Spring 5-15-2009

The Apology of Sidney: Explaining Martyrdom

Michael Marinaccio
Coastal Carolina University

The Apology of Sidney

Explaining Martyrdom

By

Michael Marinaccio
Political Science

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of
Bachelor of Science
In the Honors Program at
Coastal Carolina University
May 2009

Table of Contents

I. Introduction

The treatment of important figures throughout history has always played favor to the victor by nature and consequently only been offered thorough significance given the eventual passage of time and publicity. If queried of philosophy and its basic influence on the modern world, laymen would probably have the ability to conjure up the name of Socrates, one of the more prominent, noteworthy philosophers in history.

Why is Socrates so prominent in our minds? The answer can be traced to an observation of how the intellectual community treats information and handles the replication of it for its future generations. With consideration to its popularity and application to other various disciplines, the communication of an idea, per say Socrates, spreads openly to others and has a funnel effect into the descent of common knowledge and its future use by mankind. Through a revival of sources and a constant stream of study following the restoration and interpretations from the Greek, the works of Plato and his Socrates have become very popular to historians, thus impacting the lives of many through a reflection on Socrates' teachings and their influence upon our knowledge base. Socrates' unjust punishment and execution in particular, while not completely understood for the full merit of its purpose, has descended through the ages in a manner that has repeatedly been used to demonstrate the importance of "philosophic preservation of right through reason"[1] while at the same time weighing in on the fragility of life, society and "such [social] constructions as neither agree with law, reason, or common sense."[2]

[1] Hathaway, 127
[2] Sidney, 1683, (The Very Copy…")

As in the case with Socrates, the same prompt is posed in reference to a different man with similar attributes and events that shaped a teaching just as important. This time it is of a man named Algernon Sidney, a founder and writer of modern Republicanism. While the adamant historian could probably draw a distinct and detailed caricature of the events that occurred during Sidney's life, few have really commentated on his life and accomplishments in general, let alone the effect he has had on our modern world as a whole.

The man published no great works, spoke no great speeches and held no real positions of confidence during his lifetime. With these premises in mind, we would imagine to ourselves that his legacy would not be worth allotting any importance. Then why do we look to Socrates when he was only a man of the same credibility? The so-called teacher of Plato, often spoken as simply a mere character in his works, sought out no greater honors than did Sidney, yet we hear nothing of Sidney's martyred death nor his adoration for his country. Even granted the space in time, Socrates speaks from two millennia while Sidney only a few hundred years. If we were to give any justification to a man who died for a cause, would we not sooner grant credit to the more recent source of knowledge, more aptly accessible to historians and able for investigation?

The entirety of this analysis will dissect this accessible knowledge and the lives of both men, Socrates and Algernon Sidney. The discussion will occur in order to ascertain the meaning within their lives, the purpose behind their deaths, and the evaluation of their legacies in lieu of their sacrifices. In order to narrow the resulting impacts of both men and the scope of understanding we arrive at, the examination will be limited to the men's influences of the intellectual communities of the Western world and their conservation of

certain ideas throughout history within those contexts. All of the sources chosen are that of respected Western thought and of only the highest caliber. Being put into this perspective, every detail of their lives will be placed side-by-side and evaluated, with the help of historians, to prescribe reasoning behind the deficiency in Sidney's lasting legacy. As a basic guideline, it will be first assumed, and later explained in detail, that Socrates was a great man of wisdom, distinguished from the many in wisdom, courage or some other virtue[3], that facilitated philosophy more in his death than he ever could have in his life. It will secondly be assumed that the reader has a basic understanding of Socrates' trial, execution and the paradoxical method that led to his legacy of promoting philosophy to the masses. This understanding of his purpose and legacy is the fundamental concept that this analysis will demonstrate and through this discernment we will be able to understand the misfortunes that befell Sidney and kept his story hidden for so many centuries. Through juxtaposition with Socrates, we will be able to view Sidney in a new light and unlock truths that have since been ignored by history.

In order to maintain the utmost confidence of evidence, only the most respected versions of the texts available will be put side by side in a fashion paralleling hermeneutics and the evaluation will be preceded by a clear leniency in favor of logic over empiricism. It is clear "these humanistic and hermeneutical views [are able to] reorient the usual double mirror of historicist"[4] undertones that usually relinquish Socrates of his importance and redirect the method of questioning to erroneous matters which distort the entire point in studying his principles. Not only will these contexts be observed as stated but also other outside information as indicated from previous authors

[3] West, Apology, 1984, 34e-35b
[4] Farness, 1987, 12

and other works will accommodate the full understanding, breadth and interpretation of this work. A full range of scholarly journal articles will be cited and devoted to establishing a basis of understanding for the elucidations outlined, as well as and if not more important, the primary texts themselves. This case is important, especially concerning Socrates and how distinctly remote in history his character lies. The organization of this analysis will follow a somewhat converse transition, unlike a normal comparative work. So as to teach the importance behind each man's life, this analysis will stage a rebirth of ideologies and start backwards first from their legacies, to deaths, and continue on to decryption of their trials until they are again alive in the hearts of all those who seek to heed their teachings.

These questions and others are to be answered with ease but not before the steepest challenge to this use of information is granted a reasonable but succinct counterargument, given the precision of this examination. The most typical conjecture in assimilating text and producing conclusions comes from the "well-known problem in interpretation"[5] of Plato and Socrates, which will extend even unto Sidney and the truth behind his lives. The problem is simple: how can we know if we are learning from Socrates or from his author and observer, Plato? The question will obtain a brief answer for the sake of clarity but then continue to acknowledge the assumption. Historians can only know what they have been given from those of their discipline prior to them but just like any selection of knowledge available to us, we must question its application to our lives with consideration to how truthful it may be. If humans only believe the things that are empirically offered to them through purely data analysis, they grasp very little and do not withhold any sort of decent ethical standard from which to exist. Leo Strauss indicates, in

[5] Farness, 1987, 3

his attack on historicism's base, "since the limitations of human thought are essentially unknowable, it makes no sense to conceive of them in terms of social, economic, and other conditions"[6] which analyze knowable phenomena. Thus, the rhetoric in this project must necessarily follow from a natural right standpoint, evaluating all events in the greater schema of teachings as opposed to only developing ideas and lessons within the context of an era. We must accept that "their present tense merges with our present tense;"[7] "their" in this case being the principle teaching Socrates and Sidney have to offer. There must necessarily be a branch of trust from which humans dictate truth through an acceptance of norms by use of reason; epistemologically speaking, this is a splinter of the coherence theory of truth and understanding. Coherence theory tells us that as society grows and ideas become more prevalent and widespread, we must begin to trust those with the most expertise on a subject and comes to agree or compromise on what the truth really is. "Where truth is [a] relation between coherent sets of beliefs or theories,"[8] we can establish that more individuals can prove the more one subject truer, the harder it is to refute. This is not to say that this paper will simply reflect the agreements made by historians but allow the analysis to better refine another epistemological theory of correspondence to elicit generalized agreements on forms outside the physical realm. With this in mind we can establish groundwork for exposing new ideas within the context of an epistemological common ground. With that said, we can easily solve the Plato-Socrates problem posed by this dilemma by ascertaining truth from the primary texts with full certainty of their existence and the factual consistency of the central themes written within them. Regardless of proprietary concerns of whose

[6] Strauss, 1971, 21
[7] Farness, 1987, 12
[8] Willmott, 2002, 343

ideas belong to whom, it is easier to place stricter precision on understanding the concepts than eliciting wasted effort on determining the true source of the information. Applying "such precision as accords with the subject-matter, and so much as is appropriate to the inquiry,"[9] is of greatest importance. The texts exist, can be supported by historians and can teach something to humanity they would otherwise lack without them. It is the deaths of these men that allow the texts to become more lucid.

