

# 柏拉图著作集

PLATO

(英文本)

1

[英] 本杰明·乔伊特 英译/评注

Translated into English with Analyses and Introductions  
by Benjamin Jowett

# 柏拉图著作集

(英文本)

[英] 本杰明·乔伊特 英译/评注



## 图书在版编目(CIP)数据

柏拉图著作集. 1: 英文 / (古希腊) 柏拉图著; (英) 乔伊特(Jowett, B.) 译评. —桂林: 广西师范大学出版社, 2008.10

(西方古典文丛)

ISBN 978-7-5633-7657-5

I. 柏… II. ①柏…②乔… III. 柏拉图(前 427~前 347) — 文集—英文 IV. B502.232-53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2008) 第 120097 号

广西师范大学出版社出版发行

(广西桂林市中华路 22 号 邮政编码: 541001 )  
(网址: <http://www.bbtpress.com>)

出版人: 何林夏

全国新华书店经销

广西师范大学印刷厂印刷

(广西桂林市临桂县金山路 168 号 邮政编码: 541100)

开本: 890 mm × 1 240 mm 1/32

印张: 16.625 字数: 515 千字

2008 年 10 月第 1 版 2008 年 10 月第 1 次印刷

印数: 0 001~3 000 册 定价: 36.00 元

如发现印装质量问题, 影响阅读, 请与印刷厂联系调换。

## 编者说明

此套英文版《柏拉图著作集》是为适应中国读者阅读、研究柏拉图著作的需要而编辑出版，收录了本杰明·乔伊特（Benjamin Jowett, 1817—1893）所译的全部柏拉图著作，以及乔伊特为每篇作品所撰写的导读性文字，共六卷。

尽管柏拉图的著作，尤其是一些名篇，至20世纪出现了不少优秀译文，但一百余年前乔伊特这套完整的英译本仍然具有不可替代的地位和价值。乔伊特典雅、晓畅的文字风格历来为人称道，他避免生僻词和学院化，以其特有的韵律驾驭浅显的文字，为柏拉图在现代赢得了大量读者；这些读者可能不懂古希腊语，甚至母语并非英语，但都可借助这一译本相对完整地了解柏拉图的著作和哲学。

英译本第四版是在乔伊特去世六十年后修订而成，较乔伊特生前的最后一版第三版有较多改动，主要目的是使译文在字面上更忠实于希腊文原著，这方面可参看第四版前言中的说明（各版前言的摘选收入第一卷卷首）。

以下就本版的一些编排处理作以说明：

所有译文内容的修订以第四版为准，并有选择地保留了一部分第四版编者所加的附注（在书中以方括号括出），乔伊特的原注则基本维持不变。

遵照第四版删节了一部分乔伊特的导读性文字，但也依据第三版，保留了一些编者认为仍然有益于中国读者的内容。

在各卷、各篇顺序的编排上大体参照了第四版，但基于本版编者的理解，并照顾到篇幅问题，适当作了一些调整。

作为参考内容，将疑为伪作的《大希庇阿斯》、《小希庇阿斯》、《阿尔希比亚得斯（一）》和《美涅塞努斯》，以及受关注度较高的《第七封信》收作附录。

在第一卷后附有英文版第三、四版均沿用的柏拉图著作索引，是非常有用的资料。

本套书在编辑、排印方面定有不够完善之处，敬请广大读者批评指正，以便改进。

2008年6月

*From the*  
**PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION**

I have to acknowledge many obligations to old friends and pupils. These are: Mr. John Purves, Fellow of Balliol College, with whom I have revised about half of the entire translation; the Rev. Professor Campbell of St. Andrews, who has helped me in the revision of several parts of the work, especially of the *Theaetetus*, *Sophist*, and *Politicus*; Mr. Robinson Ellis, Fellow of Trinity College, and Mr. Alfred Robinson, Fellow of New College, who read with me the *Cratylus* and the *Gorgias*; Mr. Paravicini, Student of Christ Church, who assisted me in the *Symposium*; Mr. Raper, Fellow of Queen's College, Mr. Monro, Fellow of Oriel College, and Mr. Shadwell, Students of Christ Church, who gave me similar assistance in the *Laws*. Dr. Greenhill, of Hastings, has also kindly sent me remarks on the physiological part of the *Timaeus*, which I have inserted as corrections under the head of *errata* at the end of the Introduction. The degree of accuracy which I have been enabled to attain is in great measure due to these gentlemen, and I heartily thank them for the pains and time which they have bestowed on my work.

