adjacent islands. The eighth book narrated the various changes of fortune to which those nations had been subject who in succession held the supreme command in Asia, namely, the Assyrians, Lydians, and Persians. The fragments which remain refer principally to the history of Crœsus. In the ninth book he described the origin, changes, and migrations of the Amazons, Scythians, and other nations who inhabited the coasts of the Pontus and those northern countries, whence, through Thrace and Thessaly, he returned to Greece and its affairs. Then it was that Ephorus reached the period when, like every Greek historian, he imagined that the transactions of the whole world became centred in the causes and events of the Persian war; and then also he began to treat his subject with more copiousness, for we find that, while in his tenth book he had already brought down his history to the times of Miltiades, about 490 B.C., in his eighteenth book he had reached Dercyllidas, 399, and in his twenty-fifth he had arrived at the battle of Mantinea, 362. The part of the thirtieth book which gave an account of the sacred war was composed, not by Ephorus himself, but by his son Demophilus. At the conclusion of the war Ephorus took up the thread of the history, and continued it to the siege of Perinthus, 340 B.C. According to Diodorus Siculus, the whole period treated of was 750 years.

For a more full description of the life of Ephorus, and a collection of the fragments of his history which have been preserved, the reader may consult *Ephori Fragmenta*, by Meier Marx, 1815; Creuzer, *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen*, 1819; Vossius, *De Historicis Græcis*, 1651; and Ulrici, *Charakteristik der antiken Historiographie*, 1833.

EPHRAEM SYRUS, or Ephraim the Syrian, flourished in the 4th century of the Christian era, acquired great renown among his contemporaries, and has since been esteemed one of the most celebrated fathers of the church. So highly was he honoured that, according to the testimony of Jerome (*Script. Eccl.*, c. 115), his homilies were read in many of the churches of Greece immediately after the reading of scripture. His name is almost never mentioned without the prefix *Mor* or *Mari* (master). Of the events of his life but little is known, and what has been handed down to us is much lessened in value by an admixture of apocryphal stories. The following is a translation of a short memoir of Ephraem from a Syriac source. The original is found in a 14th century MS., which is printed by Assemani in the Roman edition of Ephraem's works.

"The blessed Mor Ephraem was a Syrian by birth; his father was of Nisibis, his mother of the city Amida. His father was an idolatrous priest, and they lived in the time of Constantine Victor [*i.e.* the Great]. His father expelled him from home because he was not obedient to his wicked will; he therefore went and lived with the holy Mor Jacob, the bishop of Nisibis, and led an entire life of godliness until the time of Jovian [when Nisibis was, in 363, surrendered to the Persians]. He then left that place and came to the city Edessa, where he received the gift of the Holy Ghost, and abundantly supplied the church with the gifts and doctrine of the Spirit. After a time he went to the desert of Egypt, and from thence to Cæsarea of Cappadocia to Basil, and received from him the imposition of hands for the diaconate. He immediately returned to Edessa, and ended his life there in the year 684 (of the Greeks), on the ninth day of Haziron (June), that is, in the year 373 of the advent of our Lord."