[9] Hippocrates, Nicomachean Ethics, 1094b

II. Purpose and Legacy

In order to properly understand the meaning of one's legacy in accordance with the power it holds to shape humanity, one must first develop a sense of purpose. While the idea may be redundant and the lesson inculcated, it is essential to completely understand the groundwork of this argument before continuing on. What are these words "purpose," "legacy" and how do they infiltrate our lives? The question of purpose in life has long surrounded the foundation of civilizations, religions and social movements throughout history. The idea that we live and die for a reason gives us greater understanding of our essence so that we may pursue comparable and worthwhile ends which point us towards the betterment of ourselves and our loved ones. Usually, we work within the confines of our surroundings and do the best with what is given to us, through fortune and the pursuit of excellence. To measure ourselves indefinitely, though, instead of only within the prospects of our own life span transcends an entirely new principle of reality.

The development of a legacy strives to pursue a greater good than is humanly possible within one single life. It is only once an individual accepts themselves as mortal beings that they can ever fully become responsible for their actions and how they will impact following generations. At that point, the fragility of life is no longer an issue and time is only a mechanism to perform deeds efficient to the procurement of humanity. Socrates is most famous for this paradox that becomes our volition in older age. Most sentient beings do not accept their demise and seek passionate lies from which to shield them from their fear of death. It is in this purpose that we must glorify those who seek their death readily and for some greater meaning. This idea is merely touched upon here but is structurally defined in the Socratic teachings. It is not to say that the form never existed before his

great "journey from this world to the next"[10] but only after did it invent itself in the written form. From this account by Plato, we can begin to understand and act upon actions that we never knew were accessible to the human psyche. Whether it may seem to be a measure of self-deception or simply insanity that leads one person to pursue phenomenal ends, the truth is that *good* is the end in which all men should seek.

The entire concept of purpose and legacy presupposes the belief in a universal code of ethics that masks all eras. Divinity or the greater good follows that of natural right, cohering to a hierarchal list of prioritized goods on one end and vices on the opposite. In order to evaluate these two men, it will be required to assume that while there are historical consequences that follow each other chronologically, we cannot depend on those consequences to lead to a greater truth every generation of new thought. The historicist argument cannot be sustained that men are defined simply by the era and in the context of social norms. As previously noted, the entire crux of the thesis would be completely erroneous if we were to only acknowledge the effect of an event simply in the direct after-effect. This freedom allows us to make value judgments of the men's actions. These men's "philosophy transcends that moment of making its appeal to us"[11] beyond what we feel. If we try to separate ourselves from time and value, we find ourselves lost in the constant chaos that Nietzsche so often tries to relinquish himself to. This misunderstanding will be promptly cured and the weakness of comparing only that, which applies to a limited parameter of time, will be clarified to admonish all methods of

[10] Bostick, 1916, 250
[11] Farness, 1987, 12

distorting the teachings of Socrates and Sidney. We must see that "Socrates and Plato's sense of history…overlaps our sense of history"[12] in a magnificent way.

When Nietzsche first presented his criticism of the *Phaedo,* in his *Gay Science,* he had hoped to shock his audience and reveal a great personal truth unlike any that had ever been told by philosophy before. In a resolute attempt to demonstrate the hopeless fruition of life through his own rhetorical interpretation, Nietzsche used Socrates' dying words to represent the perpetual transgressions of human life as a whole, even into death. As transcribed from Greek, the last words of Socrates beckoned Crito to pay "a cock to Asclepius", the God of Healing, and do not forget the debt as his last dying wish. This portrayal was utilized by Nietzsche as evidence that even the world's most knowledgeable and staunch advocate of virtue felt that "life [was] a disease" and death was his only remedy for the hatred and torture experienced on earth.[13] Nietzsche did not comprehend the strength in those last words but instead saw only a weakness of soul he assumed Socrates held. This is no surprise, though. Due to the primarily sordid teaching of prowess in man to deceive and manipulate solely for the object of power and egotism, Nietzsche misses the most obvious principle Socrates is trying to elicit. Socrates is no narcissist or perspectivist. Such an idea is completely far-fetched. As Madison argues, this understanding of Socrates' death being a release from the physical realm "has been seriously misinterpreted and [the] intended significance fundamentally obscured"[14] by Nietzsche. While the actual thoughts of the man Socrates can never distinctly be affirmed, a dissimilar argument stands out for the actual meaning of his dying phrase. Instead of paying attention to the words in context of their placement in the dialogue

[12] Ibid
[13] Madison, 2002, 421
[14] Ibid 422

alone, we must look outside through other outlets and use evidence from other dialogues of Plato to actualize the essence of his words. By assuring that "death is nothing other than the separation of the soul from the body,"[15] we can establish that the soul actually maintains a dynamic difference from that of life on earth. The soul, that which is aligned by wisdom in accordance with virtue[16], demonstrates that the proper conception of his words can only take form if we perceive the soul as an actualized part of the human being, incurring "moderation, courage, prudence"[17] and inevitably justice as the master of the soul. From the Nietzschean perspective, none of these forms exist. Since everything is of perspective, moral relativism can hardly validate a value judgment let alone a soul. There are three major counterarguments that can be made against the assumption that Socrates' last words were cowardly yelps. First, according to Nietzsche, we must assume that Socrates is offering reverence to a god, who cannot aid him in any way but to free his physical body from eternal torment, which completely contradicts his standards and teachings. Socrates was brighter and aptly cleverer than to force a literal scorn down his loved ones throats before his death. It would seem a waste of his entire life if the very last thing he spoke was literal, given that his entire life has been a metaphorical masterpiece. Secondly, *the Apology* actively demonstrates that had Socrates desired to be "released from [his] troubles"[18] promptly and without reprisal. The entire notion of his trial would hinge upon the satisfaction and amusement of a dying old man. Xenophon attempts to convey this argument but does not indulge quite as much on the trial as Plato does, thus presenting not only a conflict of interest between both stories but a curiosity as to why

[15] Ibid 426
[16] Bloom, 1991, 432a-433b.
[17] Bloom, 1991, 433c
[18] West, Apology, 1984, 41d

Xenophon would produce such a premise with so little support to maintain it. Even if Socrates were truly using the system for his pure amusement and as an escape for senility, the purpose would still remain despite his intentions. Third, the literal Greek of "we" is often overlooked in lieu of the plausibility that Socrates may actually be speaking simply for himself in his time of need. The offering given to Asclepius is for *everyone* in "the polis" who "will be in need of healing or purification" after the loss of a man like Socrates.[19] The petition is not simply for Socrates and his health. A man would not drag himself to the troubles of an unnecessary indictment, trial and execution only to beg for something selfish like resignation, so close to his demise. To fashion his words only within the context of a selfish retort is beyond the most basic comprehension of the Platonic and Socratic teachings.

The entire example presented will be the foundation for the definition of purpose. Socrates felt that "virtue or righteousness may be imparted to men by teaching them their ignorance, and by giving them an exact knowledge of what is right" through a dialectical obstacle course.[20] Never would Socrates spell out his teachings or even force them upon others, but spent most of his life searching for those he could teach:

> Socrates once said, "I have a benevolent habit of pouring out myself to everybody and I would even pay for a listener if I could not get one in any other way." [21]

From what we're given through his teachings, we can see how vanity and despair is an unlikely consequence of many years of introspection and love for humanity. While Socrates may jest in his evaluation of the human being, it would seem that in the end he had deep compassion for the hope of mankind.