I have further to explain how far I have received help from other labourers in the same field. The books which I have found of most use are Steinhart and Müller's German Translation of Plato with Introductions; Zeller's *Philosophie der Griechen*, and *Platonische Studien*; Susemihl's *Genetische Entwicklung der Platonischen Philosophie*; Hermann's *Geschichte der Platonischen Philosophie*; Bonitz, *Platonische Studien*; Stallbaum's Notes and Introductions; Professor Campbell's editions of the *Theaetetus*, the *Sophist*, and the *Politicus*; Professor Thompson's *Phaedrus*; Th. Martin's *Études sur le Timée*; Mr. Poste's edition and translation of the *Philebus*; the Translation of the *Republic*, by Messrs. Davies and Vaughan, and the Translation of the *Gorgias*, by Mr. Cope.

I have also derived much assistance from the great work of Mr. Grote, which contains excellent analyses of the dialogues, and is rich in original

thoughts and observations. I agree with him in rejecting as futile the attempt of Schleiermacher and others to arrange the dialogues of Plato into a harmonious whole. Any such arrangement appears to me not only to be unsupported by evidence, but to involve an anachronism in the history of philosophy. There is a common spirit in the writings of Plato, but not a unity of design in the whole, nor perhaps a perfect unity in any single dialogue. The hypothesis of a general plan which is worked out in the successive dialogues is an afterthought of the critics who have attributed a system to writings belonging to an age when system had not as yet taken possession of philosophy.

If Mr. Grote should do me the honour to read any portion of this work he will probably remark that I have endeavoured to approach Plato from a point of view which is opposed to his own. The aim of the Introductions in these volumes has been to represent Plato as the father of Idealism, who is not to be measured by the standard of utilitarianism of any other modern philosophical system. He is the poet or maker of ideas, satisfying the wants of his own age, providing the instruments of thought for future generations. He is no dreamer, but a great philosophical genius struggling with the unequal conditions of light and knowledge under which he is living. He may be illustrated by the writings of moderns, but he must be interpreted by his own, and by his place in the history of philosophy. We are not concerned to determine what is the residuum of truth which remains for ourselves. His truth may not be our truth, and nevertheless may have an extraordinary value and interest for us.

I cannot agree with Mr. Grote in admitting as genuine all the writings commonly attributed to Plato in antiquity, and more than with Schaarschmidt and some other German critics who reject nearly half of them. The German critics, to whom I refer, proceed chiefly on grounds of internal evidence; they appear to me to lay too much stress on the variety of doctrine and style, which must be equally acknowledged as a fact, even in the dialogues regarded by Schaarschmidt as genuine, e. g. in the *Phaedrus*, or *Symposium*, when compared with the *Laws*. He who admits works so different in style and matter to have been the composition of the same author, need have no difficulty in admitting the *Sophist* or the *Politicus*. (The negative argument adduced by the same school of critics, which is based on the silence of Aristotle, is not worthy of much consideration. For why should Aristotle, because he has quoted several dialogues of Plato, have

quoted them all? Something must be allowed to chance, and to the nature of the subjects treated of in them.) On the other hand, Mr. Grote trusts mainly to the Alexandrian Canon. But I hardly think that we are justified in attributing much weight to the authority of the Alexandrian librarians in an age when there was no regular publication of books, and every temptation to forge them; and in which the writings of a school were naturally attributed to the founder of the school. And even without intentional fraud, there was an inclination to believe rather than to inquire. Would Mr. Grote accept as genuine all the writings which he finds in the lists of learned ancients attributed to Hippocrates, to Xenophon, to Aristotle? The Alexandrian Canon of the Platonic writings is deprived of credit by the admission of the *Epistles*, which are not only unworthy of Plato, and in several passages plagiarized from him, but flagrantly at variance with historical fact. It will be seen also that I do not agree with Mr. Grote's views about the sophists; nor with the low estimate which he has formed of Plato's *Laws*; nor with his opinion respecting Plato's doctrine of the rotation of the earth. But I 'am not going to lay hands on my father Parmenides' (*Soph.* 241 d), who will, I hope, forgive me for differing from him on these points. I cannot close this Preface without expressing my deep respect for his noble and gentle character, and the great services which he has rendered to Greek Literature.

