know that one ancient sect, the Sautrāntikas (*i. e.*, Sūtra-men) refused to admit the canonicity of the Abhidharma and were content with the Sūtra-Pitaka. Moreover, the Great Council sect not only tabooed the Abhidharma, but they also had a very short recension of the Fifth Nikāya. This collection, known as the Khuddaka (Short) in Pāli, was called the Miscellaneous Pitaka by other sects, and consisted largely of commentaries. The Great Council refused to canonize these commentaries, but admitted into it only the Udāna, the Itivuttka and the Nidāna.

It is high time that Japanese scholars translated the books of this early rival sect, which may yet be proved to be older than the Pāli.

ALBERT J. EDMUNDS.

PHILADELPHIA, PA.

PRESENT-DAY SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

At a time when so much scientific literature is being issued to the public the questions naturally arise in one's mind, In what direction does this scientific influence tend? Does it make for religion, or does it favor atheism? Probably there never has been a time when an answer in the negative could be so definitely given to the latter question. Indeed, such is the attitude of religion to science that so advanced and broadminded a preacher as the Rev. R. J. Campbell has said: "I believe the next great rehabilitation of the fundamentals of religion will come, not from the side of theology, but from the side of science." This, no doubt, to many, will seem a daring pronouncement to make. Yet, is it not significant of present-day thought?

Such happy relations, however, have not always existed between religion and science. Science has had to battle hard for a recognition of its services to thought and progress, and, like religion, it, too, has had its martyrs. One has only to mention the names of Galileo, Bruno and Antonio do Dominis. Galileo, it is well known, was cruelly treated and imprisoned for promulgating the doctrine of Copernicus that the earth revolved round the sun; Bruno for teaching the plurality of worlds was sacrificed at the stake, and the body and books of Antonio Dominis were taken and burned after his death, because he attributed the colors of the rainbow to natural causes. If ever the fear existed that a knowledge of science was opposed to religion, that fear certainly was rife in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

But what immense strides progress has made! Compare the situation just described with the condition of thought that now prevails, which makes acceptable such an utterance as that of the Rev. R. J. Campbell, quoted at the beginning of this article. He, apparently, has no fear of science being the foe of religion, but rather looks to it as an aid to strengthen men's beliefs in an All-wise Creator. One might say his attitude is that of the welcoming hand of religion to science, and, what is more, it is an appeal made not in

vain. Science, also, has extended her hand. Lord Kelvin, speaking quite recently, definitely stated: "I cannot admit that with regard to the origin of life, science neither affirms nor denies Creative Power. Science positively affirms Creative Power."

The question of the attitude and relationship of science to religion is one of long standing. It seems to have disturbed the thoughts of that great natural philosopher, Lord Bacon, whose judgment is very apropos to-day. In his "Sacrae Meditationes" he says: "This I dare to affirm, in knowledge of Nature, that a little natural philosophy, and the first entrance into it, doth dispose the opinion to atheism; but, on the other side, much natural philosophy, and wading deep into it, will bring about men's minds to religion." This, indeed, seems true. Many readers will remember that when their minds first opened to the elementary truths of natural science, there was a tendency to doubt any agent other than "natural laws." But after "wading deep" into science, gaining further knowledge of the mysterious relations between living and non-living matter, the wonderful possibilities inherent in the elements, and the magnitude of the starry realms, the mind was compelled to bow in reverence before Him who has created so much that is incomprehensible.

The specific influence science has had upon thought, especially religious thought, is admirably stated by the late Professor Drummond, in his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. He writes: "Now that science has made the world around articulate, it speaks to religion with a twofold purpose. In the first place, it offers to corroborate Theology; in the second, to purify it." *To corroborate and purify*. That is the special influence science has had upon religion. Again, what does Lord Avebury—better known as Sir John Lubbock—say? "Science has always purified religion. . . . It is in those countries where science is most backward that religion is less well understood, and in those countries which science is most advanced that religion is purest." According to these two great authorities, then, science certainly does not oppose religion, but purifies it of superstition and makes the "world around articulate." Did not Longfellow hear that articulation in Nature when

"He wandered away and away
With Nature, the dear old nurse,
Who sung to him night and day
The rhymes of the Universe."

That science does not "dispose the opinion to atheism" is surely sufficiently shown by the fact that such world-wide scientists as Copernicus, Galileo, Bruno, Newton, Darwin and Drummond have been believers in a Supreme Creator. Indeed, that greatest of living scientists, Lord Kelvin, has said: "We are absolutely forced by science to believe with perfect

confidence in a Directive Power." Likewise is the opinion of Sir Oliver Lodge. Scientific literature and scientific inquiry, evidently, do not incline to disbelief, but, as Bacon said, three hundred years ago, "will bring about men's minds to religion."

W. E. ASHWELL.

BATTERSEA PARK, S. W., LONDON.