[19] Madison, 2002, 431
[20] Bostick, 1916, 251
[21] Ibid 248

The idea that even upon his deathbed Socrates would profess his undying aspiration and love for the people whom he cherished most displays how important this sense of purpose is in our lives. The repercussions that swell infinitely to all whom hear his story and follow his wisdom are immeasurable and priceless. Both him and Sidney share this likeness.

III. Enter Algernon Sidney

By the same merit that Plato's stories would have us swooning upon Socrates' philosophical crusade, the question must be begged whether every soldier that dies for a cause they believe in proposes some teaching to us that is worth retaining for thousands of years. The answer to that question comes only as a result of weighing out the range and lasting effect of the martyr's impact on a select culture or populace. In this particular case, the western world is the theater in which their thoughts and ideas have come to fruition. Thus, if proven that, like Socrates, a man could die and have his words later reflect a much greater good, then it would be proper to adorn that man with his rightful credit to his unforeseen purpose. While important to make clear how intent upon their cause they were, the real object at question is not whether each of these men really intended upon dying at the hands of a martyred cause but whether we now draw any conclusions that can help us better understand ourselves in the modern day, or the way we've handled our own pasts.

The aristocrat, Algernon Sidney, was a somewhat sardonic individual, fit for comparison to a late seventeenth century British novel character. Historians would not ever think to compare Sidney to the great teacher of Plato's dialogues due to how little study we have offered him. Sidney was a typical statesmen: a member of British Parliament and complete with his own long list of personal troubles that inundated him up until his last stand at the gallows; "poverty and debt plagued his life."[22] Born at Kent into minor royalty, the son of the second Earl of Leicester, "Sidney's ancestral burden

[22] Worden, 1985, 4

was a portentous one."[23] Sidney had been destined to serve within the court and have political matters take up the majority of his time.[24] It was only a matter of serving the British military a few years until an injury took him out of service and allowed him more time in the political arena to expand his horizons. There was one significant difference between Sidney and the rest of his confidants in parliament. Sidney saw the world in a completely different light.

To use the cave analogy of Socrates, Sidney saw the bright end of the tunnel, aside all the shadows and chains while his fellow countrymen were bound to the walls, staring at what they thought was a divine monarch demigod beyond all other reachable mortal power. It would not be a stretch of the imagination to label Sidney as a modern philosopher, for he facilitated the same movements and harmonized the same truths as Locke who would go on to be taught in universities all over the international renown. *Patriarcha*, written by Sir Robert Filmer was one of many foundational pieces of literature that argued the divine right of kings, expounding on the power given by God to each individual king and queen to wield justice and law upon their people as their holy majesties saw fit. The majority of Sidney's life was spent on his memoirs recording each and every refutation to Filmer's book, never being able to publish it until his close friends and relatives did years after his execution. This book, now compiled into his *Discourses Concerning Government*, aped much of the thought of the day's modern philosophical standards but with more words and reasons than his people required. The cleaner, more lyrical and cliché version of Sidney's discourses came at a lesser price than Sidney's head, as Locke and his treatises under a pen-name escaped the wrath of Charles II into

[23] Ibid
[24] Brown, 1984, 11-13

exile. While often overlooked due to Locke's work, it is important to note that "Sidney…did more to legitimate the American Revolution than ever Locke did"[25] with his *Two Treatise on Government*. The point of both these works was to elucidate this new idea of personal sovereignty. The idea that each man, woman and child had the natural right to their own life and property, not to be removed by any license or liberty of any free man under Adam, was not completely new but in terms of governmental structure a great liberal transition.

The trouble came for Sidney when he began meddling with the wrong types of revolutionaries, who felt no a better cause than to remove the head of the king. While he was an avid republican, Sidney felt no inclination to murder or topple government but instead insisted on necessary changes through political means. Unfortunately for him, he lacked a significant role in any party and had little political influence. The idea that Sidney was a man with a party he fully supported is often debated. His republican views had to force him to part ways with many of the terms his fellow Whigs supported, showing a clear clash of ideologies. While Sidney may have been a proponent of the exclusionary principle that kept a Catholic off the throne, any rule or law that was going to limit a monarch would have probably stirred his interest. "The dissenters to whom he felt closest were Independents and Quakers, groups whose theological emphases perhaps gave them more common ground than most Protestants had with Sidney's Platonism."[26] The established government had long drowned out the whims of philosophers and led passions only by the court's desire, hence excluding Sidney from most pertinent discussion and only focusing on the trivial. His life was often very solitary and devoid of

[25] Laslett, 1960, 14
[26] Worden, 1985, 26

personal companions or friends that shared his very same principles. He was said to have a furious passion for what he spoke and a very arrogant way about his demeanor, which made him often very difficult to manage in a group scenario. He fled the country after the beheading of Charles I and the coming of Cromwell to power. Such ordeals would inevitably lead him to the plot that would bring about his death.

The realization that begins to unfold indicates the vast similarities between Socrates and Sidney as we break down the lives of each man. Both Socrates and Sidney are charge with crimes heinous in nature to the social structure but ridiculous by any small amount of rationale. Socrates is brought upon indictment for corrupting the youth and his religious perspective while Sidney is imprisoned for a murder attempt[27] on the king and writings expressing his discontent for the current government. In an attempt to draw conclusions on the likeness of Algernon Sidney to Socrates, this project shall search for resemblances among the transcripts of cases which describe their trials in detail, the apologies that were spoken in defense of their lives, the last words before their very deaths and the literature we have about them that helps us understand what brought them to their deaths.

[27] The Rye House Plot: "the alleged plot of 1683 to assassinate Charles II [and his brother James] as [they] passed the Rye House on his way from New-Market to London." Because of a great fire, the races ended earlier than expected and the plot was never carried out due to time constraints (Worden, 1985, 12).

IV. Death and Eternal Legacy

The act of giving one's life transcends the ability to communicate an idea in the present life. After their deaths, the lives of great individuals seem to grow with some greater meaning than no one could ever demonstrate before their perishing. This is not to say that the social structure is purely at fault for the augmentation of a lesson passed down through history or the facilitation of a method. There is also a form outside the physical realm. But we are to be grateful for this pattern discovered by historians. It is an attempt to better understand those even after they no longer exist. Accordingly in this observation, we must try our hardest to separate what is pragmatically established as reminiscent and what has stuck with society as a result of "true education of the inner being."[28] Without understanding what is morally important compared to what is culturally important, we cannot call ourselves students of philosophy.

