

## **WAS SOCRATES' DEATH A TYPE OF CALVARY?**

*Dingba Dingba Esowe*

Department Of Religious And Cultural Studies, University Of Calabar,

*Emmanuel E. Etta, PhD*

*Offiong O. Asuquo*

Department Of Philosophy University Of Calabar

---

### **Abstract**

About four hundred years before Christ, a philosopher and moral giant named Socrates was convicted to death in Athens, Greece, by a jury. He and his friends believed the judgement was prejudiced against him due to his way of life which was seen as a threat to the evil ways of the elite in the society. Crito, a wealthy friend of his, made arrangements for his escape from prison but he refused. On the day of his execution, he accepted and drank poison. He died. In applauding that decision, Ziniewicz (2011) asserts that Socrates' death changed the course of things in the world for the better, that without that, he would not have been born. On the other hand, the Bible says that while we were yet sinners Christ died for us. Since the time of Christ's first advent into the world, records of dates of events are stated as either B. C. or A. D. which are acronyms meaning Before Christ or in the year of the Lord. Was Socrates death then a type of Calvary? God who created the world and directs the affairs herein, gave humanity sacrificial types in animal symbols, thus he tested and yet forbade Abraham from offering Isaac. Socrates had a way of escape made for him but he chose to die out of self pride. The Athenians did not need his death for their freedom. It is who the Son of God, Jesus Christ sets free that is free indeed. Socrates was born a sinner, Christ was born sinless. Socrates had no divine prophecies guiding his activities, but actual types of Christ and His mission had divine utterances guiding their operations. Thus, it cannot be said that the death of Socrates was a type of Calvary where Christ died to set men free from sin and destruction.

---

**Keywords:** Socrates, Christ, Calvary

## **Introduction**

Records of human history past and present usually have certain occurrences that are more pronounced than others. Commentators usually attempt a comparison of acts of history by drawing up similarities and dissimilarities of events that had happened. By so doing, lessons are learnt, cautions are observed, corrections are made and decisions are arrived at. Today, dating, an important component of historical records hinges mainly on the acronyms B.C. and A.D. which stand for Before Christ and Anno Domino i.e. “in the year of the Lord” respectively. Christ Jesus, whose birth, life and death, resurrection and ascension into heaven are recorded in the Bible, is believed to have changed the course of history radically.

Prior to Christ, the Gentile world, engrossed in philosophical thought was greatly attracted to Greece, specifically to Athens. The reason was that Athens had witnessed the rise of great philosophers with moral alertness such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle. The influence of these men in correcting and improving society through the power of thinking, teaching and practicing of morality, science and art, cannot be under-rated even till today. Of these “three greats”,

Socrates stands tallest. The reason being the way his life came to an end. He was convicted by a jury and sentenced to death. His friends tried to get him out of prison soon before his death but he refused to escape.

In view of that decision of Socrates not to escape but to die as he had been sentenced, Ziniewicz asserts that Socrates changed the way things had been happening in the whole world. He further states that it was that decision that led to the rise of Plato and his contributions to science and ideas of political form. The height of his praise of Socrates’ decision could be seen in his statement that, “If Socrates had not remained to die in prison; I would not have been born” (1).

Owing to what Ziniewicz believes and in reference to what the scriptures say, “how that Christ died for our sins...” (1Cor 15:3), one then asks: “WAS THE DEATH OF SOCRATES A TYPE OF CALVARY?” This paper will look into the subjects of Socrates’ death and Calvary. It will highlight similar and different incidents or acts discoverable in the two events. Explain what type and anti-types are and then draw a conclusion.

## **Socrates’ Death**

Socrates was born in Alopece, Athens, Greece in C. 469 B.C. (Wikipedia, 14/8/2011). According to Kreis (2011) , his father’s name was Sophroniscus whose profession was stone cutting. His mother was called Phaenarete and was a midwife. He had a wife called Xanthippe and three sons named: Lamprocles, Sophroniscus and Menexenus (Wikipedia, 4).

During the Peloponnesian Wars when he was a youthful adult, Socrates joined and fought alongside the Athenians as a hoplite at Potidaea (432-429 B.C), Delium (424 B.C) and Amphipolis (422 B.C)

( 4). He held political office once, when he was elected to the Council of Five Hundred in 406 B.C. Perhaps what he experienced in the Council made him to detest politics. He commented that a real champion of justice that wishes to survive even for a short period of time, must necessarily stick to his private life and leave politics alone.

