to illustrate how Seeley's conception of the British Empire was informed by his religious sensibilities.<sup>4</sup> While Bell's analysis is a welcome corrective to those interpretations that have misunderstood Seeley's devotion to a "political" history as both a narrowing and secularizing of the burgeoning historical profession, my purposes for revisiting *Natural Religion* are quite different. Although it was published in 1882, the book was largely written in the mid to late 1870s in an attempt to bring about a general reconciliation between science and religion. This is particularly relevant in light of Peter Harrison's recent work, which traces the emergence of "science" and "religion" as modern categories, arguing that it was only in the nineteenth century that the two entities became separated and therefore could come to represent seemingly opposing views of the natural world.<sup>5</sup> From this perspective, *Natural Religion* can be read as a response to a growing perception that science and religion needed to be kept separate to avoid the kind of conflict that had forestalled the growth of scientific knowledge in the past—as was being maintained in contemporary

<sup>3</sup> See, for instance, Amanda Behn, "Empire Divided: Seeley's *Expansion of England* in Context," *Storia della storiografia* 61, no. 1 (2012): 59–74; Teodoro Tagliaferri, "Legitimizing Imperial Authority: Greater Britain and India in the Historical Vision of John R. Seeley," *Storia della storiografia* 61, no. 1 (2012): 75–94; Theodore Koditschek, *Liberalism, Imperialism, and the Historical Imagination: Nineteenth-Century Visions of a Greater Britain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2011); and Duncan Bell, *The Idea of Greater Britain: Empire and the Future of World Order, 1860–1900* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

<sup>4</sup> Bell, *Reordering the World: Essays on Liberalism and Empire* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016), chap. 11.

<sup>5</sup> Peter Harrison, *The Territories of Science and Religion* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

histories of science that engendered what has become known as the “conflict thesis.”<sup>6</sup>

In his attempted eirenicon, Seeley sought to redefine the categories of science and religion as entities that were themselves the products of historical developments, thereby anticipating recent modern scholarship on the subject. Religion, Seeley argued, much like science, had a progressive history though it was one that threatened to stall due to the continued presence of supernaturalism in its modes of explanation. By rejecting supernatural explanations, Seeley suggested that science and religion could converge and form a “natural religion,” one that adhered to scientific explanations of natural phenomena while being tempered by a universal moral code derived from Christianity. A new developmental narrative of life could therefore emerge to replace that of the biblical creation story, while prophecy could be reborn in the form of a thoroughly modern philosophy of history based on contemporary scientific knowledge.

Examination of some of the contemporary critical commentaries will show that Seeley’s proposed reconciliation was taken quite seriously. However, it must be said that when historians of science seek to consider popular representations of science and religion at the end of the nineteenth century, they typically turn not to the narrative of reconciliation offered by Seeley but rather to the narratives of conflict offered by the likes of John William Draper and Andrew Dickson White.<sup>7</sup> Thus it is unsurprising that Seeley’s *Natural Religion* was not terribly successful in shaping the longer-term discussion about the relationship between science and religion. But its ultimate failure in this regard was due, at least in part, to the way in which it was published. Most significantly, the book was signed not by Seeley but rather “by the Author of *Ecce Homo*,” which necessarily invoked a set of associations relevant to the publication of Seeley’s first book, the anonymous *Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ* (1865). This essay therefore seeks to combine the approaches of the history of science and intellectual history with that of book history in order to consider the reception of Seeley’s attempted reconciliation of science and religion.<sup>8</sup> Attending

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of the origins of the conflict thesis see the introduction in Ronald L. Numbers, ed., *Galileo Goes to Jail and Other Myths about Science and Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

<sup>7</sup> John William Draper, *History of the Conflict between Religion and Science* (New York: D. Appleton, 1874); Andrew Dickson White, *The Warfare of Science* (New York: D. Appleton, 1876); and White, *A History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom*, 2 vols. (New York: D. Appleton, 1896).

<sup>8</sup> Relevant examples of this interdisciplinary approach include James Secord, *Victorian Sensation: The Extraordinary Publication, Reception, and Secret Authorship of Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000); Aileen

to the way in which *Natural Religion* was published—and to the way in which readers and reviewers responded to the way in which it was published—gives us insight into changing views about the relationship between science and religion at the time. More specifically, the publication of *Natural Religion* gave readers an opportunity to lament a state of affairs that was already largely accepted, namely that science and religion were distinct categories that were likely to remain in conflict long into the future, irrespective of—or perhaps even symbolized by—Seeley’s efforts.

### ANONYMOUS PUBLISHING AND *ECCE HOMO*

Even though *Natural Religion* was published in book form in 1882, much of the book’s contents appeared first in the mid to late 1870s as a series of ten essays on the topic of “Natural Religion” in the monthly *Macmillan’s Magazine*. Significantly, when Seeley negotiated how these articles were to be published in the journal, he stressed that they had to appear anonymously. This was a problem for the publisher, Alexander Macmillan, as well as the monthly’s editor, George Grove, in part because the journal was founded on the principle that articles should be signed by their authors, unlike the typical practice of some of the older periodicals. Seeley’s wishes therefore directly contradicted the trends of a burgeoning liberal ideology that fetishized the “individual opinion,” an ideology that was shared by many of Seeley’s friends and associates.<sup>9</sup> And compounding this problem was Seeley’s emerging status as an important public figure. Just a few years before, in 1869, he was appointed Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge, one of the two leading historical positions in the nation. His name alone would have likely attracted an interested and large readership. Without it, Macmillan and Grove assumed that the articles, no matter how inherently interesting, would fail to find much of an audience.

---

Fyfe, *Science and Salvation: Evangelical Popular Science Publishing in Victorian Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2004); and, more recently, Melinda Baldwin, *Making Nature: The History of A Scientific Journal* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015). For a very useful introduction to book history see Leslie Howsam, *Old Books and New Histories: An Orientation to Studies in Book and Print Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2006).