One of the key indicators that a message has defeated the erosion of history is the subtle reflection on that message's author or the sometimes-superficial gloss that has replaced the once vivacious lesson they sought so hard to inundate us with. It is no stretch to point out that those men like Socrates and Sidney clearly understood the futility of their arguments and goals, still into their deaths. Even from the analogy of the cave, the everlasting struggle called a life was simply the period of time between the tedious dragging from the shadows and into the inevitable and eventual death by heresy of the commoners.[29]

[28] Bloom, 1991, 412a
[29] Ibid 514a-b

The idea of a much-needed change in social dynamics and ethical principles is clearly understood from the conceptual understanding of Socrates but must be elucidated within the story of Algernon Sidney. This tale of two men: first is Socrates, consuming himself into a life of contemplation[30] and traveling Greece in an attempt to change the minds of men with dialectical reasoning and universal knowledge; the second, Sidney engulfing himself into the world of British politics in an attempt to over-come the crown and establish a coherent method of government from which his people could exist free of arbitrary power. While the *Apology* and *Republic* prove to us that philosophy is of a much higher *good* than politics and the implementation of, it is necessary to indicate that the big picture lies outside this hierarchy of architectonics. While it might b argued that Socrates sought a greater end than Sidney, there is no reason to deprive either man of their equal share to the same fate. To die for a cause demonstrates illicit passion for a substance beyond the necessary or obligatory. The pursuit of expanding philosophy as an end, while seemingly of greater importance than political freedom is an even more ludicrous folly than its bedfellow. The idea of growing philosophy is of a much stricter focus and quite honestly impossible when speaking broadly of humanity and their wavering understanding as a whole. People could care less for their political freedoms, let alone their ability to philosophize. Hence, since such small amounts of people cherish philosophy, the quantity of good that observing politics elicits is of equal value to the prior. For this reason it is allowable to expand on both men in an equal context to their local paradigms and then upon their ultimate reflection in modern history. Their sacrifices pose like-consequences on the time periods they were apart of and inevitably teach us something profound about humanity when all comes to fruition.

[30] Hippocrates, Nicomachean Ethics, 1177-1178b

Beginning with Socrates, we can clearly see that it is his nature to teach and in his death that he sought to supplement philosophy. The function of philosophy in life is to order the soul in accordance with prudence and wisdom. Socrates even goes as far that "philosophy, he says, is in fact none other than the preparation for death."[31] This stability is what moderates life and increases the proficiency of the human order. The expansion of the good up until death is the whole point Socrates is driving at. Again, it is important not to forget that the implausibility of attaining a legitimate legacy is a fixed point in both men's' demeanors. They know that people will not understand that the point of life is ordering one's soul, but thus is the teacher's dilemma: how do you teach those who will not listen? We must reach whom listens and work from the ground up. The maximum potential that is allocated for an impact is limited to the immediate benefactors of Socrates, i.e. Plato and his commandants. Going into his trial voluntarily and understanding its outcome certifies that Socrates fell willing to a social construct that while it was within his manipulation, was beyond his aid and mending. Within this context Socrates verifies that even while "he cannot replace the function of law entirely"[32] with a substantial substitute like philosophy, he can attempt to produce an effect, even if minimal, that will prolong the impact of his name and teachings alone. It is clear in *the Apology* that " the relationship between philosophy, law, and the city, in whose interests law legitimates the use of force, is thus more complex than Socrates allows"[33] us to understand because of this purposeful intent. This is not the intent of Socrates to imply that "political structures are irrelevant to philosophy,"[34] but simply to

[31] Madison, 2002, 425
[32] Blyth, 2000, 16
[33] Ibid
[34] Ibid

restrict the understanding of his trial to a conviction that can be understood by those of lesser intelligence than him. The first layer of his intricate teaching is the most important. The focus of the entire proceeding moves from denying "the court's power to influence his intention and the outcry this immediately provokes"[35] indicates his success in prying at the social standards of Greek law. Socrates had spent his entire life pushing the limits of men and thus arrived at the foul reputation he had commanded. "By questioning he tried to make men discover the content of such things as piety, justice, temperance, and courage"[36] but often wound up embarrassing or angering them in his promotion of the truth. The rising events that led to Socrates' execution were nothing but pure calculations of how long the city would tolerate his curiosity of the greater questions no one could answer nor had the social consent to answer. "Socrates claimed the absence in himself of any pretensions to know anything at all. He knew he was ignorant and proved that the men who claimed to know the truth were merely conceited in their knowledge"[37] and had little awareness of things as they were. The ultimate legacy that Socrates tries to leave is marred by the presupposed arrogance of his nature.

The same futility in word and action can be eminently established in an even greater context with Sidney, as his court appearances lacked the arrogant temperament and defilement of law displayed by Socrates. Thus, his death is of greater representation of the point established: namely, that Sidney's legacy was as much of a short term failure as Socrates and given this immediate stagnation of understanding and the short amount of time residing between the seventeenth century and present, we can begin to focus on why we have such greater understanding of one man over the other. As Sidney stood on the

[35] Ibid, 11
[36] Bostick, 1916, 251
[37] Ibid

scaffold awaiting his demise, some of the last words he spoke committed that he and his people "live [d] in an age [where] truth pass[ed] for treason."[38] This statement dictated the ultimate dismal reprisal for his actions and death: that no one would ever come to know the great Algernon Sidney. The truth for which Sidney sought came not from the goal of spreading philosophy like Socrates, seeing as his courtiersand commoners could not even begin to comprehend basic common sense in lieu of their loyalty, let alone anything greater but a need to live out his valorous ideals in hopes that someone would one day glorify his presumptions and fight for the freedom he died for. From a purely historical standpoint, the structure of British monarchy did not stand the test for the expansion of philosophy. Whereas ancient Greece housed and tolerated most religions and schools of thought, England's government made divine judgment the lasting impression that affirmed all orders and laws, stifling any semblance of free thought. As will be discussed later in Sidney's life, the horrid and arrogant demeanor described by Carswell and his interpretations in *the porcupine* stems from the aloof nature of Sidney and his loose ties with those around him. This comparison, much like Socrates, shows a very solitary lifestyle, plagued by tragedy, misfortunes and demonstrates a significant oddity of how the men are remembered, even while enemies of the state. Even as exclusionary principles were fought between the Whigs and Tories, Sidney can be seen as passively condoning the Whigs in order to further constrict monarchical rule. Truth be told, Sidney refused any thoughts of a king in general, regardless of religious origin. But while he did entail the disproportion of power by divine right, Sidney was never one to promote insurrection. It is often seen that "Sidney [was] less concerned to abolish

[38] Brown, 1984, 12

monarchy than to reduce it to contingency"[39], in which it may be either abolished or retained" by other means of government. Sidney never intended to betray his fellow country for the sake of an abstract idea; he simply wanted justice and sovereignty for those misfortunes that were left unnoticed. This is most often explained through the words of his Discourses, appropriately misrepresented and misinterpreted by his jurors who read only counterfeited material.

The readiness of both men to die is of great measure in determining their impact on us, historically. As motives are developed throughout this evaluation, it becomes evident how prepared these men were to die and for what price and cause. Sidney exclaimed after the verdict was spoken:

> "My lord, feel my pulse, see if I am disordered; I bless God, I never was in better temper than I am now."[40]

The severity of Sidney's words and the strength of his confidence suggests that he was ready to live up to, or die in this case, for the ideals that he had so long fought for. "A man of quality, who well knew the temper of the court," Sidney knew that he "could not be corrupted" and thus unlike the rest of his fellow contemporaries who survived past his age, must be put to death.[41] Socrates, in this same respect, astonishes Crito when he enters the holding cell of the enemy of Athens. After waking Socrates he comments on "how pleasantly"[42] the man slept, even while he was to be put to death immediately after the ship had arrived from Delos.[43] Socrates, even more than Sidney, was prepared to meet his maker. Whether by his own ego or in truth, Socrates felt that he was "distinguished

[39] Pocock, 1994, 930
[40] Cobbett, 1821, 902-903
[41] Ibid 917
[42] West, Crito, 1984, 43b
[43] Ibid 43c

from the many human beings"[44] in a way that they would "not easily discover another of" his sort again.[45] It is these distinctions that elicit a clear and avid disparity between men that leave no impact on history and those whom have built their lives upon virtue and justice, serving only to create something greater than them.

