
SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

Number 383

April, 2026

Piecing Together Plato in Late Qing China:

Wang Shunan 王樹枏 (1852–1936)

and the *Xila xue'an* 希臘學案

by

Eric L. Hutton

Victor H. Mair, Editor

Sino-Platonic Papers

Department of East Asian Languages and Civilizations

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA 19104-6305 USA

vmair@sas.upenn.edu

www.sino-platonic.org

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS

FOUNDED 1986

Editor-in-Chief

VICTOR H. MAIR

Associate Editors

PAULA ROBERTS

MARK SWOFFORD

ISSN

2157-9679 (print) 2157-9687 (online)

SINO-PLATONIC PAPERS is an occasional series dedicated to making available to specialists and the interested public the results of research that, because of its unconventional or controversial nature, might otherwise go unpublished. The editor-in-chief actively encourages younger, not yet well established scholars and independent authors to submit manuscripts for consideration.

Contributions in any of the major scholarly languages of the world, including romanized modern standard Mandarin and Japanese, are acceptable. In special circumstances, papers written in one of the Sinitic topolects (*fangyan*) may be considered for publication.

Although the chief focus of *Sino-Platonic Papers* is on the intercultural relations of China with other peoples, challenging and creative studies on a wide variety of philological subjects will be entertained. This series is *not* the place for safe, sober, and stodgy presentations. *Sino-Platonic Papers* prefers lively work that, while taking reasonable risks to advance the field, capitalizes on brilliant new insights into the development of civilization.

Submissions are regularly sent out for peer review, and extensive editorial suggestions for revision may be offered.

Sino-Platonic Papers emphasizes substance over form. We do, however, strongly recommend that prospective authors consult our style guidelines at www.sino-platonic.org/stylesheet.doc.

Manuscripts should be submitted as electronic files in Microsoft Word format. You may wish to use our sample document template, available here: www.sino-platonic.org/spp.dot.

All issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* are free in PDF form. Issues 1–170, however, will continue to be available in paper copies until our stock runs out.

Please note: When the editor goes on an expedition or research trip, all operations may cease for up to three months at a time.

Sino-Platonic Papers is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5 License. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/> or send a letter to Creative Commons, 543 Howard Street, 5th Floor, San Francisco, California, 94105, USA.

Piecing Together Plato in Late Qing China:
Wang Shunan 王樹枏 (1852–1936) and the *Xila xue'an* 希臘學案

Eric L. Hutton

University of Utah

Abstract:

This work presents a translation and analysis of the section on Plato from the *Xila xue'an* 希臘學案 by Wang Shunan 王樹枏, which was completed around 1903–1906 and is one of the very longest Chinese discussions of Plato from the Qing dynasty. Because Wang compiled his study from multiple sources, it thus provides an important snapshot of how knowledge—and sometimes misunderstanding—of Plato (as well as other Greek thinkers) was transmitted to China, before Chinese translations of Plato's works became available in the 1920s. In addition to presenting Plato's thought to his Chinese audience, Wang also commented on it. His study is thus also noteworthy for presenting one of the earliest Chinese reactions to Plato by a traditionally trained scholar-official who had devoted considerable effort to trying to understand him.

Keywords: Plato, Wang Shunan 王樹枏, *Xila xue'an* 希臘學案, reception history of Greek philosophy in China

CONTENTS

Introduction	3
Historical Background	4
Wang's Method of Composition and His Sources	7
On the Text and the Translation	10
Acknowledgments	12
Translation	13
References	63
Appendix: The Chinese Text of the Plato Section of Wang Shunan's <i>Xila xue'an</i>	68

INTRODUCTION

At present, studies of the history of the introduction and reception of ancient Greco-Roman philosophy in China are still in a relatively under-developed state. Partly, that situation is due to the rather small number of scholars who have both the interest and skills to work on this subject, but it is also partly due to the challenges of the relevant material, which is scattered in Chinese and other texts across centuries, texts that are not always easily accessible, and which present puzzles of their own in various ways. As a result, for the imperial period of Chinese history, there is as yet no work in English or Chinese (or any other language, to my knowledge) that presents a detailed, comprehensive, and reliable analysis of exactly what pieces of Greco-Roman philosophy were introduced to China, when they were introduced, and how they were received by Chinese thinkers.¹ The present work aims to fill one very small gap in that larger picture through a translation and analysis of a lengthy Chinese introduction to Plato composed near the end of the Qing dynasty by Wang Shunan 王樹柎 (courtesy name Jinqing 晉卿, 1852–1936),² a figure who has generally been overlooked in English studies of the transmission and reception of ancient Greco-Roman philosophy in China.³

¹ One of the most substantive studies is Huang (2006), but because it tries to cover the entire history of the transmission of Western thought to China, it inevitably has to omit various details that are necessary for a finely-grained picture.