He arose from the ranks of the Sophists to become a philosopher. Kreis asserts that Socrates was perhaps the most honourable and wisest Athenian that ever lived (4). Though he was not physically handsome, he was of a strong physique and a sound intellect to subdue every one that engaged him in discussion. He was always flanked by Athenian youth as he walked the streets of the agora. These young people emulated every word and gesture of his. He contributed a lot to the fields of ethics, epistemology and logic. It is quite certain how he earned his living because while ancient texts tend to indicate that he did not work for wages, later sources have it that he took over his father's stonemasonry (Honderich, 1995 ). There was an old tradition not reported in modern scholarship which has it that Socrates crafted the statues of the Three Graces, that stood beside the acropolis up to the 2nd Century A.D. (Wikipedia, 836). In teaching his students, he asked simple questions but did not supply the answers. This he did to challenge them to think for themselves and answer questions according to their minds thoughts.

In 399 B.C, Meletus a fellow Athenian brought a charge against Socrates. Kreis (2011) cites Plato, the most famous student of Socrates, as saying that he was charged as an evil-doer who was so curious that he sought for things underneath the earth and those above the heavens thereby making bad things appear to be good and teaching these things to other people. The Jury of Five Hundred of his fellow citizens convicted Socrates to death by a margin of six votes. During his trial Socrates intimated that his accusers were jealous of his wisdom which had been affirmed unequalled by the Delphic oracle which was consulted by Chaerephon his friend. Chaerephon had gone to Delphi and asked the oracle whether there was any one wiser than Socrates. In response, the Pythian prophetess said no one was wiser than him (Plato Apology 202). Referencing the claims of the oracle, he justified his acts of examining the conduct of all Athenians. He claimed that by exposing their falsehoods, he had proved the god right.

While in prison awaiting his execution, Socrates was visited by his friends. One of such friends was an old wealthy Athenian called Crito ("The Story of Socrates" 2011, 1).

Amidst the discussion that ensued, Crito told Socrates that he had brought him a sad and painful message which might not be so to himself, but to all his friends, and saddest of all to Crito. In reaction, Socrates intimated his friend that he had received a vision in which the likeness of a fair and comely woman, clothed in bright raiment called to him and said: “O Socrates, ‘The third day hence to fertile Pythia shalt thou go’” (Plato Crito, 213). Crito then expressed his love for him and his desire for him not to die. He also intimated him of what people would think about him if he should fail to help his friend, in spite of his wealth and riches. He told him he had arranged for him to escape from prison to another town where he would live freely.

Socrates rebuffed Crito’s appeals to his emotions, and asked again why he should escape from prison. He was told that it did not involve a lot of money, Crito’s reputation was at stake as a friend of his and the parental care his children needed from him in order to become good citizens was necessary. Socrates reminded Crito of their earlier agreement that one should act in accordance to the best reasoning rather than succumb to emotions or the dictates of the mob. He maintained the stance that rather than respect an opinion because it comes from a majority, he would follow the reasoning of a few who have the knowledge of justice and the Good.

The only consideration for Socrates to leave is whether it was good to do so. He did not want to do any wrong thing at all. Crito reminded him that the Jury had done him wrong since he was not guilty of the crimes for which he was to die. He did not need to oblige the verdict of a Jury that had wronged him. Socrates responded that one must not do wrong, even in order to repay wrong. He stated that the laws did no wrong, but the Jury did. He did not want to harm the laws by doing wrong to them. “Two wrongs do not make a right!”(The story of Socrates) (1). He argued further that, if he escaped, his breaking of the oath he swore to the gods, which would mean that he does not believe in them or that he is deliberately insulting them, will prove him to be impious. He would also set a bad example for the youth of Athens who would begin to break oaths, thus justifying the accusation that he corrupted the young.

Socrates remained in prison and was executed by his acceptance and drinking of a poison called hemlock (Ziniewicz, 2011, 1).