As an addendum to their success, we can admire the way both Sidney and Socrates taunt the system of government in their deaths by displaying its very eminent flaws in a manner, which flatters them after they are long gone and reveals a great deal about the political system, itself. The expansion of this idea is what Socrates tries to get across to his few hundred listeners:

> "By defending his position and rights as a citizen rather than relinquishing them in voluntary exile and by defending his way of life as a member of the community, including his dealings with and relationships to others, Socrates is expressing an interest in and views about the proper conduct of citizenship and even the city"[46]

Blyth indicates that the manner in which Socrates is acting and the extent to which his audacity is transmitted, says something of the juror's, their decision and the manner of a citizen of Athens. Socrates was "expecting the eventual outcome, in his experience of the average Athenian's intellectual dishonesty and disregard for virtue and justice."[47] He understood what the immediate legacy would hold and probably stopped to that extent, laying the guilt of the *feverish city* on the people themselves and their loss of such a great man.

On the same account, Sidney informs his jurors how they should act in accordance with virtue and citizenship. The mild nature of Sidney's demeanor within his

[44] West, Apology, 1984, 28b
[45] Ibid 30e
[46] Blyth, 2000, 12
[47] Ibid 5

trial shows us the lack of resolution Sidney had in his own fate. While he does understand that his future is futile to fight, he does so anyways to prove his point that the proper man of law would let him go. He indicates time and time again "there is neither law nor precedent"[48] that has met his reasoning as to the righteous imprisonment of a man. The point being here that if Sidney had fought with arrogance as that of Socrates, his impact on our current understanding of his time period may have been dramatically affected in a negative fashion; denying us his truth. At the same time, it is important to point out that "Whig leadership was embarrassed by the radical statements quoted from"[49] Sidney and his Discourses concerning the kingship. His family was as embarrassed and neglected his burial and legacy. While Socrates had followers like Plato and Aristotle afterwards who were to continue his name, the name of Sidney would barely live on after his death. Only a handful of radical supporters published his material and spread his ideas.

As a last point worth merit is the value of ignoring heroes/martyrs for the sake of time, exposure, and necessity due to the nature of Hegel's dialectic. The word "heroes" in this case is used by manner of distinguishing their teachings and lessons disparate from others of less importance. While Hegel would have offered a much different interpretation of how these teachings were qualified, if by any value system, the only use in this case is to offer up why societies should put aside proper teachings until they are necessary. In the opinion of this writer, Plato offers the very best lessons and counter-examples of their prominence in his *Republic*, in which Socrates blatantly outlines the different forms that Justice takes on. From here we can see that every era proceeding after these teachings can either follow the system of allowing wisdom and virtue to curtail

[48] Cobbett, 1821, 897
[49] Worden, 1985, 27

passions or allowing passions to neglect the intellect for sake of ephemeral desires. The thesis and anti-thesis of each consecutive era along with their schools of thought add to the need to retain teachings but not glorify them as much until they were required. Socrates' teachings, through Plato, took on a very substantial place in the world only after it had been abandoned, criticized for hundreds of years and reached synthesis. Even after Aquinas's and Maimonides returned to the classical way of thinking, the modern era of philosophy followed by German Idealism suffocated all methods of value. Thus, we can assume that the condoning of Sidney's death may be a sort of unseen perspective due to Machiavelli, Hobbes, and the teachings that shrouded the good nature of his purpose in death. To place it chronologically, the legacy of Sidney came too late after the breach of modern philosophy and too early to be welcomed by the revolutionist hearts of the brooding new United States of America; the tension between Britain and the Americas inhibited his effect. While this is a travesty for the era, we can now look back and appreciate the manner in which Sidney died for his ideals.

V. Trial and Execution

Some of the strongest similarities that belie what historicists inform us about the validity of ethical codes among disparate time periods stem from the trial events that unfolded between both these men. While it is important to examine that both lived in very unique and eras, the careful eye can see a distinct set of patterns that emerge from both men's stories and the way their trials were held. From these patterns, we can begin to see a trend in what seems to lead towards a martyred end. It is the actual depravity of justice that leads to false accusations and executions in the name of social fault. By these social passions that led to direct consequences after the fact and implicit teachings after, we can learn a great deal of what it means to die for a cause and how much of an impact it has on the severity of the teaching itself. We can learn from our past and evaluate how to better use these teachings in order to avoid repeating the same mistakes. That is the very barebones logic behind philosophy: to examine and elicit proper reasoning to a disagreement among premises. The strength displayed in the analogous nature of both these cases may pinpoint a certain hierarchal structure from which to elicit metaphoric importance.

One of the initial points to make clear is that both men lived in significantly different time periods, bearing many social, governmental and religious distinctions. While it is no feat to point this out, it is essential to understand how they affect the stringent restraint of truth in the context of the philosopher. First, Socrates is said to have lived the majority of his life in Athens, Greece, a democracy unlike most of the other clans and militarized dictatorships that had overtaken over the city-states aside it. On the complete opposite

spectrum, Sidney lived under an absolute monarch, tamed by the chaos of a distraught parliament before and after the restoration. What we notice is that in both cases the skew in social passions result in the executions of both men. To expound these passions, we look again to Socrates' teaching of the cave:

> "They are in [the cave] from childhood with their legs and necks in bonds so that they are fixed, seeing only in front of them, unable because of the bond to turn their heads all the way around. Their light is from a fire burning far above and behind them."[50]

Essentially, we find that the jurors or judges in both cases are representative of their peers in the city-state and are equally as bound to the walls, forced to stare at the shadows as if they were reality. This function by birth and behavior is what creates the distraught nature of passions, seeking only the maternal that is given by "the shadows cast by the fire" as opposed to seeking the light outside the tunnel.[51] Fundamentally, the decision was already made in Sidney and Socrates' youth that they would die by the hand of the institution. It is easy to see how both men suffer from this inequity within both their established governments.

What is significantly different is that Socrates lived in a robustly founded democracy while Sidney lived by arbitrary rule. The failure for the people to understand the extent of both men's greatness in the shadow of a false message shows that even while the governments are quite different, the passions of the people still inevitably submit these men to their demise, regardless of law. Socrates makes this apparent in the *Crito* by expanding on why to "abide by whatever judgments the city reaches"[52] regardless of personal interest or tragedy of the innocent bystander. Inexorably, it is the function and

[50] Bloom, 1991, 514a-b
[51] Ibid 515a
[52] West, Crito, 1984, 50c

structure of system to uphold the laws and this is why the grave difference of institutions has very little impact on the trials of both men. The democracy/monarch distinction is primarily important because as will be shown, Sidney does not have as much levity by means of court leniency while Socrates has to nearly mock the judges in order to make his point. Secondly, it is seen that more lenient types of governing, per say democracies or republics, allow a greater breadth of thought amongst the intellectual community while monarchs tend to stifle free thought and bind their courts to a narrow idea of truth and ethics. This would mean that while Socrates died amongst philosophers, Sidney died primarily by himself, aside few other politicians like himself who fled into exile. This again explains a great deal about the manner of remembrance in Socrates' case. We can trace his teaching much easier because of the facilitation of his story directly after his death while few have heard Sidney's name aside his "posthumorous reputation;"[53] the long lost brother of Locke. With the social constructs understood more clearly, we can further evaluate the manner in which the men are alike within their trials.

