has survived the ravages of time, occurs the following passage:

"Wisdom is the chief blessing of philosophy, since she gives birth to all other virtues, which unite in teaching us that no man can live happily who does not live wisely, conscientiously, and justly; nor, on the other hand, can he live wisely, conscientiously, and justly without living happily; for virtue is inseparable from happiness. Let these, then, and maxims like these, be the subjects of thy meditation by night and by day, both when alone and when with the friend of thy bosom; and never, when asleep or awake, shalt thou be oppressed with anxiety, but live as a god among mankind."

It has been said of Seneca, the moralist, who though nominally a Stoic was really an Epicurean, that he "draws nearly all his suavity and much of his wisdom from Epicurus." It was the moral beauty and simplicity of the thought of Epicurus that attracted to it the Roman poet Lucretius, who amid the confusion and turbulence of civil war "sought some stay for his inner life and found it in the philosophy of Epicurus," in defence and exposition of which he gave to the world the grandest didactic poem of classical antiquity, "De Rerum Natura."

Of course, it is easy to quote almost anything against the teachings and the influence of Epicurus that is needed to sustain the false and slanderous statements which his Pagan opponents originated, or which prejudiced theological writers, or writers who have written under the influence of the popular belief, have added in regard to Epicurus, but such statements should not carry with them the weight of authority unless they can be shown to

have a basis in fact and reason. Take, for instance, the statement of Ritter,—
"The great moral corruption of ancient Greece and Rome can in part be traced to the influence of this system" [Epicureanism].

How can this be proved? What evidence of it can be adduced? The statement is in conflict with the facts of history and with the history of philosophy; for, as Lange, the profound historical and philosophical writer, says: " In the centuries when the abominations of a Nero, a Caligula, or even of a Heliogabalus, polluted the globe, no philosophy was more neglected, none was more foreign to the spirit of the time, than that of all which demanded the coldest blood, the calmest contemplation, the most sober and purely prosaic inquiry, the philosophy of Demetrius and Epicurus."

Epicureanism as a philosophical or ethical system did not prevail during the dark ages in Christian monasteries, when they were little better than brothels; it did not prevail during the periods of witchcraft and persecution, of torture and wholesale destruction of life on account of religious belief. Epicureanism, as philosophy, did not make Spain what she is now by reason of her superstition, cruelty, and crime.

Epicurus's ethical system was certainly utilitarian. With all the details of his system we are not acquainted, for, though it is said that he wrote three hundred works, none of them have come down to us from the rich harvest field of the past, and on minor points we have to depend upon conflicting interpretations of his thought. This we know: it was essentially, in its ethical aspects, the same as that of our modern utilitarian thinkers,