the sad spectacle of one who had been the friend of every poor man at Athens, no less than of the rich and noble, requited with prosecution and death by those very hands conjoined in the unnatural act, which each should have warded off the blow inflicted by the other. The genius of Intolerance was indeed behind the scene, mixing the poi­soned cup for its destined victim. But the actors on the public stage of the trial were, at the same time, wreaking their own vengeance on a political opponent ; and the more exasperated against him, in proportion as, by his imper­turbable demeanour and real inoffensiveness, he seemed to defy their assaults, and to throw them back on the consciousness of their injustice and ingratitude towards him.

Nor can there be any doubt, that there were many indi­viduals, whose pride he had hurt, whose ignorance he had exposed, whose ill-humour he bad irritated, and who, such is the infirmity of human nature, would rejoice in the op­portunity of revenge by the verdict of a public condemna­tion of his doctrine. In affronting the sophists by his free discussions of their pretensions, he had excited, doubtless, the hostility of many of the higher order of citizens, their patrons and disciples. Many fathers of families too must then have been suffering from that corruption of public morals which, under the teaching of the sophists, had clothed it­self with plausibilities of argument, and impudently arro­gated, for its vain pretensions, the importance of philoso­phy. Disobedient, profligate sons, lifting their hands against their fathers, and adding bitterness to their unnatu­ral rebellion, by the hollow false-hearted principles upon which they had learned to justify it,—forward, petulant youths, insulting the dignity of age by their pretensions to superior wisdom, and their turbulence,—these were the fruits of sophistical education, which came home to every family at Athens. Few that felt the evil in their own homes, would stop to inquire whether Socrates was the teacher whom they had to blame for their suffering. Most would hastily conclude, that all such instruction of the young was pernicious, and their offence at the mischiev­ous doctrine of the sophists would become a disgust to phi­losophy and philosophers.

Some, indeed, would distinctly trace to Socrates the an­noyance which they had experienced from particular indi­viduals. There were many who had frequented the society of Socrates, with no sincere intention of profiting by his lessons,—who observed his inquisitive manner, and its effect in convicting and refuting the errors of those with whom he conversed, and who endeavoured, for their own wan­ton gratification, to imitate him in their intercourse with others. These would take delight in confounding and per­plexing others, and exposing and ridiculing their preten­sions to wisdom. It is easy to conceive, that the super­ficial resemblance to the manner of Socrates in these per­sons, and the vexation produced by it, would excite angry objection against the real method of Socrates.@@1 These persons would be pointed at as his disciples. These would be referred to as instances of the evil tendency of the teach­ing of the philosopher himself ; the discredit of the spurious disciples being reflected on the master, to whom it belonged not in any degree.

It appears, further, as might have been expected, that

the doctrines of Socrates were studiously misrepresented at the time. Allusions or illustrations employed by him in his reasonings were construed into positive opinions on the subjects to which he thus referred. For example, when, inculcating honest industry, he quoted Hesiod,@@t saying. “Work there is none that is a scandal, inaction is the scan­dal,” the captious absurdly but maliciously interpreted him, as applying the words of the poet to sanction the doing every thing, whether right or wrong, for the sake of gain. When he quoted from Homer the account of Ulysses si­lencing the uproar of the people, against the practice of employing worthless persons in the public service, it was represented, that he approved the coercing the common people and the poor by harshness and violence.@@5 Again, in urging the necessity of looking to the qualification of those who should be appointed to oflice, and illustrating this by the fact, that no one would choose, by lot, a pilot, or carpenter, or flute-player, or any one, indeed, in mat­ters where error was far less mischievous than in poli­tics,—he was charged with encouraging contempt of the established laws, and exciting the young to acts of violence.@@’ And, (which is the most invidious form of misrepresenta­tion), a general charge of corrupting the young was thrown out against him, unsupported by any specific statements of the means of corruption which he employed. As in the polemics of later days, so in the controversy between So­crates and his assailants, the obloquy of general hackneyed terms of reproach was resorted to as the substitute for de­finite grounds of imputation. Thus were the off-hand alle­gations against all philosophers,—“ that they searched into the things in the air and the things under the earth, and rejected all belief in the gods, and made the worse appear the better reason,”@@5—used as a cover, on this occasion, to the envy and malignity which shrank from the light and the evidence of facts.

t The accusation of Melitus, it will be observed, was dis­tributed into three heads : 1. Contempt of the established religion. 2. The introduction of new divinities.@@6 3. The corruption of the young. The second of these charges re­quires to be more particularly noticed, because it has re­ference to a peculiarity in the conduct of Socrates which gave it a colour of truth.

The mind of Socrates appears to have been deeply im­bued with religious feeling. The observation of final causes particularly excited his interest ; so much so, as to lead him to think that no other account should be attempted to be given of the phenomena of the world, but as they are the results of a wise and benevolent design. He delighted thus in contemplating every thing in a moral and religious point of view. He thought that the introduction of physical and mechanical causes into the study of nature, only perplexed and misled the mind. He had at first been greatly attract­ed by the speculations of Anaxagoras. What won his at­tention in the system of this philosopher, was its distinguish­ed merit beyond all previous systems, in assigning mind as the master principle of the universe. But when he came to study the writings of Anaxagoras more closely, he was grievously disappointed, and threw up the system in dis­gust. For he found that it lost sight of the grand and true principle with which it set out, and, after all, constructed the universe out of mere material and mechanical elements.@@7

@@@1 Xenophon speaks of persons who were pointedly corrected by Socrates, *fsii μ∙i>o> a* ∙xι<fβf xoλα<rr>)j∕ou *tnxα rtiι( <ritr aio/iinui*

*tliftaι tξωτω> ηλfγ∙χt>.* Mem. i. 4. Such persons would bear a grudge against him, as Anytus in particular appears to have done, and

would not be very scrupulous, with this angry feeling dwelling in their minds, as to the mode of resenting the affront.

@@@» Op. 311. *0fpyfiη* dt τ\* ov<tδor.

@@@3 Xenopb. Mein. i. 2.·

@@@' Plato, Euthyphro, 3, 6. ⅛r eis *xantn/MÙrrof* <re3 <πj<' *rà ôtîa, γiγ(βurraι rai>rt∣>* nj» *γmφi∣r xal iti iiaβaλ∑n ii∙l igχiraι ti;*

*ri iιxaθτi∣ξ∣(jv, t!δuς in ιυίιάβολα rà roiaùra roiς* roiς τολλβύς. Op. i. p. 6.—Xenoph. Mem. i. 2, 9.

@@@• Plat. Λpol. 23, p. 54.

@@@■ Athenians preserved the same character at the time of St Paul in this respect, also, as well in their eagerness after news ; as is seen in their accusing him of setting forth strange gods. (Acts xvii. 18.) ξtrωr *ia∣∣Mnι>n* 3oxi7, xαroχχsλst⅛ «Two.

@@@’ Plato, Phædo.—Apolog.