<sup>9</sup> Elaine Hadley, *Living Liberalism: Practical Citizenship in Mid-Victorian Britain* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2010), chap. 3; and see also George J. Worth, *Macmillan’s Magazine, 1859–1907: “No Flippancy or Abuse Allowed”* (Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2003), 32; Oscar Maurer, Jr., “Anonymity vs. Signature in Victorian Reviewing,” *Studies in English* 27 (June 1948): 1–27; and David Vincent, *The Culture of Secrecy: Britain, 1832–1998* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998), 65–66.

Seeley was adamant, however, that he had compelling reasons for wanting to remain anonymous. “It may seem to you whimsical that I should choose to run the risk of such a failure when I have a ready means of securing attention,” he wrote to Grove. “It would be very whimsical if the question were of a poem or a novel, but on more burning subjects popularity brings much more pain than pleasure, and besides pain perplexity and anxiety. The truth is I had much rather fail as you anticipate than succeed in the other way.”<sup>10</sup> On this point, Seeley spoke from experience.

He was referring implicitly to the controversy that surrounded his first book, *Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ*, which was published by Macmillan in 1865 when Seeley was a relatively unknown classics professor at University College, London. Published anonymously, *Ecce Homo* would prove to be successful—and remarkably so. While Seeley sought to avoid controversy by writing specifically about Christ’s moral philosophy, arguing that Christ engendered an “enthusiasm of humanity” in his followers, the book sparked a debate about whether it was possible or even desirable to separate Christian morality from its theology. *Ecce Homo* did have a great many admirers from across the Anglican spectrum, from Tractarians like William Ewart Gladstone and Richard William Church, to liberal broad churchmen like Frederick Denison Maurice and Arthur Penrhyn Stanley with whom Seeley more closely identified.<sup>11</sup> But *Ecce Homo* also received a fair amount of abuse, most notably from outspoken high churchmen such as George Denison and the Evangelical leader Lord Shaftesbury, who declared at a meeting of the Church Pastoral-Aid Society that *Ecce Homo* was “the most pestilential book ever vomited from the jaws of hell.”<sup>12</sup> This hyperbole was utilized to great effect by Macmillan, who advertised the book with snippets from reviews declaring the book “dangerous.”<sup>13</sup> But that was the kind of success Seeley was later to argue was “rather alarming than otherwise.”<sup>14</sup> And this was no doubt because

<sup>10</sup> Seeley to George Grove, 13 December 1875, Macmillan Archive, British Library, London (hereafter Macmillan Archive), Add MS 55074: 13.

<sup>11</sup> William Ewart Gladstone to Macmillan, 25 December 1865, Seeley Papers, MS 903/3A/1; Gladstone, *On Ecce Homo* (London: Strahan & Co., 1868); [Richard William Church], “Ecce Homo,” *The Guardian*, 7 February 1866, republished in Church, “Ecce Homo,” in *Occasional Papers* (London: Macmillan, 1897), 133–79; Frederick Denison Maurice to Macmillan, 4 January 1866, Seeley Papers, MS 309/3A/1; and A. P. S. [Arthur Penrhyn Stanley], “Ecce Homo,” *Macmillan’s Magazine* 14, no. 8 (June 1866): 134–42.

<sup>12</sup> George A. Denison, “Ecce Homo,” *The Churchman*, 29 March 1866, 304, Seeley Papers, MS 903/3B/1; “Lord Shaftesbury’s Inferno,” *Saturday Review*, 19 May 1866, 586–87; Lord Shaftesbury, diary entry, 12 May 1865, MS 62/SHA/PD/8, University of Southampton.

<sup>13</sup> See, for instance, *The Reader*, 10 February 1866, 163.

<sup>14</sup> Seeley to Macmillan, 7 July 1872, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55074: 8.

along with this alarming success came a concerted effort to discover the identity of the author, who was variously surmised to be George Eliot or John Henry Newman or James Anthony Froude or even Emperor Napoleon III.<sup>15</sup> The book took on a life of its own.<sup>16</sup>

When on 10 November 1866 the editor of the weekly *Spectator* publicized the fact that “*Ecce Homo!* appears to be at last definitely traced to Professor Seeley, of University College, London,” Seeley’s authorship became an open secret.<sup>17</sup> This upset Seeley even while the book would go on to sell upwards of twenty thousand copies in Britain in just three years.<sup>18</sup> Seeley was particularly anxious that the secret be kept from his Evangelical family. His father was Robert Benton Seeley, a well-known Evangelical publisher and author who had also worked closely with Lord Shaftesbury in establishing the Church Pastoral-Aid Society—and may very well have been present when Shaftesbury referred to *Ecce Homo*’s infernal origins. So when his authorship was discovered, Seeley received letters from family members such as his cousin Maria who urged him “to reconsider the awful step you have taken” by dishonoring “our Lord and Saviour” and causing much “trouble [to] enter many hearts and homes.”<sup>19</sup> This was precisely what Seeley was referring to when he told Macmillan that he was particularly conscious of the fact “that however much good I may hope to do I cannot fail also to do harm.”<sup>20</sup>

After his authorship was discovered and the sensation of *Ecce Homo* dissipated, Seeley aimed to avoid controversy in his appointment as Regius Professor of Modern History at Cambridge. He sought to establish himself as a leading English historian, embracing a set of methodological prescriptions that were at the time labelled with the term “scientific history.” Along with his counterparts at Oxford (William Stubbs and, later, Edward Augustus Freeman), Seeley argued that the scientific historian should focus on a careful treatment of a set of documentary sources in order to produce a specialized study that would be written in an unadorned style. Seeley

<sup>15</sup> See, for instance, “Literary Gossip,” *The London Review*, 19 May 1866, 572.

<sup>16</sup> I discuss more thoroughly the way *Ecce Homo* took on a life of its own in *Victorian Jesus: J. R. Seeley, Religion, and the Cultural Significance of Anonymity* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2017). See also Daniel L. Pals, “The Reception of ‘Ecce Homo,’” *Historical Magazine of the Protestant Episcopal Church* 46, no. 1 (1977): 63–84.