The prologue of each man's trial evolves from a steady progression of unfortunate events leading up to their deaths. Whether it is the constancy of Socrates incurring methods to draw him into trial or Sidney's lack of attention to the warrants on his head, we can see that it is clear to any historian that both these men could have stayed well out of harm's way if they had so chosen to save themselves. In the first case, Socrates is seen and often interpreted as pestering the system into indicting him of the crimes he faces. West informs us that his trial would be drawn up by a "group of citizens" and a "jury…selected by lot" [54] would be created to decide his innocence or guilt. In this highly

[53] Worden, 1985, 2
[54] West, Apology, 1984, p63, Footnote 1.

democratic society, it would have been near impossible to suffer any legal wrath that had not been forthcoming. The question of how Socrates was inevitably brought in and charged is of little consequence due to the lack of information. The fact remains that the style of government, matched with the casual manner of speaking of the prosecution and the clear pompous nature of Socrates' speech demeanor, clearly elicits a very direct notion of Socrates procuring his own fate. At the same expense, we note that from the facts given, we can draw the very same conclusions of Algernon Sidney. Despite the freedom of crown after the death of Charles I, he still fled the country in exile in order to escape the tyranny that he had spoken out against for so long, even though the divine had not ordained it. It would seem natural for Sidney to be exonerated by the fact that Charles was dead but it only furthered his suspicions of if a free England could ever actually exist. By this merit, we can see that Sidney was a rational man, aware of his circumstance and how to go about steering clear of legal strife. The capture of Sidney resulted from his presence in his hometown near the time of his father's death. Sidney had so long kept away in hiding for fear of his views being revealed and his ideas escaping his pen yet ventured home one last time to see his dying father, despite what Worden calls a "sometimes close, sometimes hostile"[55] relationship between the two men. If Sidney had been as encased in the Rye House Plot and his submissions of "wicked and diabolical treasons"[56] as the courts had alleged, he would have never compromised his safety for such a transient feeling of compassion. Shortly after his father's death, Sidney was taken into incarceration.

[55] Worden, 1985, 23
[56] Cobbett 1821, 818

The immediate correlation that arises in the trials is a mockery of both state establishment and procedure of law that prosecutes these men for the nature of their unrealistic crimes. The outcomes beg for common sense to make something of nothing or that both these trials were simply set up for pre-established failures. The prior allegation would require both social contexts to be completely ludicrous and without reason, leaving only the latter to explain this discrepancy. Along with that discrepancy, we can create a separate awareness between the men that they both could assume their life was ending very soon.

Socrates was charged with "corrupting the young, and not believing in the gods"[57] that the city believed in, notwithstanding the very weak evidence they had of both these claims. The natures of his crimes were essentially established as being a serial corrupter of children and believing in the offspring of gods instead of the gods themselves.The first charge maintains that throughout Socrates' life, he had managed to corrupt and demolish and ethical value base of all children he had come into contact with and the second that he simply did not worship the same Gods as everyone else. The magnitude of the punishment Socrates receives is of a hellacious extent for so minimal of deeds as he argues in his own apology. In the same respect, we see that Sidney is charged with wanting "to change, alter and utterly subvert the ancient government of this his kingdom of England, and to cause and procure a miserable slaughter among the subjects of the maid lord the king through his whole kingdom."[58] While more words are added and adjectives are flaunted to express the heinousness of this crime, the literal interpretation is of no worse deed than Socrates'. We can see that in the case of Socrates, he is charged for

[57] West, Apology, 1984, 24c
[58] Cobbett, 1821, 817

speaking with and demonstrating erotic ideals like his own to those of the maternal order and the same for Sidney: the understanding of a republican style government with little or no support from absolute monarchy stands as a very underground notion. The explicit difference is that the crimes portrayed by Judge Jeffrey's in the case of Sidney seem of lesser caliber than Socrates. Whereas Socrates is charged for his social demeanor, Sidney is alleged to have simply written of different forms of government, and associating socially with "one Aaron Smith"[59] and those of an assassination plot, neither of which the courts can prove. In both cases we have a series of unjust crimes that both eventually kill the men who have been accused of them. The lesson we begin to learn is that despite the importance shown of Socrates' death, the stress between the philosophical and the political of thin margin while ascertaining the true credence we devote to both men's death.

The process itself is of even stricter parameters in Sidney's case than in Socrates'. While Socrates is given, by our accounts, full reign to lead his defense speech as he sees fit, Sidney is restricted from saying very much of anything aside what the court mandates of him. Not only is his speech restricted, but the evidence used against him is tampered and counterfeited in attempt to prove that his writings are "false, seditious and traitorous libel"[60] when clearly they are very well written and to the point of his cause. In the immediate indictment of his trial, Sidney is forced to plead guilty, not guilty or demure the indictment for sake of accuracy within the text. Having the ability to neither read the complete indictment in front of him nor transcribe the Latin being read from the judge, he could not formally authenticate that he had done anything that was being said. If his third

[59] Cobbett, 1821, 819
[60] Ibid

option, the demurring, were found dilatory and erroneous, he would lose all speaking privileges for the rest of the trial, thus forcing him to plead not guilty in accordance with legal procedure. He spoke out against the indictment countless times:

"Col. Sidney. My lord, I find an heap of crimes put together, distinct in nature one front another, and distinguished by law; and I do conceive, my lord, that the indictment itself is thereupon void, and I cannot be impeached upon it."[61]

The trial itself was a mockery of law and continued to deride the system as Sidney repeatedly attempted to defend himself. He was denied every expert witness whom could allege his alibi and prove his innocence whilst allowed every counter-witness to run him into the ground even while they were legally discredited and illegally subjected to trial. If the procedure was not bad enough, after every segment and in summary after the entire trial, the solicitor general presented a wrap-up of the events that took place within the trial for the jury. It would not matter the least that the case was set up for the jury was as stacked as the allegations against Sidney.

In these contexts, we can draw the conclusion that Sidney came upon the misfortune of a graver circumstance than Socrates. While his method of inquiry and demeanor were on level with British gentlemen, it was thus necessary for Sidney to counteract this corrupt nature of trial-proceedings with a balanced conduct. In order to place the two men on an equal stance, we must presume from the previous arguments that Socrates made his way through the legal system by sheer scorn and harassment while Sidney needed nothing more than his preceding reputation and staunch logic to legitimize his threat to the British crown. After this point is made, it can be established that both

[61] Ibid 820

men, lying on equal planes, can teach us the necessity of threatening social construction without fear of the finite.

