cation of the truth; and Athenians, especially, regarded with invidiousness every attempt to impart to them moral in­struction. Every Athenian, they thought, was capable of communicating this kind of knowledge, at least every edu­cated Athenian, every individual of the higher order of citi­zens.@@1 They wanted no one to teach them virtue. Hence the allusion made on so many occasions by Socrates to the question, whether virtue could be taught or not. It was, in­deed, part of the profession of the Sophists to teach virtue ;@@2 but it was as an accomplishment or art. and not as a *discipline of life,* that it entered into the system of the Sophists. So­crates uprooted this vain notion. He laboured to impress on the Athenians, that so far from their being able to teach virtue, there were none who knew what virtue was. They had yet to learn *themselves* in order to that purpose. This, then, was his great difficulty. It was not the difficulty of communicating *new* knowledge, but that of leading men to unlearn their presumptions and conceits, and to *feel the ne­cessity* of moral instruction.@@3 That he should have succeed­ed then in any degree in such an attempt,—that he should have been able to carry on the effort for so many years, in the very centre of Greek civilization,—that, proceeding on so broad and fundamental a principle of reformation, presenting no definite system on which a sect might fasten, no specific lure to the zeal of party, he should have drawn around him so many followers and admirers,—this is the extraordinary effect in the case of Socrates, which shows the powerful charm of his address. To persons offering any particular instruction, or professing to qualify them for the office of statesmen and orators, the Athenians were most ready to attend ; and many doubtless did attend to the conversations of Socrates with this view. They could not but admire the skill which he displayed in arguing with every one that came in his way ; not with the vulgar only, but with those who had the highest reputation for talent in reasoning, and for the extent of their knowledge. They saw his superiority to the So­phists, on the very ground on which the Sophists set up their pretensions. Many, accordingly, flocked to him as the best master in political science and dialectical skill, par­ticularly as he was always accessible, and his instructions were perfectly gratuitous. Some, too, of a better nature than the rest, were won by the honest and manly purpose which shone through his teaching and manner on all occa­sions ; whatever disguise of irony, or humour, or sophistry, he might assume. There were even some of the young men, whose habits of life were reproved, and principles con­demned, by his searching interrogatories, but who yet were won to attention by the charm of his instruction, and pa­tiently heard from him truths which they would not have listened to from any other lips. For who else could stay, even for a moment, the wild impetuosity of Alcibiades, or the ferocious arrogance of Critias ? Their motives in resort­ing to Socrates were chiefly selfish and political. It was in pursuit of their schemes of ambition that they sought his society. Still he was able to retain them for a time at least, though they found his instructions very different from what they calculated on receiving; and so long as they continued to associate with him, they exercised a degree of self-re­straint which strikingly contrasted with the habitual profli­gacy of their lives.@@4 Alcibiades is represented by Plato, as confessing that he, to whom the feeling of shame was scarcely known, yet felt abashed before Socrates ; that he was en­chanted by him as by the flute of Marsyas, and constrained to acknowledge his own deficiences and neglect of private duty in the midst of his officious zeal for the public service. And this feeling, Alcibiades says, was general; for that there was no one, woman, or man, or boy, that could hear him, or even his words repeated by the most indifferent speaker, but felt taken by surprize, and riveted in attention.@@5

This attention, too, it should be observed, was excited by the address of Socrates, amidst much in his outward form and mien, that, by exciting ridicule, might have repelled the sentiment of respect. The comparison of him to the satyr Marsyas, with all allowance made for comic exaggera­tion, was true in more respects than that of the en­chantment of his conversation. His countenance, strongly marked by that arch intelligence, which half-concealed, half-betrayed, the earnest deep thought, under the light veil of irony and humour, presented features resembling those of the grotesque images of the Sileni. There were the promi­nent dilated eyes, scarcely parted by the low ridge of the nose, the broad expanded nostrils, the wide mouth with its thick lips, such as the sculptors delighted to represent in those rude but poetic forms.@@6 Then his manner of look­ing about him, his head fixed, whilst his eyes traversed the space around, glancing from side to side, excited the smile of wonder in the spectator, as to what this strange solem­nity of aspect might portend. Add to this, the clumsy pro­tuberance of his figure, so repugnant to Grecian notions of the symmetry of form, and the awkwardness of his move­ment@@7 before the eyes of a people who had a lively percep­tion of elegance in every gesture and motion.@@8 These were circumstances which, to the fastidious taste of the Greeks, would appear more important than we, in these times, can well conceive. They judged of intellectual character more from physiognomy@@9 (physiognomy, that is, considered as a science, of mental indications from bodily forms in general) than we are apt to do. Thus in regard to Socrates, the physiognomist, Zopyrus, who, as Cicero informs us,@@10 pro­fessed to discern the manners and natures of men from their body and features, pronounced that Socrates was stupid and heavy, because the outline of his throat was not con-
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@@@\* Isocratee speaks of them as *αύμ,ταβαν ageri∣e xai eυδaιμΛ.ia> ∙rωλονereς,* and, again, as r»î» *eυδaιμΛ>ia> τagaδri6traς* Or. c. Soph. 3. 4.
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See the same indicated at the opening of the Protagoras, where Socrates ironically throws out his opinion, that virtue cannot be taught ; founding it on the fact of the indiscriminate admission of all persons to advise on political affairs in the Assembly, whilst on particular sub­jects, as in a question of building, those only were consulted who were proficients in the art. *'Eτreιha. he τι tτeξi rrς ιzοktως hιοexi∣σtως hit∣ βο∙j>jυβaa6aι, <n>μJ3<Λ)λei)tι* αυro⅞ *aM>raμ,eκ>ς τegi rο∙irω∙ iμΛiως μit rixrω., i∕ιaως hi χgλxeiς, Uxνrοrομ,<∣ς, ιμ,ποgος. taνxλrlgος, <rij,∙jσκς,* win;;, *yenaaς, aγtnης.* Plato, Op. iii. p. 105 ; also Meno. Op. iv p. 375.

@@@4 Xenoph. Mem. i. 2. 24.

@@@i Plato, Conviv. 215, Op. x. p. 257.

@@@6 Xenoph. Conviv. v. Plato, Theætet. 143 e.

@@@’ The idea of his attempting to dance excites a laugh in the guests in Xenophon's Banquet. Xenoph. Sympos. He says there that be practised dancing for the sake of exercise.

@@@• Xenoph. Conviv. ii. 19.

@@@’ Aristotle introduces in his Analytics (Anal. Prior, ii. c. ult.) a notice of the subject, as affording matter of consideration to the dialectician.

@@@10 Cicero, De Fato, c. 5.