A much longer life, also extant in Syriac, gives no more historical data which can be relied on; and the so-called testament or will, which professes to contain curious autobiographical matter referring to his religious history and feelings, is of doubtful authenticity. A careful recension of the piece is given by Overbeck in his *Opera Selecta*. The statement of the manuscript just quoted, that Ephraem was born at Nisibis, has the authority of Sozomenus in its favour; and Ephraem himself, in his commentary on Genesis, refers to Mesopotamia as his native country. The Syrian sources are unanimous about the date of his death, and, according to Dr Bickell, the dubiety of Rödiger has arisen from a misinterpretation. At Edessa Ephraem adopted a monastic life, and is said to have dwelt in a cave near the town. The story of his visit to Egypt is probably mythical. Though the external facts of Ephraem's life are thus few and doubtful, there is no question of the manner in which he impressed his genius and spirit upon his own age, or of the great value of his literary remains. His popularity and influence among the luxurious and refined people of Edessa were very great. He wrote against Julian, and combated the heresies of Bardesanes the Gnostic philosopher, of the Arians and Sabellians, of the Manichæans and Novatians. Whether he was acquainted with Greek or not is a matter of dispute which can hardly be decided by his writings; but Geiger has rendered it probable that he had come considerably under Jewish influence, not a few words being employed by him in an acceptation foreign to Syriac, but well-known in the Hebrew of his time and country. His works consist of commentaries, sermons, tractates, and hymns. Of many the original Syriac appears to have perished; and they are only preserved in Greek, Latin, Armenian, or Slavonic. The greater proportion of the sermons and tractates are composed in a metrical form, the verses being of various measures—tetrasyllabic, heptasyllabic, or octosyllabic,—and arranged in strophes varying from four to twelve lines. Rhyme and assonance are both employed at irregular intervals, and, as Geiger has pointed out in the *Ztschr. d. D. Morg. Ges.*, 1867, a considerable number of the pieces are alphabetical or nominal acrostics, though the fact is sometimes disguised in the MSS. by the misarrangement of the lines. That he has applied his verse to such prosaic purposes as the refutation of heresy and the inculcation of orthodoxy would seem of itself to make heavily against Ephraem's reputation as a poet; but it is impossible to read some even of his most unpromising pieces without admitting that he has a genuine poetic gift. Some of his hymns on the death of children may rank for pathos and happy simplicity with the finest lyrics of their class; and there can be no doubt of the imaginative force of such lines as the following:—"For before that time Death by this was made arrogant, and boasted himself of it, 'Behold priests and kings lie bound by me in the midst of my prisons.' A mighty war came without warning against the tyrant Death; and as a robber, the shouts of the foe surprised him and humbled his glory. The dead perceived a sweet savour of life in the midst of Hades; and they began to spread the glad tidings among one another that their hope was accomplished." Several of the Nisibean poems are impassioned odes on events in contemporary history, and are thus of value to the historical student. The *Repentance of Nineveh* partakes of the character of the epic.

The principal edition of Ephraem's works was prepared and published at Rome under the patronage of the popes Clement XI., Clement XII., and Benedict XIV. It consists of three volumes of Greek texts and three volumes of Syriac texts, with a Latin translation. The first vol., published in 1732, was edited by Joseph Simon Assemani, the 4th and 5th (1737 and 1740) by Petrus Benedictus, the 6th (1743) by Benedictus (who died before it was completed) and Stephanus Evodius Assemani, and the 2d and 3d (1743 and 1746) by Joseph Simon Assemani. An earlier edition of 171 pieces in 3 folio volumes, edited by Gerhard Vossius, had appeared at Rome in 1589, 1593, and 1598; and Edward Thwaites had published a folio of Greek texts from Oxford MSS. in 1709. The following are the principal modern contributions to our knowledge of Ephraem and his works:—Spohn, *Collatio versionis syriacæ, quam Peschito vocant, cum fragmentis in comm. Ephraemi obviis*, 1785, 1794; Hahn, *Bardesanes Gnosticus*, 1819; Hahn, "Ueber den Gesang in der Syr. Kirche," in Staüdlin and Vater's *Kirchenhistorisches Archiv*, 1823; Hahn and Sieffert, *Chrestomathia Syriaca sive S. Ephraemi carmina selecta*, 1825; Tschirner, "De claris veteris ecclesiæ oratoribus," in his *Opuscula academica*, 1829; Pius Zingerle, *Ausgewählte Schriften des heil. Kirchenvaters Ephraem*, Innsbruck, 1830–1833; Lengerke, *De Ephraemi Syri arte hermeneutica*, Königsberg, 1831; J. B. Morris, *Select Works of St Ephraem the Syrian*, *translated out of the original Syriac*, 1847; Angelo Paggi and Fausto Lasinio, *Inni funebri di S. Efrem Siro*, Florence, 1851; Burgess, *Select Metrical Hymns and Homilies of Ephraem Syrus*, 1853, and *The Repentance of Nineveh*, 1853; Alsleben, *Das Leben des H. Ephraim*, Berlin, 1853; Rödiger, "Ephram Syrus," in Herzog's *Real-Encyclop. für Protest. Theol.*, 1855; R. P. Smith, *Catalogue of the Syrian Manuscripts in the Bodleian*, 1864; Overbeck, *Ephraemi Syri aliorumque opera selecta* (Syrian text), Oxford, 1865; Bickell, *S. Ephraemi Syri Carmina Nisibena* (Latin transl.), Leipsic, 1866; Wright, *Catalogue of the Syriac Manuscripts in the British Museum*, part ii. p. 406-416; Benin, *Tradition of the Syriac Church*, 1871.