<sup>17</sup> *The Spectator*, 10 November 1866, 1243.

<sup>18</sup> Sales figures are discussed in the letters from Macmillan to Seeley, Seeley Papers, MS 903/3A/1. See also the advertisement in *The Spectator*, 11 January 1868, 59, declaring sales of 19,000 copies.

<sup>19</sup> Maria Seeley to Seeley, Seeley Papers, MS 903/3A/4.

<sup>20</sup> Seeley to Macmillan, 7 July 1872, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55074: 8.

was particularly adamant that the historian should avoid at all costs the temptation to falsify or sensationalize the past with dramatic rhetoric. Despite his intentions, Seeley's Cambridge appointment was a controversial one. It was unclear just what authority Seeley had to guide the study of modern history at Cambridge, particularly given that he had at that point authored only one work of theology, which was considered irrelevant to his position as Regius Professor. Seeley worked very hard to change the public's perception about who he was and what he stood for.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, professional considerations influenced Seeley's publishing strategies of the 1870s and further complicated his relationship to *Ecce Homo*.

This is an important consideration because when *Ecce Homo* was first published, the author claimed that it was only the first of a two-part study. If *Ecce Homo* dealt with Christ's humanity, a sequel was meant to deal with the theological implications that Seeley was so eager to avoid. In fact, one of the strategies employed to combat some of the criticisms of *Ecce Homo* was precisely to allude to that future study; consequently some reviewers declined to pass full judgment on *Ecce Homo* until the next volume appeared.<sup>22</sup> And *Ecce Homo*'s Boston publisher even explicitly marketed *Ecce Homo* as the first of two volumes.<sup>23</sup> So while Seeley was seemingly moving in a very different direction in the 1870s, both professionally and intellectually, he recognized that a promise had gone unfulfilled during that time and was still willing to complete the larger project of which *Ecce Homo* was but a part. But, at this stage in his career, he was adamant that it would only be completed on his own terms.

#### BY THE AUTHOR OF *ECCE HOMO*

Seeley would eventually complete the second part of the project, but publishing it as a series of anonymous articles in *Macmillan's Magazine*, with no suggestion that they were a continuation of the sensational *Ecce Homo*,

<sup>21</sup> Hesketh, *The Science of History in Victorian Britain*, chap. 4; Hesketh, "Writing History in Macaulay's Shadow: J. R. Seeley, E. A. Freeman, and the Audience for Scientific History in Late Victorian Britain," *The Journal for the Canadian Historical Association* 22, no. 2 (2011): 30–56; and Howsam, *Past into Print: The Publishing of History in Britain, 1850–1950* (London: British Library, 2009), 50–54.

<sup>22</sup> See, for instance, "Ecce Homo," *Dublin University Magazine* 68, no. 403 (July 1866): 75–91, at 76–77.

<sup>23</sup> *Ecce Homo: A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ* (Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1866), verso of the half-title: "In Preparation; *Christ as the Creator of Modern Theology and Religion*. By the Author of *Ecce Homo*."



was not terribly beneficial for Seeley's publisher. As discussed above, both Macmillan and Grove made their opposition to this plan quite clear, but they eventually had to concede, as Seeley would not reconsider his position despite the dire warnings that the articles would likely be ignored. The first five installments of the anonymous "Natural Religion" were published in close succession in 1875 in *Macmillan's Magazine*. Unfortunately, the last five installments were stretched out over several years, with the final, tenth installment appearing in 1878.<sup>24</sup> In 1877 Macmillan wrote to Seeley that he "wish[ed] you would have allowed us to put by the Author of [*Ecce Homo*] to the articles in the Magazine. It would have done good all around."<sup>25</sup> Macmillan lamented this decision because as he had predicted, in the form of anonymous articles, "Natural Religion" does not appear to have generated any interest at all. He was, however, still hoping to publish the articles in book form and was anxious for Seeley to agree to do so.<sup>26</sup>

Seeley was surprised but thankful that Macmillan was still interested in publishing the articles as a book and he seems to have agreed to sign the book in some way in order to help with the marketing, though what precisely was decided is unclear. What is clear, however, is that at this stage Seeley was not in a hurry to have the book version published. He was in the final stages of writing his specialized multivolume study of German history that would be published as *The Life and Times of Stein, Or Germany and Prussia in the Napoleonic Age* (1878).<sup>27</sup> While he did not want to disrupt his schedule in finishing this important study, he was also perhaps more troubled by the timing of publishing *Natural Religion*. He was concerned that should the books appear simultaneously, or in close succession, readers might be confused by the relationship between the two works. And as *The Life and Times of Stein* was meant to establish Seeley's reputation as a leading modern historian, and moreover justify his Cambridge position, he did not want the publishing of *Natural Religion* to undermine all his hard work in this regard. "All you say has weight," Macmillan wrote

<sup>24</sup> "Natural Religion" was originally published in *Macmillan's Magazine* in ten installments: I: 31, no. 184 (February 1875): 357–67; II: 31, no. 186 (April 1875): 473–83; III: 32, no. 189 (July 1875): 193–204; IV: 32, no. 192 (October 1875): 481–89; V: 33, no. 189 (November 1875): 1–9; VI: 33, no. 197 (March 1876): 385–93; VII: 34, no. 200 (June 1876): 156–67; VIII: 34, no. 204 (October 1876): 522–34; IX: 35, no. 210 (April 1877): 417–29; X: 37, no. 219 (January 1878): 177–91.

<sup>25</sup> Macmillan to Seeley, 11 January 1877, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55401: 374.

<sup>26</sup> Macmillan to Seeley, 30 January 1877, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55401: 550; Macmillan to Seeley, 20 June 1877, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55403: 208; and Macmillan to Seeley, 11 December 1877, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55404: 478.