B. Jowett  
Balliol College  
January, 1871

*From the*  
**PREFACE TO THE SECOND AND  
THIRD EDITIONS**

In publishing a second edition (1875) of the dialogues of Plato in English, I had to acknowledge the assistance of several friends; of the Rev. G. G. Bradley, Master of University College, now Dean of Westminster, who sent me some valuable remarks on the *Phaedo*; of Dr. Greenhill, who had again

revised a portion of the *Timaeus*; of Mr. R. L. Nettleship, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, to whom I was indebted for an excellent criticism of the *Parmenides*; and, above all, of the Rev. Professor Campbell of St. Andrews, and Mr. Paravicini, late Student of Christ Church and Tutor of Balliol College, with whom I had read over the greater part of the translation. I was also indebted to Mr. Evelyn Abbott, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, for a complete and accurate index.

In this, the third edition, I am under very great obligations to Mr. Matthew Knight, who has not only favoured me with valuable suggestions throughout the work, but has largely extended the index (from 61 to 175 pages) and translated the *Eryxias* and *Second Alcibiades*; and to Mr. Frank Fletcher, of Balliol College, my Secretary, who has assisted me chiefly in vols. iii, iv, and v. I am also considerably indebted to Mr. J. W. Mackail, late Fellow of Balliol College, who read over the *Republic* in the second edition and noted several inaccuracies.

At the end of a long task, the translator may without impropriety point out the difficulties which he has had to encounter. These have been far greater than he would have anticipated; nor is he at all sanguine that he has succeeded in overcoming them. Experience has made him feel that a translation, like a picture, is dependent for its effect on very minute touches; and that it is a work of infinite pains, to be returned to in many moods and viewed in different lights.

I. An English translation ought to be idiomatic and interesting, not only to the scholar, but to the unlearned reader. Its object should not simply be to render the words of one language into the words of another or to preserve the construction and order of the original; this is the ambition of a schoolboy, who wishes to show that he has made a good use of his Dictionary and Grammar; — but is quite unworthy of the translator, who seeks to produce on his reader an impression similar or nearly similar to that produced by the original. To him the feeling should be more important than the exact word. He should remember Dryden's quaint admonition not to 'lacquey by the side of his author, but to mount up behind him'.<sup>①</sup> He must carry in his mind a comprehensive view of the whole work, of what has preceded and what is to follow, — as well as of the meaning of particular passages. His version should be based, in the first instance, on an intimate knowledge of the text; but the precise order and arrangement of the words may be left to fade out of

---

① Dedication to the *Æneis*.



sight, when the translation begins to take shape. He must form a general idea of the two languages, and reduce the one to the terms of the other. His work should be rhythmical and varied, the right admixture of words and syllables, and even of letters, should be carefully attended to; above all, it should be equable in style. There must also be quantity, which is necessary in prose as well as in verse; clauses, sentences, paragraphs, must be in due proportion. Metre and even rhyme may be rarely admitted; though neither is a legitimate element of prose writing, they may help to lighten a cumbrous expression (cp. *Symp.* 185 d, 197, 198). The translation should retain as far as possible the characteristic qualities of the ancient writer — his freedom, grace, simplicity, stateliness, weight, precision; or the best part of him will be lost to the English reader. It should read as an original work, and should also be the most faithful transcript which can be made of the language from which the translation is taken, consistently with the first requirement of all, that it be English. Further, the translation being English, it should also be perfectly intelligible in itself without reference to the Greek, the English being really the more lucid and exact of the two languages. In some respects it may be maintained that ordinary English writing, such as the newspaper article, is superior to Plato; at any rate it is couched in language which is very rarely obscure. On the other hand, the greatest writers of Greece, Thucydides, Plato, Æschylus, Sophocles, Pindar, Demosthenes, are generally those which are found to be most difficult and to diverge most widely from the English idiom. The translator will often have to convert the more abstract Greek into the more concrete English, or vice versa, and he ought not to force upon one language the character of another. In some cases, where the order is confused, the expression feeble, the emphasis misplaced, or the sense somewhat faulty, he will not strive in his rendering to reproduce these characteristics, but will rewrite the passage as his author would have written it at first, had he not been ‘nodding’; and he will not hesitate to supply anything which, owing to the genius of the language or some accident of composition, is omitted in the Greek, but is necessary to make the English clear and consecutive.