EPHRAIM, the younger son of Joseph, who received the precedence over the elder (Manasseh) by the blessing of Jacob, on the occasion when he adopted both into the number of his sons in place of Joseph their father. Both, accordingly, were the founders of tribes which bore their names, the intention of Jacob being that Joseph should by this means have double the honour accorded to his brethren. At the exodus from Egypt, the tribe of Ephraim, of which he was the founder, numbered 40,500, while that of Manasseh numbered only 32,200 (Numb. i. 32–35), but in their wanderings the number of the former was diminished by 8000. Their possessions in the very centre of Palestine included most of what was afterwards called Samaria. The proud and ambitious character of the tribe is indicated in their demands as narrated in Josh. xvii. 14, Judges viii. 1–3, xii. 1, and they were long jealous of the regal honours of Judah; but after the dismemberment of the tribes, their rivalry was merged in that subsisting between the two kingdoms.

EPICHARMUS (540–450 B.C.), a celebrated poet of the old comedy, was born in the island of Cos, where his father Elothales was a physician, of the race of the Asclepiads. According to Diogenes Laertius, he was brought to Megara, in Sicily, when only three months old; but it is more probable that he migrated thither, as Suidas asserts, of his own accord at a later period. After the destruction of Megara he removed to Syracuse, where at the court of Hiero he spent the remainder of his days, dying, it is said, at ninety years of age. From his protracted residence in the island he is generally known in antiquity as a Sicilian (Hor. *Ep.* ii. 1. 58). Epicharmus studied philosophy, it is said, under Pythagoras, for it is now generally admitted that Epicharmus the Pythagorean, and Epicharmus the father of the old comedy are identical. It was only after his residence in Megara, a colony from the Isthmian Megara, which disputed with Athens the invention of comedy, that he turned his attention to that branch of dramatic literature. His principal merit in this department seems to have consisted in the exclusion of that vulgar buffoonery which disgraced all previous comedies, and in the introduction of a regular plot in which the *comus*, or band of revellers, sustained the dialogue, with which maxims drawn from the Pythagorean ethics were liberally interspersed.

"The subjects of the plays of Epicharmus," says Müller (*Dorians*, iv. 7, 2) "were mostly mythological, *i.e.*, parodies or travesties of mythology, nearly in the style of the satyrical drama of Athens. Thus in the comedy of *Busiris* Hercules was represented in the most ludicrous light as a voracious glutton; and he was again exhibited in the same character (with a mixture perhaps of satirical remarks on the luxury of the times) in *The Marriage of Hebe*, in which an astonishing number of dishes was mentioned. He also, like Aristophanes, handled political subjects, and invented comic characters like the later Athenian poets. The piece called *The Plunderings*, which described the devastation of Sicily in his time, had a political meaning; and this was perhaps also the case with *The Islands*; at least it was mentioned in this play that Hieron had prevented Anaxilas from destroying Locri."