<sup>27</sup> Seeley to Macmillan, 6 February 1877, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55074: 18.

in response to Seeley's request to delay the publication of *Natural Religion*, "but if you publish it as *by the author of 'Ecce Homo'* and not the Professor a good deal of the objection to immediate publication would vanish." Macmillan's point was that even though discerning readers would recognize that the two books were written by the same person, they would also know to read the books differently based on the different signatures.<sup>28</sup>

Clearly, Seeley found this suggestion intriguing. Yet he was still adamant that the publication of the two books needed to be staggered. So *The Life and Times of Stein* would appear in 1878, and it was almost universally regarded as the product of an immense amount of empirical research combined with a suitable inductive methodology thereby helping to secure Seeley's identity as a legitimate modern historian.<sup>29</sup> Macmillan would have to wait until 1882 when Seeley would finally consent to the publication of his *Natural Religion*. But it would be signed, as Macmillan originally suggested, "by the Author of *Ecce Homo*," thereby linking the book explicitly to the anonymous—and sensationally popular—*Ecce Homo* and ensuring that the book would receive more notice than the articles and, moreover, that it would be read in connection with its bibliographic lineage.<sup>30</sup> Expectations would be very high indeed.

But *Natural Religion* was actually quite distinct from its predecessor, in part reflecting changing historical circumstances. *Ecce Homo* was written at a time in the 1860s when the uptake of historical criticism was perceived as a challenge to central Christian theological dogmas. Seeley sought to counter that perception by stressing Christ's high moral wisdom as the real foundation for the development of Christian society. Even though *Ecce Homo* is often considered a product of the "historical Jesus" genre,<sup>31</sup> and is therefore grouped with critical biographies like those of Renan and Strauss, it is more accurately an essay on Christian morality that sought to reflect on how certain Christian principles, such as philanthropy and a love of humanity, should be understood in a modern context. *Ecce Homo* therefore sought to provide a positive framework for belief in Christ, a framework that was decidedly missing from other liberal works of biblical

<sup>28</sup> Macmillan to Seeley, 1 January 1878, Macmillan Archive, Add MS 55404: 646 (emphasis added).

<sup>29</sup> See, for instance, reviews in *The Examiner*, 18 January 1879, 84–85; *The Saturday Review*, 7 January 1879, 146–47; and *Westminster Review* 55, no. 2 (April 1879): 329–59.

<sup>30</sup> On the function of "by the author of . . ." in anonymous publishing see Robert J. Griffin, "Anonymity and Authorship," *New Literary History* 30 (1999): 877–95.

<sup>31</sup> See, for instance, Pals, *The Victorian "Lives" of Jesus* (San Antonio, TX: Trinity University Press, 1982); and Jennifer Stevens, *The Historical Jesus and the Literary Imagination, 1860–1920* (Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010).

criticism at the time, such as the controversial *Essays and Reviews* (1860) and Bishop Colenso's critical studies of the Pentateuch.<sup>32</sup>

*Natural Religion*, on the other hand, was written in the mid-1870s when debates about the relationship between science and religion were intensifying. John William Draper's *History of the Conflict of Science and Religion* was published in 1874, followed closely by Andrew Dickson White's *The Warfare of Science*, published in 1876. Both works seemed to imply a necessarily conflictual relationship between science and religion, a theme that the physicist John Tyndall seemed to endorse in his famous 1874 "Belfast Address." Recent work by James Ungureanu, for instance, has shown that proponents of this "conflict thesis" were not necessarily anti-religious, as they often couched their claims within the rhetoric of a "new reformation" that would further purify religion of the corrupting influence of centuries of Anglican dogma.<sup>33</sup> But central to the new reformation was the establishment of distinct boundaries between science and religion and the argument that for the sake of scientific progress, they must be kept separate.<sup>34</sup> This was a view that Seeley sought to challenge.

Seeley argued that he wrote *Natural Religion* to engage with "the fashionable scientific world," which was led by a group of scientific men who rejected revealed religion as a matter of course, treating it with contempt. He moreover argued that "the men whose minds are in this state are now all-powerful over opinion, and they are forming a vast school of young crusaders, whose one ambition is to destroy religion." While Seeley was careful to avoid naming anyone in particular, it seems likely that this group of young crusaders would go on to be known as "scientific naturalists."<sup>35</sup> What was most interesting about this group, Seeley continued, was that "just at the moment of victory they are seized with a misgiving. They begin to stammer out that it is not religion they hate, but only Christianity; that . . . when Christianity is destroyed, some other religion must be substituted

<sup>32</sup> On the controversy surrounding *Essays and Reviews* as well as the related works of Bishop Colenso see Victor Shea and William Whitla, eds., *Essays and Reviews: The 1860 Text and Its Readings* (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 2000).

<sup>33</sup> James Ungureanu, "The Origins of the 'Conflict Thesis': Draper, White, and the Protestant Tradition" (PhD thesis, University of Queensland, Australia, 2017). See also Richard Shafer, "Andrew Dickson White and the History of a Religious Future," *Zygon* 50, no. 1 (March 2015): 7–27.

<sup>34</sup> Bernard Lightman, "Victorian Sciences and Religions: Discordant Harmonies," *Osiris* 16 (2001): 343–66, at 355.

<sup>35</sup> See, for instance, Gowan Dawson and Lightman, eds., *Victorian Scientific Naturalism: Community, Identity, Continuity* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014); and Frank Turner, *Between Science and Religion: The Reaction to Scientific Naturalism in Late Victorian England* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 1974).

for it. I try to catch them in this mood.”<sup>36</sup> Ultimately, Seeley sought “to show that if all the negations of the fashionable scientific world were true, there still remains a religion of considerable and indispensable use.”<sup>37</sup>

