

would have adorned the annals of any faith, is auctioned off for about \$2,300, or two talents. Pythagoras brings \$160, whilst Diogenes, the cynic, the father of the snarling school, with dirt, rags, growls and all complete, sells for six cents. Surely, one must conclude that Lucian had some fair notion of the value of the real philosophic spirit, and a very proper detestation of bad manners and silliness, even if it did pose as a school of thought and philosophy, and produce a man with courage enough to order the conqueror of Asia to get out of his sunshine!

Another illustration from Lucian is contained in the "Banquet," or "Lapithæ." Here, the author represents the philosophers as having given a feast. The unlettered portion of the guests behaves most becomingly; but the learned men get into a discussion and afterwards into a free fight.—This, to my mind, looks strikingly as though Lucian did not think that the learning of his day always carried common sense or even humane manners with it, and that it, without some other guidance, was a very poor leading for men to follow; a conclusion with which we, as members of this Society, would have little difficulty in uniting.

The skeptics and "unbelievers" of the Christian world are too many to be enumerated. It may be even too much for our patience to enumerate their classes. Those who lived and taught something "uncanonical" in the early church were legion, and they can be found described in any book of reference. It is with the disbelief of modern times, that since the Protestant Reformation, or even since the beginning of the last century, that I have made up my mind to deal in this paper. My text shall be the famous saying of Leibnitz:

"Every affirmation is true, every contradiction false."

The disbelief, that is to say, the dissent from generally accepted standards, of the last century, such as was repre-

sented by Voltaire, Rousseau and their school in France, and Thomas Paine in this country, was born before the advent of modern scholarship and before the days of the real philosophic spirit which it brings with it. To such men, the destructive spirit was the only one, and it is very doubtful if any good was really done, either in church or state by their presence. To them, the condemnation of Leibnitz properly belongs: they were the ones who simply "denied," and were in that sense, false. With them, or their intemperate followers, the current doctrines as to literal Biblical inspiration, as to the "faith" and to most of the tenets of the evangelical Christians of their times, were simply so much error, and their energy so completely evaporated before they had got through with contradictions and denials that they had none left for constructive work. In the earlier years and up to the middle of this century, this iconoclastic spirit, though recognized as in part a mistake, yet received a strong impulse from the manifest proofs furnished by science grown stronger, that the old Mosaic books, as well as the other portions of the Bible, could not possibly have had the origin or character attributed to them of old; the consequence of which was that with many persons, the mere negative position was greatly strengthened. The term "faith," as a necessary portion of the religious language of the people, was pretty well dropped for a time; and "righteousness," that good, old-fashioned, hearty word of the prophets and the fathers, tended to give place to the less expressive one of "morality." Throughout all these changes, it was graciously allowed by the denying brethren, in a patronizing sort of way, that the morality taught by the men of old, who like John, came from the deserts telling men to repent and seek the kingdom of God, was all very good in its way, very sensible, don't you know, quite necessary to keep order in the community and to