Of his comedies, which are generally written in trochaic tetrameters, thirty-five titles and a few fragments are still extant. The excellence of his dramatic style is proved by the high estimation in which he is held by Plato (*Theæt*, p. 152, e).

EPICTETUS (the word means "acquired," but no other name has been handed down for him) was, according to the received account, born at Hierapolis, a town in the south west quarter of Phrygia. His life extends between a date slightly anterior and a date slightly posterior to the second half of the 1st century A.D. While young, he was one of the slaves of Epaphroditus, a freedman and courtier of the emperor Nero; and while in that position, he managed to attend the lectures of Musonius Rufus, an important and esteemed teacher of the Stoical system during the reigns of Nero and Vespasian. Epictetus was lame—whether from birth or in consequence of an accident or of his owner's cruelty is unknown; he was also of weakly health. That he was a free man in the later part of his life is evident, but the means by which his liberty was obtained are unrecorded. In the days of Domitian he was one of the recognised votaries and perhaps professors of philosophy; and in the year 90, when that emperor, irritated by the support and encouragement which the opposition to his tyranny found amongst the adherents of Stoicism, issued an edict to all philosophers to quit Rome, Epictetus was amongst those who withdrew into the provinces. For the rest of his life he settled at Nicopolis, a town of southern Epirus, not far from the scene of the battle of Actium. There for several years he lived, and taught by close earnest personal address and conversation. According to some authorities he lived into the time of Hadrian; he himself mentions the coinage of the emperor Trajan. His contemporaries and the next generation held his character and teaching in high honour. According to Lucian, the earthenware lamp which had belonged to the sage was bought by an enthusiastic relic-hunter for 3000 drachmas. He was never married. He wrote nothing; but much of his teaching was taken down with affectionate care by his pupil Flavius Arrianus, the historian of Alexander the Great, and is preserved in two treatises, of the larger of which, called the *Discourses of Epictetus* (Ἐπικτήτου Διατριβαί), four books are still extant. The other treatise is a shorter and has been a more popular work, the *Manual* or Ἐγχειρίδιον. It contains in an aphoristic form the main doctrines of the longer work. There exists a tolerably extensive commentary on the *Manual* by Simplicius.

The philosophy of Epictetus is stamped with an intensely practical character, and exhibits a high idealistic type of morality. He is an earnest, sometimes stern and sometimes pathetic preacher of righteousness, who despises the mere graces of a literary and rhetorical lecturer and the subtleties of an abstruse logic. He has no patience with mere antiquarian study of the Stoical writers. The problem of how life is to be carried out well is the one question which throws all other inquiries into the shade. "When you enter the school of the philosopher, ye enter the room of a surgeon; and as ye are not whole when ye come in, ye cannot leave it with a smile, but with pain." True education lies in learning to wish things to be as they actually are: it lies in learning to distinguish what is our own from what does not belong to us. But there is only one thing which is fully our own,—that is, our will or purpose. God, acting as a good king and a true father, has given us a will which cannot be restrained, compelled, or thwarted; he has put it wholly in our own power, so that even he himself has no power to check or control it. Nothing external, neither death nor exile nor pain nor any such thing, is ever the cause of our acting or not acting; the sole true cause lies in our opinions and judgments. Nothing can ever force us to act against our will; if we are conquered, it is because we have willed to be conquered. And thus, although we are not responsible for the ideas that present themselves to our consciousness, we are absolutely and without any modification responsible for the