It is difficult to harmonize all these conflicting elements. In a translation of Plato what may be termed the interests of the Greek and English are often at war with one another. In framing the English sentence we are insensibly diverted from the exact meaning of the Greek; when we return to the Greek we are apt to cramp and overlay the English. We substitute, we compromise, we give and take, we add a little here and leave out a little there. The translator may sometimes be allowed to sacrifice minute accuracy

for the sake of clearness and sense. But he is not therefore at liberty to omit words and turns of expression which the English language is quite capable of supplying. He must be patient and self-controlled; he must not be easily run away with. Let him never allow the attraction of a favourite expression, or a sonorous cadence, to overpower his better judgement, or think much of an ornament which is out of keeping with the general character of his work. He must ever be casting his eyes upwards from the copy to the original, and down again from the original to the copy (*Rep.* vi. 501 a). His calling is not held in much honour by the world of scholars; yet he himself may be excused for thinking it a kind of glory to have lived so many years in the companionship of one of the greatest of human intelligences, and in some degree, more perhaps than others, to have had the privilege of understanding him (cp. Sir Joshua Reynolds' Lectures; Disc. xv. *sub fin.*).

There are fundamental differences in Greek and English, of which some may be managed while others remain intractable. (1) The structure of the Greek language is partly adversative and alternative, and partly inferential; that is to say, the members of a sentence are either opposed to one another, or one of them expresses the cause of effect or condition of another. The two tendencies may be called the horizontal and perpendicular lines of the language; and the opposition or inference is often much more one of words than of ideas. But modern languages have rubbed off this adversative and inferential form; they have fewer links of connexion, there is less mortar in the interstices, and they are content to place sentences side by side, leaving their relation to one another to be gathered from their position or from the context. The difficulty of preserving the effect of the Greek is increased by the want of adversative and inferential particles in English, and by the nice sense of tautology which characterizes all modern languages. We cannot have two 'buts' or two 'fors' in the same sentence where the Greek repeats ἀλλά or γάρ. There is a similar want of particles expressing the various gradations of objective and subjective thought — που, δὲ, μήν, μέντοι and the like, which are so thickly scattered over the Greek page. Further, we can only realize to a very imperfect degree the common distinction between οὐ and μή, and the combination of the two suggests a subtle shade of negation which cannot be expressed in English. And while English is more dependent than Greek upon the apposition of clauses and sentences, yet there is a difficulty in using this form of construction owing to the want of case endings. For the same reason there cannot be an equal variety in the order of

words or an equal nicety of emphasis in English as in Greek.

(2) The formation of the sentence and of the paragraph greatly differs in Greek and English. The lines by which they are divided are generally much more marked in modern languages than in ancient. Both sentences and paragraphs are more precise and definite — they do not run into one another. They are also more regularly developed from within. The sentence marks another step in an argument or a narrative or a statement; in reading a paragraph we silently turn over the page and arrive at some new view or aspect of the subject. Whereas in Plato we are not always certain where a sentence begins and ends; and paragraphs are few and far between. The language is distributed in a different way, and less articulated than in English. For it was long before the true use of the period was attained by the classical writers both in poetry or prose; it was πολλῆς πείρας τελευταῖον ἐπιγένημα. The balance of sentences and the introduction of paragraphs at suitable intervals must not be neglected if the harmony of the English language is to be preserved. And still a caution has to be added on the other side, that we must avoid giving it a numerical or mechanical character.

