was again in Thrace, at Amphipolis,@@1 in the same year as that of the unfortunate expedition to Delium. No particu­lars are mentioned of this adventure. But the fact itself is sufficiently attested. Nor, though it follows immediately on the affair of Delium, is it improbable on that account. For at this busy period of the war, when the Athenians were making demonstrations of their power, by the presence of their forces in different places at once, and when Brasilias was pushing his successes against them in Thrace, no indi­vidual of the military age, (and Socrates was not more than forty-six or forty-seven years of age at this time), would en­joy any long interval of relaxation from foreign service.

With these exceptions, Socrates appears then to have constantly resided at Athens. All this time, throughout his whole life indeed, he lived in great poverty, content with the least that might suffice for mere sustenance and cloth­ing from day to day.

Yet it was no artificial, and melancholy, and fanatical life that he led. He accustomed himself to a strict mode­ration, not with any view to the mortification of the body, or as thinking that abstinence was in itself a virtue, but in or­der to self-command ; by rendering himself as independent as possible of the circumstances of the body, to disencum­ber the soul of every burthen and obstruction to its free operation. There was nothing, indeed, of austerity in his life or manner. He might be seen walking barefoot, but it was not for the pain that it might inflict. It was only that he might bear cold and privations of every kind the better, and suffer the less inconvenience when exposed to neces­sary hardships, and require the less for his ordinary subsist­ence. So far was he from studying a discipline of bodily severity for its own sake, that he was observed at times mingling in the social festivities of his fellow-citizens with the full freedom of Athenian conviviality, and shewing that he could bear excesses which mastered others, without los­ing his self-command.@@2

One account, indeed, but not a very credible one, as it rests on the authority of Aristoxenus, an invidious writer, states that he was supported by the alms of friends, contri­buted from time to time for his relief. With his very li­mited wants, and his ready access to the house of Crito and other liberal patrons of philosophy at Athens, he would not have to depend on this precarious charity. The pittance which sufficed for the humblest citizen would suffice for him. He is said to have inherited a patri­mony of seventy or eighty minæ.@@5 But this sum, it is added, he lost (though the time is not stated when the loss occurred) by the failure of the person with whom it had been placed at interest. He possessed also a house in Athens ; and he was able, however scantily, to support a family. So that we cannot suppose he was absolutely des­titute of all resources of subsistence. He appears then ra­ther to have voluntarily renounced every kind of worldly possession, so far as his own personal comfort was concern­ed, than to have been absolutely reduced to want by the pressure of circumstances. Poverty, in fact, was his pro­fession, and not the mere necessity of his case. If he prided himself in any thing, it was in his avowal of his contempt for riches, and disregard of domestic interests and comforts, in contrast with the general habits of an age of selfish acti­vity and profusion. The means of enriching himself, at least

of extricating himself from want, were often placed in his power, and he as often rejected them. Alcibiades offered him land on which he might build a house, but he refused it pointedly, observing, “ Had I wanted shoes, would you have offered me leather to make shoes for myself?—and ri­diculous should I have been in taking it.” Charmides would have given him slaves, as a source of revenue by their labour. This offer also he refused.@@4 In the same spirit, he would often cast a look at the number of things that were sold, and say to himself, “ Of how many things I have no need !@@s Thus was his whole plan of life studi­ously opposed to the acceptance of any provision for his comfort or ease. It was a service of the Deity in which he felt himself engaged, and in the prosecution of that, so­lemnly devoted to a course of hardy poverty.@@®

In the domestic relations of life, he lived an Athenian among Athenians. He differed from other heads of families at Athens in this respect, that in his dedication of him­self to his philosophic mission, he took no thought about the management of his private affairs. His home was abroad ; his household the people of Athens. Still he discharged the duties of a husband, and the father of a family ; and that under trying circumstances, unless the pro­verbial severity of temper of his wife Xanthippe be es­teemed an idle scandal of the day. No Athenian, indeed, was truly domestic, in the sense of making his home the scene of his highest interest and enjoyment. Nor was So­crates domestic in this sense. Still less was he so than other Athenians ; inasmuch as his very profession of life was a call from the bosom of his family. But in the midst of these avocations from his immediate home, and the vexa­tions to which he was subjected there, he was not estranged from the ties of domestic affection. Xenophon has recorded a simple and touching trait of the character of Socrates un­der this particular point of view—a trait the more interest­ing, as almost every thing else that we know of the philoso­pher is drawn from his life in public. It occurs in the course of a conversation between Socrates and bis son Lamprocles, who had complained of the insufferable temper of his mo­ther Xanthippe. “ What,” said he to the youth, “ do you think it more annoying to you to hear what she says, than it is to the actors, when in the tragedies they say every thing bad of one another ?” “ But they, I conceive,” re­

plied the son, “ bear it easily, because they do not suppose that the speaker, in contradicting them, intends to hurt them, or that, in threatening, he intends to do them any ill.” “ Then are you,” resumed Socrates, “ vexed, when you well know that what your mother says to you, she says, not only intending no evil, but even wishing more good to you than to any one else ; or do you regard your mother as un­kindly affected towards you ?” Lamprocles disclaiming this latter supposition ; “ Do you, then,” he added, “ say of her, who is both kind to you, and takes every possible care of you when you are sick, that you may recover, and want no­thing proper for you, and who, moreover, prays to the gods in your behalf for many a good, and pays vows,—that she is vexatious ? For my part, I think, if you cannot bear such a mother, you cannot bear what is good for you.”@@7

From the description given by Plato of the family of So­crates in the prison-scene, it would appear, that Socrates had other three children besides Lamprocles,—for Lampro-
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@@@, About L.400 of our money. Plutarch (in his life of Aristides) finds fault with Demetrius Phalereus for having endeavoured to remove the imputation of poverty from Socrates, by stating that Socrates had land of his own and seventy minæ put out to intereat by Crito. Demetrius, however, seems only to have stated what he believed to be the truth. The idea of bis extreme indigence originated pro­bably with the caricatures of bis profession of poverty by the comic poets ; and true as it was substantially, was afterwards, it seems, maintained by bis friends and admirers, as the evidence of the consistency of his life with his avowed contempt for worldly pos­sessions.
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