Sidney's plight develops from the fact that his trial is ruled with ridiculous, corrupt, authority and almost pushed to the limit of legal legitimacy. Socrates has the unfortunate luck of living under a decent style government where only the people misinterpret what is good for them as opposed to the rule of law bludgeoning their being. He has to forcibly and arrogantly lay his foundation in his apology in order to stir the jurors that are not as quick to condemn him as the entire lot of Sidney's jury. While again attempting a leveling of contexts between both men, we must evaluate the juries that ruled for, against and through their own apathy of the men's arguments. The men who were presented with Socrates were chosen by lot and drawn randomly from the democracy that had long come to despise him. His "first accusers"[62] were those most pertinent to his defense as he spoke out in his apology; those who had come to hate him after decades of embarrassment, disdain and poor luck in their rhetorical battles against Socrates. While it is not at all evident that these first accusers made up the majority of the jury, it was clear that they had a great influence on the verdict's propensity. The new accusers of Socrates had little to no incriminating evidence that Socrates had inflicted on either the city-state or its people. Yet we see that Socrates addresses the jury, as if knowing his fate ahead of time or adhering to his own manipulation of the cause:

> "You will be persuaded by me still less when I say these things. This is the way it is, as I affirm, men; but to persuade you is not easy."[63]

[62] West, Apology, 1984, 24b
[63] Ibid 38a

Socrates comprehends the appearance he is giving off on a few different levels: first, his arrogance is preceded by his presence on a general level without any surplus of comments, second his gutting of legal manner that ridicules his audience and thirdly the understanding and condescending nature of his ridicule on a personal level. By any account, Sidney would have had a far better chance of winning over his audience had they been on the same level as Socrates' jurors. To no avail, the jurors in his case already knew their verdict before they sit at the bench. While Sidney is seen as calm and collected during his entire proceedings, there are a few moments where he can no longer stand the obvious inconsistencies in the court: "It hath not (as I think) been ever known that they have been referred to the judgment of a jury, composed of men utterly unable to comprehend them."[64] The "them" in this case refers to both the maxims which legitimize Sidney's innocence and the constructions of government that have led him to the very place he sat, fighting for his life. Again, the divergence that we see between Socrates and Sidney stems from a societal and governmental aspect more than a huge margin of difference between their ideologies or purposes. If to characterize one man as being the "father of philosophy," we must also give the title of "father of republicanism" to Sidney for paying the same toll and proclaiming the same truths as Plato.

Even though this it has been shown that Sidney has a harder time convincing his peers, there are still little nuances in the way both Socrates and he speak to their interlocutors that demonstrate a high level of intentionality in their motives and demeanors. Both men approach the bench claiming to know nothing of law and politics, having never been charged with such allegations. Socrates spoke that he was "foreign to the manner of speech" for it was the "first time" he had ever "come before a law court."

[64] Cobbett, 1821, 915

[65] This truly blatant lie, if not seen clearly seen by the jurors, is meant to portray a false sense of naiveté in the court-proceedings but the cynical nature of such a misleading as clear to most of Socrates' jurors as Sidney's when he attempts the same trick. Sidney indicates that he is "an ignorant man in matters of this kind" "and never was at a trial" "and never read a law book."[66] Sidney was plainly a member of parliament and enough into law to conjure his own defense yet pleaded as if he had never before step foot inside a courtroom. Both men gauge the tempers of their jurors by not only insulting their intelligence in the prior but later reproving their naiveté through a somewhat specific knowledge of law. After countless barrages of questions, Socrates informs Meletus that "the law orders you to answer"[67] any questions that he has; this clear demonstration of a knowledge of procedure contradicts his original statement and brings to question his proclivity to misinform the jury. Again, in the same exact manner, Sidney voids his own statements with an acclamation of law, almost within the same minute of having denied his own knowledge:

> "Sidney. My lord, there are in this indictment some treasons, or reputed treasons that may come within the statue of the 13th of this king, which is limited by time, the prosecution must be in six months and the indictment within three"[68]

This detachment from common logic indicates a motive outside that of defending one's life for the sake of living alone.

There is clear indication that both men aspire to achieve something much greater than what is of obvious nature to those around them in their immediate deaths. It is shown through the way they propose their arguments and handle their circumstance that

[65] West, Apology, 1984, 17d
[66] Cobbett, 1821, 820
[67] West, Apology, 1984, 25d
[68] Cobbett, 1821, 820

speaks quite differently than what would be maternally accepted by each man's respective society. Sidney exclaims half-way through his trial: "It may as easily be guessed, what verdict I expected from an ignorant, sordid and packed jury"[69] The demeanor displayed here always seems to reciprocate the notion that either Sidney has at this point given up all hope and understands that his execution is inevitable or that he is feeding the already stacked decision against him. A man of his nature would not insult the law, which was binding his actions with knowledge that it would affect his criminal sentence after the fact. Socrates' redundant sarcasm is of the same type, relating the entire city of Athens to a "great and well-born horse who is rather sluggish because of his great size and needs to be awakened by some gadfly;"[70] that gadfly of whom is Socrates.

If it were not enough to have both men accused of erroneous crimes and tried by appalling procedure, they had to endure an evasion of their near irrefutable arguments in defense of their case. Socrates crafts two defenses. The first, concerning the youth, states that if Meletus was confident of his Socrates' meddling of the youth, he would have at least "offered someone as a witness during his own speech"[71] that could prove that they had been influenced badly or misinformed by his corrupt teachings. Even if Socrates was to blame for his actions, he has a secondary defense for the charge. For one who "corrupt[s] involuntarily" is not charged with "such involuntary wrongs" but is instead taught and admonished for those ideas he mistakes as virtuous.[72] But again, the demeanor in which Socrates attempts to fool the jury with is evident. They are clearly suspicious of his claim to require proper teaching, given that he himself was presumed the greatest of

[69] Ibid 940
[70] West, Apology, 1984, 30e
[71] Ibid 34a
[72] Ibid 26a

sophists. The second argument that Socrates battles has more comedic properties than the first. It is understood that Socrates believes in *daimonia* yet believes not in the Gods of the city. Put ever so eloquently, "Socrates does injustice by not believing in gods, but believing in gods"[73] of a different manner; specifically the "children of gods."[74] It is of this consequence that Socrates declares these rumors and accusations as "slander and envy of the many."[75] Socrates builds solid arguments for each allegation that completely exonerates all guilt Meletus has implied yet it seems that the purposeful conceit of his logic destroys any hope of convincing the jurors otherwise. "Where Socrates acknowledges the obligation to defend himself, he remarks on the difficulty he faces, a difficulty that has resulted from the slander to which he has long been subjected, because of the public humiliation felt by those whose false conceit of knowledge he has exposed"[76] as being traitors to reason. It is this problem that serves to punish Socrates and his ways.

Sidney's arguments have the very same effect on the juror's and maybe of even less influence on the overall decision, considering the audience. Like Socrates calls for Meletus to provide witnesses to prove his point of youthful corruption, Sidney demands "two witnesses to prove the conspiracy and in that there were those matters done that are treason"[77] enough to even hold a trial. The court resorts to one Lord Howard to indicate that Sidney had taken part in the Rye House Plot, which by all standards has failed to prove anything close to treason. Over and over, Sidney demands that the law be upheld by basic precedence but is marred by the corrupt legal system. His defense properly

[73] Ibid 27a
[74] Ibid 27d
[75] Ibid 28a
[76] Blyth, 2000, 2
[77] Cobbett, 1821, 861

ascertains the law has wronged him in ever so many ways, discouraged any remedy to depravity of legal allowances and considered him a criminal upon entrance to the court.

> "My lord, I humbly conceive, I have had no trial; I was to be tried by my country, I do not find my country in the jury that did try me, there were some of them that were not freeholders, I think, my lord, there is neither law nor precedent of any man that has been tried by a jury, upon an indictment laid in a county, that were not freeholders. So I do humbly conceive, that I have had no trial at all and if I have had no trial, there can be no judgment."[78]

This exemplifies the steady legal rebuttal that Sidney repeats throughout his entire trial, redundantly claiming, "the papers said to be found in [his] closet" were "easily counterfeited," "the many perjuries " of Lord Howard were ignored for the sake of testimony and that everything in this accumulation of lies lead up to his "trial and condemnation."[79]

The majority of the similarities in these cases are eminent examples of arrogance facing death. The proper argument to make is that these men were either completely insane or sane within their own right. To the merit of Plato for allowing Socrates' name to survive and and to the followers of Sidney, we can analyze books like the *Republic* and Sidney's *Discourses* and determine the ways in which these men were stable in mind before their trials and the threats of execution. If it can be proven that they had something good to say before their deaths, then essentially we can grant their deaths value and pose that had they not died in a way worth remembering, their messages would not have lived on to teach us lessons concerning life, liberty and virtue.