(3) This, however, is not one of the greatest difficulties of the translator; much greater is that which arises from the restriction of the use of the genders. Men and women in English are masculine and feminine, and there is a similar distinction of sex in the words denoting animals; but all things else, whether outward objects or abstract ideas, are relegated to the class of neuters. Hardly in some flight of poetry do we ever endue any of them with the characteristics of a sentient being, and then only by speaking of them in the feminine gender. The virtues may be pictured in female forms, but they are not so described in language; a ship is humorously supposed to be the sailor's bride; more doubtful are the personifications of church and country as females. Now the genius of the Greek language is the opposite of this. The same tendency to personification which is seen in the Greek mythology is common also in the language; and genders are attributed to things as well as persons according to their various degrees of strength and weakness; or from fanciful resemblances to the male or female form, or some analogy too subtle to be discovered. When the gender of any object was once fixed, a similar gender was naturally assigned to similar objects, or to words of similar formation. This use of genders in the denotation of objects or ideas not only affects the words to which genders are attributed, but the words with which they are construed or connected, and passes into the general character of the style. Hence arises a difficulty in translating Greek into English which

cannot altogether be overcome. Shall we speak of the soul and its qualities, of virtue, power, wisdom, and the like, as feminine or neuter? The usage of the English language does not admit of the former, and yet life and beauty of the style are impaired by the latter. Often the translator will have recourse to the repetition of the word, or to the ambiguous 'they', 'their', &c. ; for fear of spoiling the effect of the sentence by introducing 'it'. Collective nouns in Greek and English create a similar but lesser awkwardness.

(4) The use of relation is far more extended in Greek than in English. Partly the greater variety of genders and cases makes the connexion of relative and antecedent less ambiguous; partly also the greater number of demonstrative and relative pronouns, and the use of the article, make the correlation of ideas simpler and more natural. The Greek appears to have had an ear or intelligence for a long and complicated sentence which is rarely to be found in modern nations; and in order to bring the Greek down to the level of the modern, we must break up the long sentence into two or more short ones. Neither is the same precision required in Greek as in Latin or English, nor in earlier Greek as in later; there was nothing shocking to the contemporary of Thucydides and Plato in anacolutha and repetitions. In such cases the genius of the English language requires that the translation should be more intelligible than the Greek. The want of more distinctions between the demonstrative pronouns is also greatly felt. Two genitives dependent on one another, unless familiarised by idiom, have an awkward effect in English. Frequently the noun has to take the place of the pronoun. 'This' and 'that' are found repeating themselves to weariness in the rough draft of a translation. As in the previous case, while the feeling of the modern language is more opposed to tautology, there is also a greater difficulty in avoiding it.

(5) Though no precise rule can be laid down about the repetition of words, there seems to be a kind of impertinence in presenting to the reader the same thought in the same words, repeated twice over in the same passage without any new aspect or modification of it. And the evasion of tautology — that is, the substitution of one word of precisely the same meaning for another — is resented by us equally with the repetition of words. Yet on the other hand the least difference of meaning or the least change of form from a substantive to an adjective, or from a participle to a verb, will often remedy the unpleasant effect. Rarely and only for the sake of emphasis or clearness can we allow an important word to be used twice over in two successive sentences or even in the same paragraph. The particles and pronouns, as they are of most frequent occurrence, are also the most troublesome. Strictly

speaking, except a few of the commonest of them, 'and', 'the', &c. , they ought not to occur twice in the same sentence. But the Greek has no such precise rules; and hence any literal translation of a Greek author is full of tautology. The tendency of modern languages is to become more correct as well as more perspicuous than ancient. And, therefore, while the English translator is limited in the power of expressing relation or connexion, by the law of his own language increased precision and also increased clearness are required of him. The familiar use of logic, and the progress of science, have in these two respects raised the standard. But modern languages, while they have become more exacting in their demands, are in many ways not so well furnished with powers of expression as the ancient classical ones.

Such are a few of the difficulties which have to be overcome in the work or translation; and we are far from having exhausted the list. (6) The excellence of a translation will consist, not merely in the faithful rendering of words, or in the composition of a sentence only, or yet of a single paragraph, but in the colour and style of the whole work. Equability of tone is best attained by the exclusive use of familiar and idiomatic words. But great care must be taken; for an idiomatic phrase, if an exception to the general style, is of itself a disturbing element. No word, however expressive and exact, should be employed, which makes the reader stop to think, or unduly attracts attention by difficulty and peculiarity, or disturbs the effect of the surrounding language. In general the style of one author is not appropriate to another; as in society, so in letters, we expect every man to have 'a good coat of his own', and not to dress himself out in the rags of another. (a) Archaic expressions are therefore to be avoided. Equivalents may be occasionally drawn from Shakespeare, who is the common property of us all; but they must be used sparingly. For, like some other men of genius of the Elizabethan and Jacobean age, he outdid the capabilities of the language, and many of the expressions which he introduced have been laid aside and have dropped out of use. (b) A similar principle should be observed in the employment of Scripture. Having a greater force and beauty than other language, and a religious association, it disturbs the even flow of the style. It may be used to reproduce in the translation the quaint effect of some antique phrase in the original, but rarely; and when adopted, it should have a certain freshness and a suitable 'entourage'. It is strange to observe that the most effective use of Scripture phraseology arises out of the application of it in a sense not intended by the author. (c) Another caution; metaphors differ in different languages, and the translator will often be compelled to substitute one for another, or to paraphrase them, not giving