### **Calvary**

The place outside of Jerusalem’s city walls where Jesus of Nazareth was crucified is called Calvary (Luke 23:33). In view of the above, the mention of Calvary readily reminds one of Jesus’ dead on the cross in the behalf of humanity. Prior to the event of Christ’s death, Calvary was a place where criminals were executed (White, 2002, 741), and of course He died

as a result of the criminality of the human race whose stead he took in order that we might be saved.

Jesus of Nazareth was born to Joseph and Mary after an angelic proclaimed mysterious conception took place in the virgin girl betrothed to the man of Judah (Matt. 1:1-3, 16, 18-21, 24, 25). His universal mission was acknowledged while at infancy by the wise men from the east that came to worship Him, pronouncing His birth at Jerusalem. When the heavenly stars guided them to Bethlehem where they saw Him as a baby, though they were philosophers (White, 59), they presented prophetic gifts of Gold, frankincense, and myrrh, indicative of His being King, priest and prophet respectively. The jealousy of King Herod was aroused by the intimation of the magi and from then onward the Saviour's life became threatened. Herod being an Edomite (White, 61), felt that the priests and the wise men had colluded to unseat him with the news of the birth of a "son of the soil". He ordered, after waiting without the return of the wise men to tell him where to see the new King whom he intended in his heart to destroy, that all male children of age two and below in Bethlehem be killed. Unknown to him God had directed Joseph to take the child and His mother away to Egypt. Not long after, Herod died, and Joseph was instructed to return to Israel with the child and His mother, but this time to Nazareth in Galilee (Matthew 2).

At age twelve, Jesus went to Jerusalem with His parents for the Passover feast. It was the age when Hebrew boys transited from childhood to youth, and became addressed as sons of the law as well as sons of God (White, 75). His presence at the Temple in Jerusalem accorded Him the privilege to observe what was going on and also interact with the teachers of the law. He not only asked questions, but supplied answers to questions thrown to Him to the amazement of all. He proved to all and sundry that He knew the scriptures (White, 78). Jesus went to river Jordan and was baptized by John the Baptist. After His baptism He was anointed with the Holy Spirit and with power from God who pronounced Him as "My beloved Son in whom I am well pleased" (Matt. 3:17; Mk. 1:11; Luke 3:22; Jn. 1:31-34; Acts 10:38). After that He went into solitude in the wilderness fasting and praying for forty days and nights. In the end of this spiritual exercise, He undertook a course in trials and temptations with Satan as the chief examiner (Matt. 4:1-11; Mk. 1:12, 13; Luke 4:1-13) and came out tops. His effective weapon with which He conquered the tempter was the scriptures, rightly quoted. Being about thirty years of age (Luke 4:23) at this period, Jesus began His public ministry of teaching in the synagogues of Galilee, Preaching the gospel of God's kingdom and healing all manner of sickness and disease among the people (Matt. 4:23). Christ did not mince words in citing the prophets of old to authenticate His mission. One

of such quotes upon which He laid credence to His ministry would suffice us here: The spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel he hath anointed me to heal the broken-hearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. (LK 4:18, 19 cf Isa. 61:1, 2). Realizing that He had come for the afore stated purpose, He told His audience that the Scriptures had that day been fulfilled in their ears. The people marveled at His teachings because His words were very powerful (Luke 4:32) and He healed many sick people and cast out several demons (Luke 4:33-41; Matt. 4:24, 25). Jesus became so famous that for latent political reasons, the religious leaders of the Jews, began to plot His downfall either by hook or crook.

