but a motion of the body. The executioner uncovered him, and they observed his eyes fixed ; upon which Crito, faithful in the last respectful attentions to his beloved friend, the now departed philosopher, closed the mouth and the eyes.

Thus died Socrates, when he had now completed his se­ventieth year, b.c. 400, or 399, in the full vigour of a healthy old age ; happy in his own estimation, and in that of his admiring disciples, in having terminated his life in so glorious a manner, with unimpaired faculties of mind and body, and after a defence sustained with so much truth, and justice, and fortitude.@@1

His death spread dismay at the moment among those who had been most conspicuous in their attachment to the philosopher, as they naturally dreaded the overflowings of that malignant spirit which had swept down their master. The chief of these appear to have fled to Megara, where they could reckon on finding a refuge from Athenian hostility, and a home with their fellow-disciple, the friendly Euclid. It is remarkable, however, that Isocrates, timid as he was by nature, should not have scrupled to remain at Athens, and to testify his affectionate regret for his master, by ap­pearing the next day in public, clothed in mourning.@@8 But with the fall of its great victim, the spirit of persecution was sated for a time. An act had been perpetrated, to which the eyes of all Greece would be intently turned ; and the greatness of the sacrifice seems at the moment to have absorb­ed the attention of its agents and instruments, in the contem­plation of it and its possible effects. If we may believe the representation of subsequent writers, shame and repentance soon followed the cruel act ; and those who were most osten­sibly involved in its guilt, were either banished or sentenced to death, or laid violent hands on themselves. Of the banish­ment of Anytus, and the death of Melitus, we are told by Laertius, that Antisthenes was the immediate cause. In what way he was instrumental to the death of Melitus, is not stated. But with regard to Anytus, Antisthenes is said to have occasioned his banishment, apparently without the intention of doing so, by a stroke of practical humour. For meeting with some young men from Pontus, inquiring for Socrates, whose fame had induced them to visit Athens, he conducted them to Anytus, who, as he observed to them, was “ wiser than Socrates upon which, the indignation of the bystanders was excited, and they drove Anytus forth from the city.@@5 He fled to Heraclea ; but there found no peace, being forced by public proclamation to leave the city forthwith.@@4 Though, however, these individuals soon after received the retribution due to their offence, it would not follow that they suffered from their countrymen on ac­count of the part they had taken against Socrates. The ascendancy of another political faction, (and Athens was ever fluctuating between contending parties), would be quite sufficient to account for their overthrow and despera­tion. On the other hand, the testimony of Plutarch is ex­plicit to the point, though he mentions no individuals by name, that the sycophants who had assailed Socrates be­came the objects of popular hatred to such a degree, that none would associate with them in any way, not even to return them an answer when addressed by them, and that at last they hanged themselves, being no longer able to endure the public execration.@@5 His friends, indeed, per­formed the last obsequies to his remains ; but his fellow- citizens afterwards concurred in honouring him, by erecting a brazen statue of him, the work of Lysippus, in the

Pompeium, and expressing their sorrow, by closing the public gymnasia for a while.

This at any rate is certain, that persecution, as it ever does, overwrought its part in the case of Socrates. It op­pressed, indeed, the individual, but it gave the seal of mar­tyrdom to the cause in which he had been engaged. It produced a temporary intimidation, under which men would hear less of the name and teaching of Socrates openly avowed, but throughout which the admiration and love of the heroic philosopher would be cherished in secret, and his doctrine would be fostered in the shade, to appear in the sunshine of a future day. If the Athenians had desired to plant the root of philosophy in their city, they could not more effectually have done so, than by their violence against Socrates. Such, in fact, was the result. Philosophy hence­forth obtained an Athenian naturalization and name ; and the schools of Athens may date their period of nearly a thousand years from this memorable act, which, in its in­tent and spirit, fiercely but blindly endeavoured to extin­guish there the very profession of philosophy.@@6

The cause, however, in which Socrates had been en­gaged, was too true, for any opposition to it, though con­ducted with the greatest prudence, to have been long suc­cessful. It had also already advanced too far, and interest­ed too many persons in the maintenance of it, to be put down by a sudden blow. The burning of a book, or a for­mal condemnation of the opinions of a writer, are but fu­tile means, as experience shews, of suppressing obnoxious doctrines. How much less could opposition avail, where, as in the case of Socrates, the offending doctrines had been scattered over, not the pages of a book, but the strenuous exertions of a long life,—already engraved in characters which no obliterating hand could reach, and doubtless so worked into many a mind, as not to be distinguishable from its own proper convictions,—doctrines too, so confirmed by the noble example of their teacher, in carrying them out to their full consequences by his death ? For the death of So­crates, it should be observed, was not simply a test of his sincerity in his teaching. It was this, and still more. It was the ultimate and decisive opposition to those false principles, against which every action and discourse of his life had been directed. He had been all along exposing the presump­tuousness and vanity of the principles on which men ordi­narily judged and acted. He was now further to shew, that this opposition on his part was not to be daunted by those principles, when set in formidable array against his own life ; and that, professing a low estimate of the present life, he would not disown or shrink from that profession at the moment of greatest trial.

If we inquire, accordingly, what was the substance of the positive teaching of Socrates, we must address ourselves to the contemplation of his active life, and his resigned patient death. He had no design of establishing philosophy as a literary pursuit or intellectual pastime ; though he probably foresaw, that that taste for inquiry into truth which he was ever awakening, must soon lead to the formation of *a* philo­sophical literature at Athens. He already witnessed, in­deed, the commencement of such a literature, the result of this excitement, if it be true that he had read the Lysis of Plato, and observed respecting it, “ How much the young man makes me say that I never said !”@@7 He wished rather to divert men from the vanity of setting themselves up as philosophers, and make them employ their thoughts in learn­ing and investigating, instead of prematurely commencing

@@@l Xenoph. Mem. iv. 8—Apol. 32.—Plato, Phædo, ad fin.

@@@\* Pseudo-Plutarch. X Orat. Vit. Plutarch. Op. ix. p. 336.

@@@’ Diog. Laert. in vit. Antisth. vi 4, 10.

@@@‘ Ibid, in vit Socr. ii. 5, 43.

@@@5 Plutarch, de Invid. et Od. Op. viii. p. 128.—Diodorus Siculus says, ό *8ημos μeτtμf∖η∂η* .... καl rcλoc *ακρίτους aπiκτftvt.* xiv. 88 ; also Augustin, de Civ. Dei, viii. 3.

@@@, The schools of Athens were closed in the reign of Justinian, A. C. 529.

@@@τ Diog. Laert. in vit. Plat, xxiv.