

so brief a reference to such a comprehensive subject. We learned that Buddhism had been termed the Protestantism of the East, that as a religion there were some things to be gained from it by Christianity, particularly as to its high moral standard in some respects, its tolerance for other beliefs, and in the ideal practice of the brotherhood of mankind. The evening was well occupied by a number of participants in the discussion that followed, with frequent reference to Sir Edwin Arnold's "Light of Asia." F. N.

CAN A SCIENTIFIC MAN BE A SINCERE FRIEND?

BY PROF. SILVANUS P. THOMPSON,
D SC, F.R.S.

Read at the Manchester Conference of Friends,
England, Eleventh mo. 13th, 1895.

(Concluded from last month.)

The emphasis thus laid upon the clear and determinate difference between the operation of the intellect working by the scientific method in the establishment of physical truths, and the process by which the soul is brought to the apprehension of spiritual truths, must equally be extended to the truths themselves. Each process has its own sphere, each discovers only its own kind of truth. The one establishes proofs: the other instills convictions. That which is spiritually discerned is not to be measured by physical process; nor is that which is proved to be physically true to be controverted by motions of the soul. It were equally fallacious to attempt to weigh pains and pleasures with a pair of scales, or measure them with a foot rule. I do not take my geology from Moses or my anatomy from Solomon: but neither do I take the writings of Faraday or of Owen as guides to the things that are unseen and eternal.

Is science then necessarily irreligious or religion unscientific? Not for one moment let the thought be entertained. Never will I, for one, admit their incompatibility. Human nature is not

built in such compartments that a man's religious convictions can be kept from influencing his whole nature, from directing the whole tenor of his life and thought.

We cannot forbid the man of spiritual convictions from rejoicing in the works of the Creator; his is the privilege to feel and understand how wonderfully the wisdom of the Almighty has shewn itself in this Creation. The great astronomer, Kepler, said that two things filled him with wonder: the starry heavens above, and the moral law within the soul. If the undevout astronomer is mad, so is the undevout follower of any other science. All this we may admit, yet protest against such arbitrary conceptions as that of Paley, whose likening of God to an Almighty Clockmaker is deplorably unspiritual. Why should any incompatibility be even suggested between science and revelation? We, who reverently accept Christ as our Master, who acknowledge the Fatherhood of God, and worship Him as the Ruler and Maker of all, the Creator of the Universe, do not find the humble following of Christ to be incompatible with the effort to learn more and more of the things of Creation around us, and of the laws by which that creation is governed. To us it is a principle needing no demonstration that our Father who created the Universe will not deliberately deceive His children, or put them to confusion by creating contradictions or by making part of His revelation incompatible with some other part. That were to think Him less than All-good or All-mighty. His we are, and Him we serve. His we are, no less than the tiniest atom. He has created us as we are, and endowed us with whatever faculties we possess. We dare not stultify our conception of His Fatherhood by adopting unworthy views of Him. Either we must acknowledge that He is the Creator of the Universe, in which case the facts are but what He has made them, and the physical laws that govern them are