Since He was proving to be a religious authority and the Messiah, the Jewish leaders began to question Him craftily in order to hook him up and condemn Him to death (Matt. 9:3; 13:54-58; Luke 4:22; Mk. 2:7, 18). The gospel of Mark vividly states: “And the Pharisees went forth, and straightway took counsel with the Herodians against him, how they might destroy him” (3:6). Unruffled by their plot, Jesus withdrew to a mountain solitude, prayed all night to God and the following morning, He chose twelve of his disciples and ordained them, calling them apostles (Mk. 3:13-19; Luke 6:12-16). He gave them authority to go forth and preach, teach and heal (MK 3:14, 15). This act was Christ’s first step toward the organization of His followers. These people would represent Him on earth and further His cause when He might have returned to His father in heaven (White, 291). What broke the “Carmel’s Back” was the raising of Lazarus of Bethany from death. Ellen G. White sums it up thus: A meeting of the Sanhedrin was at once called to decide as to what should be done. Christ had now fully made manifest His control of death and the grave. That mighty miracle was the crowning evidence offered by God to men that He had sent His Son into the world for their salvation. It was a demonstration of divine power sufficient to convince every mind that was under the control of reason and enlightened conscience. Many who witnessed the resurrection of Lazarus were led to believe on Jesus. But the hatred of the priests against Him was intensified. They had rejected all lesser evidence of His divinity, and they were only enraged at this new miracle.... They were more than ever determined to put a stop to Christ’s work (537). Just as Christ was born at the fullness of time (Gal 4:4), so was He betrayed into the hands of the chief priests and elders of the Jewish people when His time on earth was up (Mt 26:47-50; 27:1-8). Judas Iscariot who was one of the twelve apostles fulfilled the betrayal prophecy by receiving thirty Silver Coins as the price for his master (Mt 26:14-16; 27:3-10; Zech. 11:12, 13). Jesus asked the chief priests, captains of the temple and elders of the people

why they came with swords and staves to arrest Him as if He was a thief. He reminded them that He had been with them daily in the temple teaching and answering questions and they did Him no harm. However, He obligated to follow them because it was time for them to exhibit the power of darkness working in them (LK 22:52, 53). When daylight came the elders of the people, the chief priests and the scribes met together and brought Jesus before their Sanhedrin council. “Art thou the Christ? Tell us”, they queried. “If I tell you, ye will not believe.... Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God,” He replied. “Art thou then the Son of God?” they asked Him. “Ye say that I am”, He remarked. They concluded their trial and were satisfied of themselves as witnesses of what they heard Him say (LK 22:67-71). They took Him to Pilate, the Roman governor in order to confirm His sentence to death and have Him executed for blasphemy, having claimed to be the Son of God. Pilate had been dealing with all manner of criminals, but his gaze at Jesus gave him a different picture. He saw no sign of guilt, no fearful jittery, no arrogance nor stubbornness. He visualized a countenance of dignity, calmness and heavenly fervor. He was impressed favorably toward Christ. Pilate went out to the Jews who would not go into the judgment hall in order not to defile themselves and miss the Passover feast, and asked of the charge against Jesus. They told him He was a deceiver, and a confussionist, who deserved to die. He told the Jews to go and judge Him according to their law. Since they wanted Christ dead, they told Pilate “we have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the son of God” (Jn. 19:7).

Nevertheless since the Roman governor would not act on such a premise, they framed up a tale against Jesus that would elicit the action of Pilate. They accused Him of offending by forbidding people to give tribute to Caesar and perverting the nation by insinuating that He is Christ and a king. If he let Christ go, then he was not a friend of Caesar (Jn. 19:12). On returning to the judgment hall and inquiring of Christ as to whether He was the king of the Jews, Christ told him that His kingdom was not of this world. If it were to be, His servants would have fought against what Pilate was going to do - deliver Him to the Jews. At a point Pilate told Jesus that he had the power to either crucify Him or release Him. But Jesus told him in return that except such power had been granted from heaven, he could not exercise it. All the same He charged the traitor for committing the greater sin (Jn. 19:10, 11). In the end of it all, Pilate succumbed to the pressure of the Jewish leaders and handed over Jesus Christ to be crucified. This, the Roman soldiers did and hung Him on the cross that had been prepared for Barabbas the robber. After nailing Him to the cross, strong men lifted it and thrust it into the hole dug for it with great force. This agonized Jesus greatly. Pilate wrote an

inscription on Hebrew, Greek and Latin which read “JESUS JOF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS” and placed it upon the cross above the head of Jesus. It irritated the Jews and they protested to Pilate, but he asserted “what I have written I have written” (Jn. 19:19-22). While they cried crucify Him, crucify Him in Pilate’s court and went on to claim that they had no king but Caesar, unknown to them, they had sacrificed their national existence. But to Christ, His willingness to surrender to those tortures and finally die earned Him the right to become the advocate of men in God’s presence (White, 745).