[78] Ibid 897
[79] Sidney, 1683, (The Very Copy…")

VI. Conclusions

The extent to which we would have to infiltrate the lives of both Socrates and Sidney would dictate not only an analytical bias through the texts which give us only so much tacit information but also a huge undertaking that requires much more precision than necessary. The evaluation stops here. By taking up the arduous task of completing the *Republic* or Sidney's *Discourses,* one could easily qualify the sources themselves and the validity of thought proven within them.

The similarities that have presented themselves are not without their flaws and refutations, but they seem to hold up in comparison. The legacy of Socrates and his goal of procuring philosophy will always hold a greater significance to historians and fans alike but the things that appear the same are astounding. Given more time and the span of a book, details could be drawn to show the very intricate workings of both men's tendencies in the dialogues and the way they reciprocate others' intentionality. The length of this paper is too short and constrained to ever fully pursue such a goal but it is the hope of this writer that some new ideas have been made throughout the process of explaining these similarities.

The real questions that we have to ask ourselves are: do we really understand all the great people that brought us to the point we are at? Could we not be somewhere better if we sought after men not illuminated by history? Would we be somewhere worse without the teachings of such men willing to give their lives? Sidney followed the same path that Socrates did yet achieved none of the successes and even to this day your average American knows nothing of Sidney's story despite his outward involvement in the furthering of republican-style government. It is the goal of this analysis to shed some

light and further interest in Sidney's story so others may look into the past and make more of it than I have the ability to. It can already be conjectured that both men were of the same philosophical mind and stature. Both men had similar trials and similar defeats that were neither fair nor rational to the reasonable man. And both men died for something greater than their physical being. They both demonstrated something great that they owed no one but perhaps their supreme being: justice.

The product of both these men's lives has brought us something remarkable that cannot go without a certain amount of appreciation. The impact of their legacies has lived on with us by the very merit of their teachings even if we have chosen not to listen. While at times we have not always allowed ourselves to understand their principles in the context of why and how they came to be, we still are able to put names to causes and figure out truths for ourselves. It is not to say that everything in life has been learned from an earlier cause or that Socrates or Sidney is a necessary part of a better life. Their teachings simply aid us in comprehending the many confusing ways life presents itself. In the end it is up to us to always search into our history and find out which great men gave us the opportunities we have today and how we can aspire to be like them.

Bibliography

Anselment, Raymond A. 1978. “Socrates and The Clouds: Shaftesbury and A Socratic Tradition.” Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 39, Number. 2, pp. 171-182. Project Muse: (November 17, 2008)

Blyth, Dougal. 2000. “Socrates’ Trial and Conviction of the Jurors in Plato’s Apology” Philosophy and Rhetoric, 33(1): 1-22. Project Muse (October 14, 2008).

Bostick, William F. 1916. “Jesus and Socrates” The Biblical World, 47(4):248-252. JSTOR (October 14, 2008).

Brown, Irene Coltman. 1984. “Algernon Sidney, The Noble Republican.” History Today, 34(2): 11. Ebsco (Tue, 9 Sep 2008).

Clay, Diskin. 1972. “Socrates’ Mulishness and Heroism” Phronesis, 17(1): 53-60. JSTOR (October 14, 2008).

Cobbett, William. 1821. “Cobbett's Complete Collection of State Trials and Proceedings for High Treason: And Other Crimes and Misdemeanor from the Earliest Period to the Present Time ... from the Ninth Year of the Reign of King Henry, the Second, A.D.1163, to ... [George IV, A.D.1820].” R. Bagshaw, 1821. University of Virginia: Digitized Sep 26, 2007 (http://books.google.com).

Danzig, Gabriel. 2003. “Apologizing for Socrates: Plato and Xenophon on Socrates' Behavior in Court.” Transactions of the American Philological Association, Volume 133, Number 2, Autumn 2003, pp. 281-321. Project Muse: (November 17, 2008)

Farness, Jay. 1987. “Missing Socrates” Penn State Press: University Park, Pennsylvania.

Freeman, Thomas. 2007. “Martyrs and Martyrdom in England, C.1400-1700.” Studies in Modern British Religious History. Boydell Press.

Frey, R.G.1978. “Did Socrates Commit Suicide?” Philosophy, 53(203): 106-108. JSTOR (October 14, 2008).

Graham, Daniel W. 1992. “Socrates and Plato.” Phronesis, Volume 37, Number 2, pp. 141-165. JSTOR (November 17, 2008)

Hathaway, Ronald. 1970. “Law and the Moral Paradox in Plato's Apology” Journal of the History of Philosophy, 8(2): 127-142 (October 14, 2008)

Hippocrates, Apostle. Gerson, Lloyd. 1983. “Aristotle: Selected Works” The Peripatetic Press: Des Moines, Idaho.

Laslett, Peter. 1960. “Locke Two Treatises of Government” Cambridge Publications: Cambridge, UK.

Levi, Albert W. 1956. “The Idea of Socrates: The Philosophic Hero in the Nineteenth Century.” Journal of the History of Ideas, Volume 17, Number. 1, pp. 89-108. roject Muse: (November 17, 2008)

Madison, Laurel A. 2002. “Have We Been Careless with Socrates' Last Words?: A Rereading of the Phaedo. ”Journal of the History of Philosophy, Volume 40, Number 4, October 2002, pp. 421-436. Project Muse: (November 17, 2008)

Metcalf, Robert. 2004. “The Philosophical Rhetoric of Socrates’ Mission” Philosophy and Rhetoric: 37(2)143-163. Project Muse (October 14, 2008)

Plato. “Apology” Translator: West, Thomas. 1984. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, New York.

Plato. “Crito.” Translator: West, Thomas. 1984. Cornell University Press: Ithaca, New York.

Plato. “Republic.” Translator: Allan Bloom. 1991. Basic Books: Jackson, Tennessee.

Pocock, J. G. A. 1994. “Review: England’s Cato: The Virtues and Fortunes of Algernon Sidney.” The Historical Journal, 37(4): 915-935. JSTOR (Tue, 9 Sep 2008).

Riley, Mark T. 1980. “The Epicurean Criticism of Socrates” Phoenix, Vol. 34, No 1, pp 55-68. JSTOR (October 14, 2008)

Sidney, Algernon. 1996 “Court Maxims” Cambridge Press: Cambridge, UK.

Sidney, Algernon. 1996 “Discourses Concerning Government.” Liberty Fund: Indianapolis, Indiana.

Sidney, Algernon. 1683. “The Very Copy of a Paper Delivered to the Sheriffs, Upon the Scaffold on Tower-hill, on Friday December 7. 1683.” By Algernon Sidney, Esq; Before his Execution there (London 1683)

Strauss, Leo. 1971. “Natural Right and History” University of Chicago Press: Chicago, Illinois.

Willmott, Robert. 2002. “Reclaiming Metaphysical Truth for Educational Research.” British Journal of Educational Studies, 50(3): 339-362. JSTOR (April 28, 2009).

Worden, Blair. 1985. “The Commonwealth Kidney of Algernon Sidney.” The Journal of British Studies, 24(1): 1-40. JSTOR (Tue, 9 Sep 2008).