Thus, a significant portion of *Natural Religion* was concerned with showing the common ground between sides in the “present strife between Christianity and Science.”<sup>38</sup> Seeley first established that Christianity and modern science actually agree on fundamental assumptions about the natural world and universe, such as the belief in the uniformity of nature and its laws, as well as a recognition of the inherent limitations of human knowledge. He also suggested that the God of the Hebrew Bible is not much different from what scientific men call Nature, as both views entail an infinite and eternal power. “Whether they [the fashionable men of science] say God, or prefer to say Nature, the important thing is that their minds are filled with the sense of a Power to all appearance infinite and eternal, a Power to which their own being is inseparably connected, in the knowledge of whose ways alone is safety and wellbeing, in the contemplation of which they find a beatific vision.” Seeley’s point was that this “God is also the God of the Christians.”<sup>39</sup> Moreover, both the Christian and the man of science recognize “that all happiness depends upon the knowledge of the Laws of Nature, and the careful adaptation of human life to them.”<sup>40</sup> What the scientific view of nature was missing, however, was a sense of humanity that was provided by Christianity. Under Seeley’s scheme, therefore, “Nature including Humanity would be our God.”<sup>41</sup>

Despite these similarities, argued Seeley, there remained a barrier separating these apparently competing modes of thought, or what Seeley often referred to as “opposite religions,”<sup>42</sup> namely Christianity’s putative basis in the supernatural. As can be deduced from his title, Seeley argued that Christianity needed to abandon supernaturalism as an unnecessary survival from an early stage of its development. In embracing a developmental interpretation of Christianity’s history, Seeley argued that it had gone through a series of stages analogous to the growth of the individual. The supernatural was therefore the by-product of a stage of youth that had to be discarded in Christianity’s current state of adulthood and then merge with modern

<sup>36</sup> [Seeley], “‘Natural Religion,’ and its Drift,” *The Spectator*, 16 June 1883, 767–68.

<sup>37</sup> [Seeley], 767.

<sup>38</sup> *Natural Religion*, by the Author of *Ecce Homo* (London: Macmillan, 1882), 8.

<sup>39</sup> *Natural Religion*, 28.

<sup>40</sup> *Natural Religion*, 25.

<sup>41</sup> *Natural Religion*, 82.

<sup>42</sup> *Natural Religion*, 5.

civilization itself by embracing both science and art. Seeley stressed that it was important to recognize what was truly eternal about Christianity, such as its moral code, as reflected in the figure of Jesus Christ, from what was merely historically contingent, such as the promotion of the miraculous, which was a product of the time. This was important because he believed contemporary society to be “throwing off at once the melancholy and the unmeasured imaginations of youth; it is recovering, as manhood does, something of the glee of childhood and adding to that a new sense of reality. Its return to childhood is called *Renaissance*, its acquisition of the sense of reality is called Science.”<sup>43</sup>

This new sense of reality, argued Seeley, channeling the kind of overarching evolutionary narrative found in *Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation* (1844), referred to a law of development as applied to all things.<sup>44</sup> What was now key for Seeley was for this law of development to be revealed as the basis of a great new religion, one that would be “as convincing to the modern mind as . . . miracles [were] to the mind of antiquity.”<sup>45</sup> For that to happen, however, another ancient practice needed to be restored, namely the practice of prophecy, a practice that was enabled thanks to the rise of scientific history.<sup>46</sup>

Seeley recognized that the story drawn from the Bible and from Church doctrine, a story that provided something like “a map of history,” was no longer “serviceable” to the vast majority. What was needed was a new grand outline of history, one that not only applied the eternal law of the universe to the past but also utilized the prophetic spirit of science to guide the direction of future progress.<sup>47</sup> According to Seeley, his scheme of “natural religion” would unite science, history, and prophecy to establish a new grand narrative of life that would counter the “anarchy which is already almost upon us.”<sup>48</sup>

Seeley was not only seeking to adapt Christianity to modern circumstances. He was also seeking to offer a historical narrative that would provide the basis for this adapted form of Christianity, “a grand outline” that would replace the one drawn from the Bible that was no longer useful. It was, moreover, his newly adopted discipline of scientific history that would show the way, by renewing an ancient form of prophecy that would now be

<sup>43</sup> *Natural Religion*, 178.

<sup>44</sup> *Natural Religion*, 26; on *Vestiges* see Secord, *Victorian Sensation*.

<sup>45</sup> *Natural Religion*, 223.

<sup>46</sup> *Natural Religion*, 271.

<sup>47</sup> *Natural Religion*, 243.

<sup>48</sup> *Natural Religion*, 270–71.

informed by the science of historical development. “By reviving prophecy in its modern form of a philosophy of history,” argued Seeley, “we at once adapt religion to the present age and restore it to its original character.”<sup>49</sup>

### RECEPTIONS OF NATURAL RELIGION

While *Natural Religion* was ultimately an attempt to construct a middle ground where Christianity and science could meet on equal terms, Seeley was right to worry that this seemingly innocuous message would meet much opposition. And compounding that issue was the fact that in book form, there was a clear connection made between *Natural Religion* and *Ecce Homo*. Interestingly, the public’s perception of *Ecce Homo* had mellowed in the sixteen years since it was published. The controversy surrounding its publication had largely been forgotten in favor of a general nostalgia for the moralistic view of Christ and Christianity that was central to its content. By referring to *Natural Religion* as “by the Author of *Ecce Homo*,” Seeley invited the reader to remember the experience of reading *Ecce Homo*, with the expectation that *Natural Religion* would provide a similar experience. Some readers were therefore terribly disappointed when *Natural Religion* did not live up to their expectations.

Many of the letters Seeley received upon *Natural Religion*’s publication made that apparent. To give one example, after observing that *Natural Religion* was “full of interesting and suggestive thoughts,” a Mrs. J. Ross (sister of the classics scholar John Stuart Blackie) said that she finished the volume “with a feeling of dissatisfaction, missing there, the living Christ who was made so real to me in *Ecce Homo*.” She was actually in disbelief that “the author of *Ecce Homo* should think it possible that a Christianity without faith in a living Christ can live as a faith powerful and regenerate humanity.” She clearly had her own idea about what a sequel to *Ecce Homo* should look like, and *Natural Religion* did not fulfill that vision. Indeed, she claimed that ever since she read *Ecce Homo* she “earnestly hoped that God would give you strength to redeem your promise that you would give another book on Christ as the Creator of Modern Theology and religion. Is it possible that ‘Natural Religion’ is the promised book? Some men have suggested that it is—but I will not think it!”<sup>50</sup> It clearly pained her to imagine that *Natural Religion* was that long promised sequel.