### **Comparable Events In The Lives And Times Of Socrates And Jesus Christ**

Though Socrates and Jesus did not live within the same environment and historical time, there still could be identified certain comparable events in their lives and experiences. One, Socrates was wise within human limits to the point that his friend Chaerephon went to consult the oracle at Delphi to ascertain if anyone could be wiser than he (Plato, Apology, 1990, 202). Jesus grew and waxed strong in spirit and not only was He filled with wisdom, He was wisdom personified (LK 2:40; 1Cor 1:24).

Two, Socrates was a moralist, at least during his adulthood. He was remarkable for living the life he preached. People sought and received his advice on matters of practical conduct and educational problems, free of charge (Kreis, 2). Jesus lived a sinless life and was fair to all, hence He could challenge any one that can, to prove Him a wrong-doer (Jn. 8:46). Of course, no authentic accusation was proved against Him, warrantingly therefore it is stated that in all points Christ was tempted but found sinless (Heb 4:15).

Three, Meletus, a fellow Athenian citizen betrayed Socrates in 399B.C. by indicting him as evil-doer. Even when during the trial, no wrong doing was established against him, prejudice was meted against him (Kreis, 2). Judas Iscariot a friend of Jesus, numbered among His twelve apostles, gave Him a kiss of betrayal into the hands of His enemies. When after the trial, He was not found guilty, Pilate was compelled to condemn Him to death by the Jews who exclaimed “crucify Him, crucify Him”. When told of His innocence, they retorted, “let His blood be upon us and upon our children” (Luke 22:47, 48; 23:13-25; Jn. 19:4-6; Matt. 27:24-26).

Four, the role played by the Jury of Five Hundred of the Athenians, a ruling council of the people, which was out of hatred for Socrates’ lifestyle, led to his conviction and sentence. His lifestyle was an indictment to those of the elite in the society of which the council members were chief. The Sanhedrin, the highest ruling council of the Jews, played the role of heaping up unproofable charges on Jesus to enable them secure authority to kill him from the Roman Governor Pilate (White, 698, 699). Their lifestyle had been frequently condemned by

Christ's own teachings and way of life. Five, Socrates' life-style and teachings paved the way for the development and flourishing of Greek philosophy. This system of thought now permeates all cultures in definite and subtle ways. Jesus' life and teachings and indeed His ordination of the twelve apostles began the movement now called Christianity. This religious movement has overwhelmed the world by her teachings and practices.

In spite of the above, there are areas and points of difference between Jesus and Socrates. They are briefly enumerated below.

### **Differences In The Lives Of Socrates And Jesus Christ**

Though Socrates lived and died about 400years before Jesus Christ was born, his name still makes waves among philosophers of today. Nonetheless, it is not in all spheres of identity that his data can match those of Christ. One, historical records are today dated before or from the time of Christ, but not with Socrates'. Two, there were no recorded prophecies concerning the birth, life, death and other activities of Socrates prior to his birth into the world. Jesus' place of birth, type of birth, life activities, death and resurrection, and ascension were all prophetically recorded (Micah 5:2; Isa. 7:14; 53:1-5; 61:1-3; Zech. 11:12, 13; Matt 26:15, 16; 27:3-10; Psalm 22:1; MK 15:34; Jonah 2:2; Matt. 12:38-41; 20:18, 19; Rev. 12:5) and they all got fulfilled in that order. Three, Socrates believed in idol consultation and as such took the Delphi oracle as his god. Jesus on His part believed not in gods made by human hands. Instead he believed, obeyed and trusted the God of heaven (John 17:4-8; 9:3-5) and wrought great wonders that have been unequaled in earth's history. Four, while Socrates was by craft a stone mason, Jesus was a carpenter. Five, Socrates had a wife and children. Jesus had neither wife nor carnal children. Six, Socrates recognized his mortality, while Jesus proclaimed His immortality.

Seven, Socrates was a sinner, who fought wars for his nation and led revolts against a democratically elected government in his land. Jesus was tempted but was found without sin (Heb 4:15). Eight, while Socrates' sentence had a margin of six votes that of Jesus was unanimous among council members who tried Him. Nine, Socrates' execution was delayed for some days after his sentence, hence his friends came to rescue him but he refused. Jesus' sentence was immediately followed by his torture and execution. Everyone forsook Him even though He would not have accepted any offer to escape too. Ten, Socrates accepted a poisonous drink called hemlock and drank it un-coerced, but Jesus was mercilessly nailed to the cross by Roman Soldiers. Eleven, for refusing an opportunity to escape and willingly drinking poison, Socrates committed suicide. Jesus, who had no sin, had no escape opportunity and was forcefully killed, died vicariously, shedding his blood for all.