word for word, but diffusing over several words the more concentrated thought of the original. The Greek of Plato often goes beyond the English in its imagery; cp. *Laws* iii. 695 c, ὧν καὶ νῦν ἐτι σμικρὰ ὄνειρατα λείπεται; *Rep.* i. 345 e; ix. 588 c, &c. Or again the modern word, which in substance is the nearest equivalent to the Greek, may be found to include associations alien to Greek life; e. g. δικασταί, 'jurymen', τὰ μέσα τῶν πολιτῶν, 'the bourgeoisie'. (d) The translator has also to provide expressions for philosophical terms of very indefinite meaning in the more definite language of modern philosophy. And he must not allow discordant elements to enter into the work. For example, in translating Plato, it would equally be an anachronism to intrude on him the feeling and spirit of the Jewish or Christian Scriptures or the technical terms of the Hegelian or Darwinian philosophy.

(7) As no two words are precise equivalents (just as no two leaves of the forest are exactly similar), it is a mistaken attempt at precision always to translate the same Greek word by the same English word. There is no reason why in the New Testament δικαιοσύνη should always be rendered 'righteousness', or διαθήκη 'covenant'. In such cases the translator may be allowed to employ two words — sometimes when the two meanings occur in the same passage, varying them by an 'or' — e. g. ἐπιστήμη, 'science' or 'knowledge', εἶδος, 'idea' or 'class', σωφροσύνη, 'temperance' or 'prudence', — at the point where the change of meaning occurs. If translations are intended not for the Greek scholar but for the general reader, their worst fault will be that they sacrifice the general effect and meaning to the over-precise rendering of words and forms of speech.

(8) There is no kind of literature in English which corresponds to the Greek dialogue; nor is the English language easily adapted to it. The rapidity and abruptness of question and answer, the constant repetition of ἦ δ' ὅς, εἶπε, εἶη, &c., which Cicero avoided in Latin (*de Amicit.* c. 1), the frequent occurrence of expletives, would, if reproduced in a translation, give offence to the reader. Greek has a freer and more frequent use of the interrogative, and is of a more passionate and emotional character, and therefore lends itself with greater readiness to the dialogue form. Most of the so-called English dialogues are but poor imitations of Plato, which fall very far short of the original. The breath of conversation, the subtle adjustment of question and answer, the lively play of fancy, the power of drawing characters, are wanting in them. But the Platonic dialogue is a drama as well as a dialogue, of which Socrates is the central figure, and

there are lesser performers as well; the insolence of Thrasymachus, the anger of Callicles and Anytus, the patronizing style of Protagoras, the self-consciousness of Prodicus and Hippias, are all part of the entertainment. To reproduce this living image the same sort of effort is required as in translating poetry. The language, too, is of a finer quality; the mere prose English is slow in lending itself to the form of question and answer, and so the ease of conversation is lost, and at the same time the dialectical precision with which the steps of the argument are drawn out is apt to be impaired.

B. Jowett  
Balliol College  
October, 1891

*From the*  
**PREFACE TO THE FOURTH EDITION**

Jowett died in October 1893, a year after the appearance of the third edition of his translation of the dialogues of Plato. In his will he provided for his writings as follows; 'I specially bequeath the perpetual copyright of my writings to Balliol College. I desire that they may be republished from time to time as may seem expedient, and that the profits, if any, arising from the republication of them shall be invested from time to time and the income thence accruing applied in the first place to the improvement or correction of them.' Since his death no new edition of the translation of Plato has been published, though the work (or parts of it) has been reprinted in many forms. The Copyright Trustees appointed by the College under the will have now thought it expedient to cause a new edition to be prepared, with such improvement or correction as may seem to be desirable.