way in which we use them. Nothing is ours besides our will. And the divine law which bids us keep fast what is our own forbids us to make any claim to what is not ours; and while enjoining us to make use of whatever is given to us, it bids us not long after what has not been given. "Two maxims," he says, "we must ever bear in mind,—that apart from the will there is nothing either good or bad, and that we must not try to anticipate or direct events, but merely accept them with intelligence." We must, in short, resign ourselves to whatever fate and fortune bring to us, believing, as the first article of our creed, that there is a god, whose thought directs the universe, and that not merely in our acts, but even in our thoughts and plans, we cannot escape his eye. In the world, according to Epictetus, the true position of man is that of member of a great system, which comprehends God and men. Each human being is thus a citizen of two cities. He is in the first instance a citizen of his own nation or commonwealth in a corner of the world; but he is also a member of the great city of gods and men, whereof the city political is only a copy in miniature. All men are the sons of God, and kindred in nature with the divinity. For man though a member in the system of the world is more than a merely subservient or instrumental part; he has also within him a principle which can guide and understand the movement of all the members; he can enter into the method of divine administration, and thus can learn—and it is the acme of his learning—the will of God, which is the will of nature. Man, said the Stoic, is a rational animal; and in virtue of that rationality he is neither less nor worse than the gods, for the magnitude of reason is estimated not by length nor by height, but by its judgments. Each man has within him a guardian spirit, a god within him, who never sleeps; so that even in darkness and solitude we are never alone, because God is within, and our guardian spirit. The body which accompanies us is not strictly speaking ours; it is a poor dead thing, which belongs to the things outside us. But by reason we are the masters of those ideas and appearances which present themselves from without; we can combine them, and systematize, and can set up in ourselves an order of ideas corresponding with the order of nature.

The natural instinct of animated life, to which man also is originally subject, is self-preservation and self-interest. But men are so ordered and constituted that the individual cannot secure his own interests unless he contribute to the common welfare. We are bound up by the law of nature with the whole fabric of the world. The aim of the philosopher therefore is to reach the position of a mind which embraces the whole world in its view,—to grow into the mind of God and to make the will of nature our own. Such a sage agrees in his thought with God; he no longer blames either God or man; he fails of nothing which he purposes and falls in with no misfortune unprepared; he indulges neither in anger nor envy nor jealousy; he is leaving manhood for godhead, and in his dead body his thoughts are concerned about his fellowship with God.

The historical models to which Epictetus reverts are Diogenes and Socrates. But he frequently describes an ideal character of a missionary sage, the perfect Stoic—or, as he calls him, the Cynic. "The Cynic," he says, "is a messenger sent from God to men to show them the error of their ways about good and evil, and how they seek good and evil where they cannot be found." This missionary has neither country nor home nor land nor slave; his bed is the ground; he is without wife or child; his only mansion is the earth and sky and a shabby cloak. It must be that he suffer stripes; and being beaten, he must love those who beat him as if he were a father or a brother. He must be perfectly unembarrassed in the service of God, not bound by the common ties of life, nor entangled by relationships, which if he transgresses he will lose the character of a man of honour, while if he upholds them he will cease to be the messenger, watchman, and herald of the gods. The perfect man thus described will not be angry with the wrong-doer; he will only pity his erring brother; for anger in such a case would only betray that he too thought the wrong-doer gained a substantial blessing by his wrongful act, instead of being, as he is, utterly ruined.

The best edition of the works of Epictetus is that by Schweighäuser in 6 vols. 8vo, 1799-1800. There are at least two English translations,—an old one by Elizabeth Carter, and a recent version by George Long. (W. W.)