Twelve, whereas it could be said that Socrates died out of personal pride, Jesus died as a substitute for those who accept Him as their Lord and Personal Saviour. Thirteen, Socrates died at an age above 70 years and could be said to have been tired of life. Jesus died at a youthful prime age of 33½ years when life is said to be very sweet. Fourteen, whereas Socrates' bones are still in his grave, Jesus overcame death; hence His tomb is empty of any bone. Finally, whereas Socrates' followers and ideas will one day cease to exist, Jesus' words abide forever and his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom. Right now, philosophical reasoning is not what it used to be in the time of Socrates. Right from Plato his best student, his ideas and methods began to receive changes. But for Jesus, "the grass withereth, and the flower fadeth away. But the word of the Lord endureth forever" (Isa 40:8; 1Pet. 1:24, 25). From the foregoing, it is obvious that several things differ when Socrates is compared to Jesus Christ.

### **Type And Anti-Type**

Typology comes from the Greek *tupos* and the Latin *figura* (Wikipedia 10/15/2012, 1). From a biblical view point, a type was a representation of a thing or person that would exist later in history. The future thing or person was called the antitype (Blank, 2012, 1). Bunch puts it more vividly thus: "A type is a literal representation of a spiritual fact" (1). He further expatiates by citing Ellen G. White (2011) thus: The sacrifices typified the wonderful antitype. Jesus Christ was to come and give His life that He might set man free from Satan's claims, that He might unlock the prison houses and bring forth those that plead for a glorious immortality. When type met antitype in the death of Christ, what was done? The great antitypical offering had been made to save every transgressor of the law if they would believe on Jesus Christ as their Saviour and return to their loyalty. Then every sin and transgression would be forgiven (2).

The afore stated is corroborated by Blank (2012) who asserts that Aaron and Jesus Christ are the type and antitype for the high priest that atoned for sins on behalf of the people (1).

Given the type of life Socrates lived and the claims of Ziniewicz, (2011) one who superficially glosses over the idea or concept of types and antitypes could easily accept that Socrates was a type of Christ and his death a type of Calvary. However, it is important to note that Socrates was a free thinker who though he exhibited a high moral taste and conduct, was not a religious person. He did not talk about religion. When he passively talked about the Delphic oracle, it was in reference to the acts of his late friend Chaerephon who went to inquire about Socrates wisdom.

If Socrates were religious and connected to God, he would not have suffered himself to committing suicide by drinking the poison called hemlock. Three reasons could be adduced for this position herein stated. One, God had instituted animal sacrifices as types for the remission of human sins pending the coming of the Messiah, Jesus Christ, who is the antitype and real sacrifice for man's sins, provided by the creator God. Even when Abraham was tested by God and he went up to Mount Moriah to offer up his son Isaac, he was restrained from doing the act by God (Gen. 22:1-19). The shedding of the blood of a sinful human (All humans except Christ are sinful Rom 3:23) being cannot atone for sins before God, in the real sense of it, hence the types were animals. Why use human beings as types when they were not the real sacrifice? God did not do that, neither approved He that any man should do so.

Furthermore, White (2012) elucidates clearly that the law requires a complete righteousness in being and behaviour that man does not possess. That it is only the life of Christ that met the standard of character required by God's law, for the remission of sin. Thus He offered that life, a free gift to all who would receive it, in exchange for man's sinful life. When accepted, the righteousness required of man by the law, is fulfilled in the believer in Christ (762).

Two, the animal types never died voluntarily. They were slaughtered by the persons whose sins they were to remit (see Leviticus 4). Three, the typical sacrificial animals never rejected a chance of escape from death as did Socrates. In fact, the Bible says that in the course of our performing our religious duties, we should flee for our lives in the face of adverse persecution, to another city (Mt. 10:23).

The Passover lamb on the day of Christ's crucifixion escaped unhurt when the ensuing confusion resulting from the quaking of the earth and the tearing of the inner Temple Veil overwhelmed all and sundry (white, 757). But in the case of Socrates, he rejected the plea of his friends who could have brought him out to safety.