It will be appropriate here to offer a brief account of the history and character of Jowett's translation, following the narrative of Professor Lewis Campbell, in the first volume of the *Life and Letters of Benjamin*

Jowett,<sup>①</sup> and in the Preface to his and Jowett's edition of the *Republic*.<sup>②</sup>

Soon after his appointment as Regius Professor of Greek at Oxford in 1855, Jowett began to promote a series of scholarly editions of the dialogues of Plato. He proposed himself to edit the *Republic*, and also to write a critical survey of Plato's philosophy, in which was to be incorporated a full analysis of the dialogues; this analysis was to reproduce every nuance of the Greek.

When I was with him at Askrigg in the summer of 1864, he was struggling with the analysis of the *Parmenides* and other dialectical dialogues. His taste in language was becoming more and more fastidious. At this time he was resolved to turn every sentence so as to exclude the colourless pronoun 'it'. I troubled him with the remark that 'which' was not much better, and one or other was inevitable. . . . This protracted labour was almost finished when a casual remark of Pattison's (I think) convinced him that the analysis could never be complete, and that the *Republic* at all events must be translated in full. As he proceeded with this in 1865, he formed the resolution of translating the whole of Plato (*Life*, vol. i, pp. 333-4).

He evidently lost interest in his plan for a general estimate of Plato's philosophy, and his commentary on the *Republic*, in which from 1875 onwards he was assisted by Campbell, did not appear until 1894, the year after his death. But he turned eagerly to the translation of the dialogues, and so devoted himself to it that the first edition, in four volumes, appeared in 1871. The second edition was published in 1875, the third in 1892. In both the later editions the translation was severely revised; the whole work was expanded to five volumes, and so great were the changes that those who possessed the earlier editions were invited to send back their copies to the Clarendon Press, and to purchase the third at half-price. The nature of these changes was, very briefly, as follows. Many friends of Jowett gave him advice, which he used freely, on the rendering of particular dialogues. He himself was perpetually seeking to improve the style; Evelyn Abbott tells us that 'the vagueness of the translation was due in part to his habit of polishing the English when he had laid the Greek aside'. (*Life*, vol. ii, 7, note.) The fruit of these labours was the 'innumerable alterations' which appear in

---

① John Murray (London), 1897.

② Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1894.



the text of the two later editions. Moreover, he added to the second edition an index prepared by Abbott; and to the third, translation of the *Eryxias* and *Alcibiades II* (by his secretary, Matthew Knight, with short introductions by himself), a large expansion of the index (also by Knight), and a marginal analysis of the argument of every dialogue. Finally, in the introductions of both editions he expanded considerably his general comments and reflections on the substance of certain dialogues.

Regarding the third edition as a whole, few will deny that he left it in 1892 a massive and splendid work, which, moreover, attained the practical end he set before himself. It was not primarily addressed to classical scholars, or to professional philosophers (most of whom, in his day, could probably read Plato in the original), but to the intelligent public, whether in or outside the universities, to whom Greek was an unknown language. He wrote to his friend Sir R. Morier: 'My Plato is only a translation, but I have a satisfaction in feeling that it may continue to influence the English and American world in the right direction long after I am gone' (*Letters*,<sup>①</sup> p. 182); and there can be no doubt that for many years during his life and after his death he did in fact bring a knowledge of Plato and the Platonic dialogues to many thousands of such readers. His success was won partly perhaps by his abstention from the detailed apparatus of editorial scholarship, partly by the masculine vigour and frankness of his own reflections, expressed in the pure, easy, and dignified style which (like other great Victorian writers) he seems to have had always at his command; but most of all by the generally idiomatic and rhythmical English of the translation itself. In its own way it is still unsurpassed. Although a reader wishing to have the whole of Plato in English may now be able to obtain as good versions of some of the dialogues, it may safely be said that he could not form a complete collection of versions which would rival or even approach Jowett's work, if account be taken of anything besides verbal accuracy.

But it is now eighty years since the first edition appeared, and sixty since the third; for several reasons some alterations in Jowett's work seem desirable. In the first place, neither Greek scholarship in general, nor the study of Plato in particular, has stood still during that long period. Secondly, the character of the public whom Jowett thought to address has

---

① A supplementary volume to the *Life and Letters*; John Murray (London), 1897.