EPICURUS, the founder of the Epicurean school of philosophy, was born in the end of 342 or the beginning of 341 B.C., seven years after the death of Plato. His father Neocles belonged to Gargettos, one of the small villages of Attica, but had settled in Samos, not later than 352, as one of the colonists sent out by the Athenian state after the conquest of the island by Timotheus in 366. In Samos, and also at Teos, Epicurus passed the early years of his life, probably assisting his father, who was a common schoolmaster, possibly, too, assisting his mother Archestrata in the practice of her witchcraft—if we may believe doubtful tales. At the age of 18 he went to Athens, where the Platonic school was flourishing under the lead of Xenocrates, and which Aristotle had recently quitted for Chalcis to avoid an indictment for impiety. This visit to Athens, however, was a short one, for in the next year (322) Antipater the Macedonian punished the Athenians for their incipient revolt by banishing about 12,000 of the poorer citizens to distant shores. It was in connection with this event that Epicurus joined his father, who was now located at Colophon. It seems possible that before this time he had listened to some lectures from Nausiphanes, a Democritean philosopher—perhaps also from others—but there is little reason to suppose that he was much better than a petty teacher like his father. The first awakening of the philosophic spirit was seen, it is said, when he asked his teacher, as they read together in Hesiod how chaos was the first of all things, "What then preceded chaos?" Stimulated further by the perusal of some writings of Democritus, Epicurus began to formulate a doctrine of his own; and at Mitylene and Lampsacus, where he spent several years, he gradually gathered round him several disciples who adopted his views with enthusiasm. In 307, the year in which Demetrius Poliorcetes entered Athens and restored to it an at least nominal freedom, Epicurus returned to that city, which had now for a century and a half been the recognized head-quarters of Greek philosophy. Half his life was past; for the remaining thirty-six years he continued at Athens, with the exception of one or two visits to his friends in Ionia. The scene of his philosophic life and teaching was a garden which he bought at the cost of about £300 (80 minæ). There he passed his days as the loved and venerated head of a remarkable society, such as the ancient world had never seen. Amongst the number were Metrodorus, a bosom-friend of more energetic temperament than Epicurus; during their acquaintance, which lasted till the death of Metrodorus seven years before his friend, they only parted company for the space of six months. Timocrates, a brother of Metrodorus, was another member; so were Polyænus, a fair-minded and studious man, Hermarchus, a son of poor parents, who succeeded Epicurus as chief of the school, Leonteus, and others. Nor were women absent from the philosophic coterie. Themista, the wife of Leonteus, was a friend and correspondent of Epicurus; Idomeneus, another member, had married a

sister of Metrodorus; and Metrodorus himself had as his consort Leontion, once a hetæra in Athens, but now the mother of a boy and girl, for whose welfare Epicurus made special provision in his will. That these were not the only ladies in the society is possible enough, and it is possible that the relations between the sexes—in this prototype of Rabelais's Abbey of Thelème—were not entirely what is termed Platonic. But there is on the other hand scarcely a doubt that the tales of licentiousness which ill-tempered opponents circulated regarding the society of the garden are groundless. The stories of the Stoics, who sought occasionally to refute the views of Epicurus by an appeal to his alleged antecedents and habits, were no doubt in the main, as Diogenes Laertius says, the stories of maniacs. The general charges against him which they endeavoured to substantiate by forged letters need not count for much. Even when they tried to show that he was not a citizen with full rights, that he was a plagiarist of other men's wisdom, a correspondent of ladies whom the aristocracy of the period held of dubious rank, an ignoramus, and a scandalous and abusive critic of his opponents, they only exaggerated what, if true, was not so heinous as they wished it to appear. Against them trustworthy authorities testified to his general and remarkable considerateness; they pointed to the statues which the city had raised in his honour, and above all to the numbers of his friends, who were many enough to fill whole cities.

The mode of life in his community was plain. The general drink was water, and the food barley bread; half a pint of wine was held an ample allowance. "Send me," says Epicurus to a correspondent, "send me some Cythnian cheese, so that, should I choose, I may fare sumptuously." But though they lived together, Epicurus would not let his friends throw all their property into the common stock; that, he remarked, would imply distrust of their own and others' good resolutions. The company was held in unity by the siren-like charms of his personality, and by the free sociality which he inculcated and exemplified. Though he seems to have had a warm affection for his countrymen, it was as human beings brought into contact with him, and not as members of a political body, that he preferred to regard them. He never entered public life. His kindliness extended even to his slaves, one of whom, named Mouse, was a brother in philosophy.