This act of Socrates must have been a result of what Asouzu (2004) calls antithetical and self-negating ego which emanates from one's inability to conceptualize properly the link between little bits of things and the general operations of universal significance (433). In such situations, self-autonomy is sought in a manner that makes men anti-self through their rejection of others, being forgetful of their weaknesses as relative beings, he adds (433). The circumstance of his conviction was enough to make Socrates to escape if he had thought twice. He understood that his case was a ploy to get rid of him in a wrong way. Yet he amidst such injustice told his friend Crito that it was wrong for him to escape, averring that "two

wrongs do not make a right”. If he had escaped, the Athenian Jury would have received what they deserved. The theory of retributive justice sees punishment as a moral imperative that arises from man’s moral dignity.

Philosophically, punishment is justified and founded mainly on the cardinal moral virtue of justice, specifically retributive justice which Iwe states that it “insists that one should get what one deserves” (253). Socrates did not deserve to die the way he did. His choice of allowing the Jury have their way neither set the common Athenians free nor led to the coming into the world of Ziniewicz as he claims. God is the controller of the universe and it is through Christ that He has set the world free.

### **Conclusion**

In view of the discussions so far, I submit that the death of Socrates was not a type of Calvary. I further buttress my stand with the following scholarly statements: “I act as I choose, but my choices are themselves caused-caused by my previous choices, my temperamental characteristics, my environment, and my genetic features over which I have control” (Hospers, 1997, 151). One cannot please as one please even though one can act as one please. Rather than resorting to suicide, whether spiritual or physical, we can protest against unreasonable acts in the universe that are meaningless to us (Porter, 1995, 425). Christ’s examples as contained in the Scriptures are best in all sufficiency to anyone who seeks a peaceful life of the heart and eternal salvation. While we have moral virtues to tap from the life of Socrates, we should note that he was neither a type nor an antitype sacrifice for the salvation of souls. Christ Jesus is the one whose life and times brought about eternal milestones in human history.

### **References:**

- Asouzu, Innocent I. (2004) *The Method and Principles of Complementary Reflection In and Beyond African Philosophy*. Calabar: University of Calabar Press.
- Blank, Wayne “Type and Antitype” <http://www.keyway.ca/htm2000/20000912.htm>. Downloaded 15/10/2012.
- Bunch, Taylor G. “Types & Antitypes”.[http://www.sdabol.org/BOL%20 Research/types.htm](http://www.sdabol.org/BOL%20Research/types.htm). Downloaded 15/10/2012.
- Honderich, Ted.(1995) Ed. *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hospers, John.(1997) *An Introduction to Philosophical Analysis*. London: Routledge.

- Iwe, Nwachukwuike S. S. (1987) Socio –Ethical Issues in Nigeria. New York: Peter Lang.
- Kreis, Steven. “Greek Thought: Socrates, Plato and Aristotle”. The History Guide: Lectures on Ancient and Medieval European History. <http://www.historyguide.org/ancient/lecture8b.html>. Downloaded 17/8/2011.
- Plato (1990) “Apology” Great Books of the Western World vol.6. Editor-in-chief, Adler, Mortimer J. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.
- (1990)“Crito” Great Books of the Western World vol. 6. Editor-in-chief, Adler, Mortimer J. Chicago: Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.
- Porter, Burton F. (1995) Philosophy: A Literary and Conceptual Approach. Orlando, Florida: Harcourt Brace & Company.
- “The Story of Socrates in prison” <http://eawc.evansville.edu/anthology/crito.htm>. Downloaded 17/8/2011.
- White, Ellen G. (2002)“The Desire of Ages”. New York. Global Distributors Ltd.
- Wikipedia. “Socrates”. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/socrates>. Downloaded 14/8/2011.
- Wikipedia; <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/socrates>. Downloaded 17/8/2011.
- Wikipedia. “Typology (theology)”. [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Typology-\(theology\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Typology-(theology)). Downloaded 15/10/2012.
- Ziniewicz, Gordon L. “Plato: The Crito: Summary of the Argument Against Escaping from Prison” (Loyola College, Maryland). <http://www.qcc.cuny.edu/socialsciences/ppecorino/intro-text/chapter%20%20GREEKS/Socrates-prison.htm> downloaded 17/8/2011.