<sup>49</sup> *Natural Religion*, 296.

<sup>50</sup> Mrs. J. Ross to Seeley, 2 November 1888, Seeley Papers, MS 903/3A/4.

The review literature reflected a similar disappointment with *Natural Religion*. The Tory *Quarterly Review*, perhaps unsurprisingly, hated *Natural Religion*, but its primary critique was one widely shared: “For sixteen years we have been waiting for the fulfilment of the promise held out in ‘Ecce Homo,’ that ‘Christ, as the creator of modern theology and religion, will make the subject of another volume,’ and at last we are put off with a farrago of science and culture, a pseudo-religion, from which Christ and God have been ejected to make room for Humanity and Nature. Instead of the bread we hoped for, a stone has been thrown to us; instead of a fish we have been mocked with a serpent.” The reviewer was convinced that *Natural Religion* was evidence that the author’s faith must have receded since writing *Ecce Homo*.<sup>51</sup> This was also the view of the novelist and Catholic sympathizer William Hurrell Mallock who argued that as a second volume, Seeley’s *Natural Religion* “is a complete, though unconscious, condemnation of his first.” He, moreover, found *Natural Religion* to be “a sad and singular book, and to any careful reader it must present itself in two lights—first, as a series of impersonal arguments; secondly, as a personal confession—a mental autobiography.”<sup>52</sup> In other words, *Natural Religion* was a confession for Seeley’s declining religiosity. John Robinson Gregory, writing in *The Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine*, extended this argument about Seeley’s loss of faith by suggesting that it was analogous with that of society as a whole.<sup>53</sup> Indeed, for Gregory, the author of *Natural Religion* “is distinctly a representative man” of the current age. “From him we can learn the direction in which the thought of an influential section of our fellow-countrymen is trending.”<sup>54</sup> *Natural Religion* represented a movement that pointed distinctly away from Christianity toward a dreaded materialism. For Gregory, Mallock, and the *Quarterly Review*, Seeley had not reconciled science and Christianity but had in fact contributed to the growing public perception that faith was in decline in favor of scientism.

There were some genuinely positive reviews, however. Yet tellingly they still worked to substantiate the more general claim that *Natural Religion* represented a profound shift in both Seeley’s and the public’s perception concerning religious truths. The *Athenaeum*, for instance, while believing

<sup>51</sup> [W. T. Davidson], “Natural Religion,” *The Quarterly Review*, 154 (Oct 1882): 425–47, at 447.

<sup>52</sup> [William Hurrell Mallock], “Natural Religion,” *Edinburgh Review* 156 (Oct 1882): 508–51, at 517.

<sup>53</sup> John Robinson Gregory, “Natural Religion,” *The Wesleyan-Methodist Magazine* (December 1882): 904–14, at 914.

<sup>54</sup> Gregory, 904.

that *Natural Religion* was written by a “genius” found the results not false or ill-conceived but actually rather “depressing”: “it shows how fast and how far the world has been drifting since 1866 to reflect that this book takes the place of an exposition of ‘Christ’s theology’ promised in the preface of ‘Ecce Homo.’”<sup>55</sup> William Henry Simcox, writing for *The Academy*, argued that “much had happened” between the publishing of *Essays and Reviews* in 1860 and that of *Ecce Homo* in 1866 when that book “was half accepted by the orthodox as an ally, if not a champion, of the cause they held dear.” But the publishing of *Natural Religion* made it very clear that much “more has happened between the publication of *Ecce Homo* and the present day.” This was evidenced by the fact that “the public mind has come to regard as open questions, not only the infallibility of the Christian Scriptures, not only the supernatural origin of the Christian Revelation, but the fundamental axioms of all religion as hitherto understood in Europe.”<sup>56</sup> Simcox stressed that the author “succeeded admirably” in grasping the religious problem of 1866 while proposing a thoughtful solution that gained many orthodox and heterodox adherents. While Simcox believed that Seeley had once again grasped the “problem of the present,” and perhaps even dealt with that problem “with more originality, and at least as much force” as he did in *Ecce Homo*, Simcox doubted that *Natural Religion* “will be equally successful in exactly catching the public attention of the moment.”<sup>57</sup>

In this almost visceral sense, the connection to *Ecce Homo* did *Natural Religion* a profound disservice. Readers could not help being disappointed by the fact that Seeley could not produce a more positive framework for the reconciliation of faith and skepticism as he seemed to accomplish with *Ecce Homo*. Moreover, the enthusiasm for a humanistic conception of Christianity that was so central to *Ecce Homo* seemed to be completely missing from *Natural Religion*. *The Athenaeum* believed that readers would find that Seeley’s “words are wise but sad.” With *Ecce Homo* he was able to “fire [readers] with faith,” but with *Natural Religion* he sought “only to light them with reason.”<sup>58</sup> The editor of *The Modern Review*, Robert Crompton Jones, found that upon repeated perusals *Natural Religion* “seemed richer each time in suggestiveness, and more impressive in its earnestness and serious courage, more searching in its criticisms of life. And yet the feeling of disappointment and misgiving does not pass away.” With

<sup>55</sup> “Natural Religion,” *The Athenaeum*, 29 July 1882, 135–36, at 136.

<sup>56</sup> William Henry Simcox, “Natural Religion,” *The Academy*, 15 July 1882, 41–42, at 41.

<sup>57</sup> William Henry Simcox.