Epicurus died of stone in 270 B.C. In a letter to a friend, he speaks of the pleasure afforded to him in his sufferings by the remembrance of happy hours spent in reasoning on the questions of philosophy. He passed away bidding his friends keep in mind the doctrines he had taught them. By his will he left his property, consisting of the garden, a house in Melite (the south-west quarter of Athens), and apparently some funds besides, to two trustees for behoof of his society, and for the special interest of some youthful members. The garden was set apart for the use of the school; the house became the house of Hermarchus and his fellow-philosophers during his life-time. The surplus proceeds of the property were further to be applied to maintain a yearly offering in commemoration of his departed father, mother, and brothers, to pay the expenses incurred in celebrating his own birthday every year on the 7th Gamelion, and for a social gathering of the sect on the 20th of every month in honour of himself and Metrodorus. Besides similar tributes in honour of his brothers and Polyænus, he directed the trustees to be guardians of the son of Polyænus and the son of Metrodorus; whilst the daughter of the last-mentioned was to be married by the guardian to some member of the society who should be approved of by Hermarchus. His four slaves, three men and one woman, were left their freedom. His books passed on to Hermarchus.

Epicurus was a voluminous writer,—the author, it is said, of about 300 works. He had a style and vocabulary of his own. His chief aim in writing was plainness and intelligibility, but his want of order and of logical precision considerably thwarted the realization of his purpose. He pretended to have read little, and to be the original architect of his own system, and the claim was no doubt on the whole true. But he had read Democritus, and it is said Anaxagoras and Archelaus were also amongst his more favourite philosophical authors. His works, it is said, were full of repetition,—which was natural enough; and critics profess to have found in them some vulgarities of language and faults of style. But at any rate they were read and remembered, his pupils got them by heart, and to the last era of Epicureanism they continued in full authority. His chief work was a treatise on nature, in thirty-seven books, of which fragments from about nine books have been found in the rolls discovered at Herculaneum, along with considerable treatises by several of his followers, and most notably Philodemus. An epitome of his doctrine is contained in three letters preserved by Diogenes.

The Epicurean philosophy is traditionally divided into the three branches of logic, physics, and ethics. But it is only as a basis of facts and principles for his theory of life that logical and physical inquiries find a place at all. Epicurus himself had not apparently shared in any large or liberal culture, and his influence was certainly thrown on the side of those who depreciated purely scientific pursuits as one-sided and misleading. "Steer clear of all culture" was his advice to a young disciple. In this aversion to a purely or mainly intellectual training may be traced a recoil from the systematic metaphysics of Plato and Aristotle. With these writers the tendency was to sacrifice the moral to the intellectual—to subordinate the practical man to the philosopher. Ethics had been based upon logic and metaphysics; more had been done to explain the formation of a right judgment in matters of morality than to explain or promote right action. But every-day experience showed that no amount of merely intellectual study is preventive of immorality, and that the systematic knowledge of truth is one thing and right action is another. It seemed to many as well as to Epicurus that the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle led to an aristocracy of intellect, but not to a commonwealth of happiness and goodness. In this way a reaction set in against reasoning and speculation; people wanted to get back to common sense and the feelings of ordinary men. In the second place, Plato and Aristotle had constructed their moral theories on the assumption that a state or a city existed which both showed in the shape of its several institutions how the individual man was expected to behave, and threatened him with various penalties in case he attempted to find out a way of action for himself. They could accordingly give themselves the comparatively easy task of showing how the individual could learn to apprehend and embody in his own conduct the moral law which was exhibited in the institutions of society. But experience had in the time of Epicurus shown the temporary and artificial character of the civic form of social life. It was necessary therefore for Epicurus to go back to nature to find a more enduring and a wider foundation for ethical doctrine, and to decline the help that might be derived from a consideration of the existing form of political union. It was no less necessary to go back from words to realities, to give up reasonings and get at feelings, to test conceptions and arguments by a final reference to the only touchstone of truth—to sensation. There, and there only, one seems to find a common and a satisfactory ground, supposing always that all men's feelings give the same answer. Logic must