<sup>58</sup> “Natural Religion,” *The Athenaeum*, 29 July 1882, 135–36, at 135.



each reading Jones was left with a profound feeling of doubt about the possibility that Seeley's "natural religion" could ever produce the enthusiasm necessary to replace "the true controlling power of religion."<sup>59</sup>

References to such disappointment extend throughout the review literature. The Oxford classics scholar and poet George Augustus Simcox, brother of the aforementioned William Henry Simcox, writing in *Nineteenth Century*, found that "there is nothing of the abounding buoyancy of conviction which made *Ecce Homo* rather oppressive to readers who were not carried away by it."<sup>60</sup> And the broad church theologian John Llewelyn Davies believed that while the "remarkable" *Natural Religion* could "renew our hope for our country and our race" it could do so only after "first putting us through the experience of a wholesome depression." Davies argued, "Whatever profit may be derivable from [*Natural Religion*], there is no class of readers to whom it professes to offer comfort."<sup>61</sup>

Here Davies was in particular referring to the last few pages of *Natural Religion*, where Seeley discusses the fact that a natural religion simply cannot make the promises that are offered by a supernatural one, namely that of a future life. "The more our thoughts widen and deepen," argued Seeley, "as the universe grows upon us and we become accustomed to boundless space and time, the more petrifying is the contrast of our own insignificance, the more contemptible become the pettiness, shortness, fragility of the individual life."<sup>62</sup> Seeley's suggestion that as long as life remains worth living a moral paralysis would not take hold seemed cold comfort indeed for readers who were being asked to reject the supernatural entirely.

George Augustus Simcox therefore found that Seeley's treatment of "immortality" was "one of the weakest points of the author's argument."<sup>63</sup> Recognizing that "it is quite certain that the earth will become within a measurable time uninhabitable to man" and that "it is more than probable that the human race will die out of itself, as all men die out one by one,"<sup>64</sup> Simcox argued that Seeley gave his reader little hope with which to accept "the natural course of things."<sup>65</sup> Davies also found Seeley's treatment of a

<sup>59</sup> The Editor [Robert Crompton Jones], "Natural Religion," *The Modern Review* 4 (January 1883): 24–51, at 45.

<sup>60</sup> George Augustus Simcox, "Natural Religion," *Nineteenth Century* 12, no. 67 (1882): 391–409, at 392.

<sup>61</sup> J. Llewelyn Davies, "'Natural Religion,' by the Author of 'Ecce Homo,'" *Contemporary Review* 42 (Sept. 1882): 442–54, at 454.

<sup>62</sup> *Natural Religion*, 304.

<sup>63</sup> George Augustus Simcox, "Natural Religion," 407.

<sup>64</sup> George Augustus Simcox, 393–394.

<sup>65</sup> George Augustus Simcox, 408.

future life unsatisfactory and could only make sense of it by speculating that Seeley must be leaving a small but significant space for the supernatural in this realm. Without accepting some form of judgment in the next world, Davies argued that by Seeley's own logic right and wrong would disappear altogether, engendering a truly intolerable world.<sup>66</sup> This was a significant point of confusion. Was Seeley leaving space for the supernatural in conceptions of a future life, or was he suggesting that the afterlife was beyond a naturalist perspective and therefore excluded from his proposed "natural religion"?

The question was deemed a false problem by the most enthusiastic of *Natural Religion's* readers, some of the researchers associated with the Society for Psychical Research, which was established by Edmund Gurney and Frederic Myers in 1882, the same year that *Natural Religion* was published. The primary goal of the society was to study the evidence for a world beyond this one by relying on a careful, scientific methodology.<sup>67</sup> Among this group of researchers, *Natural Religion* clearly had an impact. Writing in the journal *Mind*, Gurney claimed that he had no need to summarize the contents of *Natural Religion* because it was a book that "every possible reader of this paper must have read." He also felt it unnecessary "to lavish praise on the spirit of peace and process in which it is conceived, and on the well-known style, at once so weighty and so brilliant, in which it is executed."<sup>68</sup> The book's content along with its appeal among Gurney's psychical associates simply went without saying.

Myers was even more enthusiastic. Like Seeley, he had also been seeking to extend a naturalist view into realms normally reserved for supernatural religion, ultimately believing that the next terrain for science to penetrate was that of the "supernormal" world.<sup>69</sup> For Myers, *Natural Religion* showed that a great diversity of contemporaries, from artists and men of science to positivists and orthodox Christians, have much more in common than they have differences, that whether or not they are worshipping God or the "Unity of the Universe," they are ultimately worshipping the same thing. Myers argued that it was therefore time to follow Seeley's lead

<sup>66</sup> Davies, "Natural Religion," by the Author of 'Ecce Homo,' 454.

<sup>67</sup> On the SPR see Janet Oppenheim, *The Other World: Spiritualism and Psychical Research in England, 1850–1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1985).

<sup>68</sup> Edmund Gurney, "Natural Religion," *Mind* 8, no. 30 (1883): 198–221, at 198.

<sup>69</sup> Quoted in Leigh T. I. Penman, "The History of the Word *Paranormal*," *Notes & Queries* 61, no. 2 (2015): 31–34. Myers is also one of the main figures discussed in Turner's *Between Science and Religion*, chap. 5.

by “bringing together the truths of science, art, and religion and establish a truly “world-wide Church of civilisation.”<sup>70</sup>

Like other readers, Myers noted—but was not troubled by—the rather pessimistic conclusion, for he was convinced that there was indeed an afterlife, the evidence for which could be investigated with the help of scientific methods. Hence, he believed that *Natural Religion* left the door open for the kind of naturalization of the afterlife that he promoted in his work with the Society for Psychical Research. Unfortunately for Seeley, this was not exactly the audience that he sought when he wrote *Natural Religion*. While it is true that the psychical researchers such as Myers and Gurney were seeking to achieve scientific status for their subject matter and claimed to be following scientific procedures in their research of the afterlife, they were at the margins of a naturalized and respectable science. Moreover, Seeley’s concerns were very much with this world, and he would have found Myers’s focus on “the other world” beyond to be an unhelpful gesture that would confuse the role of Christianity in the here and now. As Seeley argued in his letter to the *Spectator*, “My opinion in general about a future life is that we ought to believe in it, and then think as little about it as possible. . . . I am so full of the bearings of religion on life, society, and politics, that I find it hard to do justice to what treats of death, not life.”<sup>71</sup>

So what did the “newest school of the expounders of science” think about *Natural Religion*?<sup>72</sup> Despite the fact that the book received extensive commentary in the periodical press, it seems that those most interested in the book were religious figures, journalists, and psychical researchers. If their apparent silence is any indication, those men of science whom Seeley wanted to engage appear not to have been troubled by or interested in the book at all. And yet the review literature overwhelmingly believed that in acting as a “peacemaker,” Seeley had negotiated largely on behalf of science rather than on behalf of religion. The sympathetic *Athenaeum* put the problem this way: “He lacks sympathy with one side. He is entirely on the side opposed to the angels, and assumes too confidently that supernatural religion is spiritually defunct and its advocates ready to own their inefficiency.”<sup>73</sup> But in responding to such criticism, Seeley found himself defending what he claimed were his orthodox religious beliefs while sounding somewhat dismissive of the scientific views he seemed to embrace. As

<sup>70</sup> Frederic W. H. Myers, “A New Eirenicon,” *Fortnightly Review* 32, no. 191 (November 1882): 596–607, at 596.

<sup>71</sup> [Seeley], “‘Natural Religion,’ and Its Drift,” 768.

<sup>72</sup> The “newest school of the expounders of science” is from *Natural Religion*, 3.

<sup>73</sup> “Natural Religion,” *The Athenaeum*, 135.

he stated in the preface to the second edition, in trying to find a common ground between science and religion, “I thought it essential to take the scientific view frankly at its worst.” By showing that there were very real connections between extremist views of science and orthodox views of religion, he hoped “to fix the meaning of the word ‘religion,’” so that its essential nature would no longer be confused with what was a historical accident, namely supernaturalism.<sup>74</sup> As to his own beliefs, Seeley stressed that they were *biblical*. By that he meant “that they are drawn from the Bible at first-hand, and that what fascinates me in the Bible is not a passage here and there, not something which only a scholar or antiquarian can detect in it, but the Bible as a whole, its grand plan and unity, and principally the grand poetic anticipation I find in it of modern views concerning history.”<sup>75</sup> This is a pertinent reminder that by this time, Seeley was identifying, first and foremost, as a historian. In seeking to bring together science and Christianity, Seeley was also ultimately reducing them to the prophetic vision of a scientific historian whose allegiance was not to science or to Christianity but to history.

## CONCLUSION

It is unfortunate, then, that *Natural Religion* has received little recognition in the secondary literature, particularly with regard to Victorian science and religion. It is likely that the book did not find the precise audience of scientific men that it sought. It did, however, find a readership that was hoping to experience *Ecce Homo* once again, though in the context of a very different time, namely at a moment when narratives of conflict between science and religion were just emerging. Therefore understanding the issues confronting the publication and reception of *Natural Religion* gives us insight into just how difficult it was to establish a framework by which science and Christianity could meet on equal terms at the end of the nineteenth century. As Peter Harrison has shown, the disembedding of science from a much broader social and moral practice, that occurred throughout the nineteenth century, worked to reify a concept of science that was defined in part by what it was not, namely religion.<sup>76</sup> Therefore, for all Seeley’s work in trying to merge science and religion after this process of

<sup>74</sup> *Natural Religion*, by the Author of *Ecce Homo*, 2nd ed. (London: Macmillan, 1882), v–vi.

<sup>75</sup> *Natural Religion*, 2nd ed., viii–ix.

<sup>76</sup> Harrison, *The Territories of Science and Religion*, chap. 6.

disembedding took place, the fact that the book took it as a point of departure that these two entities were perceived as being comparable with one another shows that he was working against well-established boundaries—and therefore could not help but reinforce them.

That said, Seeley clearly recognized that there was still some common ground between theistic and naturalistic concepts of nature—a common ground that has more recently been discussed by Matthew Stanley in his comparative analysis of Thomas Henry Huxley and James Clerk Maxwell.<sup>77</sup> Seeley moreover understood that the scientific naturalists were ultimately promoting a separate spheres solution to the perceived conflict between science and theology, which he argued was no solution at all. Seeley made the case that a religion would ultimately have to be constructed to fill the void, and he worried that it would be one informed not by the humanity of Jesus Christ but rather by an inhumane cosmic purposelessness that would have disastrous consequences for the future progress of society. A naturalized Christianity could provide just the humanist perspective needed for a modern science that was desperately searching for something more. And Seeley's solution, namely the construction of a developmental grand history informed by the findings of modern science, anticipates more recent trends in popular science that seek to replace the putative function of religion with unifying cosmic narratives of epic proportions.<sup>78</sup> This also suggests that perhaps the discipline of history played a more prominent role in debates concerning science and religion in the late nineteenth century than has typically been recognized.

The reception of *Natural Religion* shows that Seeley was largely unsuccessful in convincing those radical men of science to embrace a naturalized Christianity, but by focusing on the nature of *Natural Religion*'s publishing—that is, as written “by the author of *Ecce Homo*”—we come to a greater understanding of why readers seemed to be disappointed by the study. Readers wanted *Natural Religion* to replicate the experience they had when they read *Ecce Homo*. But as a consequence of being reminded about what they admired about *Ecce Homo* they were also reminded about just how rapidly traditional religious beliefs had eroded in the intervening years. *Natural Religion* became a symbol for the end of an era. While it could not have achieved this meaning without having been signed “by the

<sup>77</sup> Matthew Stanley, *Huxley's Church and Maxwell's Demon: From Theistic Science to Naturalistic Science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014).

<sup>78</sup> See Hesketh, “The Story of Big History,” *History of the Present* 4, no. 2 (Fall 2014): 171–202; and Harrison, *The Territories of Science and Religion*, 178–80.

Author of *Ecce Homo*,” that signature also prevented the work from being judged on its own merits—which may have something to do with why Seeley wanted it published anonymously in the first place. Unlike *Ecce Homo*, *Natural Religion* was never able to develop a life of its own.

University of Queensland.