² Different sources disagree about the year of Wang's birth, with some listing it as 1851, and others as 1852. The confusion seems to have started when Wang's grandson Wang Hui'an published a biography of him (Wang 1983), in which he listed the year of Wang Shunan's birth according to the traditional reign-year calendar (咸豐元年) as 1851. However, Wang Shunan wrote an autobiography titled *Taolu laoren suinianlu* 陶庐老人随年录 (reprinted in Ouyang 2007), in which he lists the exact month and day of his birth in that reign-year as 咸豐元年十一月二十五日 (Ouyang 2007: 11), and that particular date would in fact fall in 1852 instead (see Dai 2001), so 1852 is the correct date.

³ Other than brief mentions in a few books here and there, the most substantive discussion of Wang Shunan in English of which I am aware is chapter two of Price (1974), but that material focuses on another of Wang's works, which concerns Peter the Great.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The introduction to China of Plato and other ancient Western philosophers occurred in roughly two main phases. The first phase happened in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, when Jesuit missionaries incorporated materials from and about Aristotle, Plato, and other early philosophers in various Chinese texts that they composed for the purpose of trying to win influence and converts in China. However, subsequently the Jesuits suffered a series of political setbacks that increasingly restricted their proselytizing activities and culminated in a 1732 edict by the Qing emperor Yongzheng expelling them to Macau, and with that the dissemination of Greco-Roman philosophy in China effectively ground to a halt. As the second phase, the dissemination resumed about a hundred years later on in the Qing dynasty, in the nineteenth century. At that time, another wave of missionaries—now Protestants—again began to compose treatises in Chinese that introduced Western views. During this same period, Western colonial powers were encroaching on Chinese territory, which spurred a desire among the Chinese to understand Western culture and history through all means at their disposal, and toward the end of the nineteenth century, Chinese scholars were also traveling abroad and reporting back what they had learned of the West. From this mixture of circumstances, information about Greco-Roman philosophy started circulating to Chinese readers once more, and in amounts that far exceeded what the Jesuits had made available.

Wang Shunan belongs to this second phase, and occupies an interesting place in it. He was a scholar-official who was thoroughly familiar with the Chinese classics, as he had passed the highest level of the imperial civil service exams and attained the rank of *jìnshì* 進士 (“presented scholar”) in 1886. In addition to serving the Qing court as an official appointed to various locales, he was also a prolific writer. Due to the threat posed by Western colonialism, he became particularly interested in helping his compatriots better understand Western nations, and he composed multiple books for this purpose. Of those, one is titled *Xīlá xué’àn* 希臘學案 (*Studies of the Greeks*), which was completed sometime in the range of 1903–1906,⁴ though it was published only much later, in 1919. More will be said about the value

⁴ In Wang’s autobiography, he says in the entry for Guangxu year 28 (*renyin*) that he completed this work in the twelfth month of that year (see Ouyang 2007: 44). The twelfth month of that lunar calendar year overlapped 1902 and 1903 (see Rong 1953: 73–74), so without knowing the exact day, it is impossible to determine exactly which year the work was

and significance of this work in the next section, but for now, there are two particular respects in which Wang's work stands out relative to its historical background.

First, the *Xila xue'an* provides an *extensive* introduction to numerous ancient Greek thinkers. In the earlier Jesuit texts that taught Chinese readers about ancient Western philosophy, Aristotle received the lion's share of attention, largely due to the importance of Aristotelian scholasticism in European history and Aristotle's influence on Aquinas in particular. Beyond just reporting Aristotle's views, though, the Jesuits also produced texts that amount to translation-cum-paraphrase of Aristotle's own works. In contrast, Plato and most other Greek thinkers receive only passing mention here and there in the Jesuit tracts.⁵ Wang's work, on the other hand, strives to be both detailed and comprehensive. In fact, Wang's book contains one of the most sustained Chinese discussions of Plato written in the Qing dynasty (forty-seven pages of text in the original printing), which is one reason it is worth focusing on here.⁶

Second, Wang's work does not merely report the views of Plato and others. It also offers commentary on them. While not all of Wang's comments are original (more on which below), a number of them are ostensibly Wang's own, new opinions. The book thus represents one of the earliest evaluations of Plato

completed. However, based on the fact that he appears to be drawing from multiple Chinese publications from 1903 (see footnotes to the translation), it seems more likely that Wang's work continued well into 1903, and probably his memory is faulty. In one interlinear note early on in the book (*juan* 1: 8b), though, he references Huang and Zhang (1905). In other places (see note 37 below), he makes comments that likewise suggest that he may still have been working on the text possibly even as late as 1906. That said, all the published sources on which Wang drew in composing the Plato section translated here seem to date from no later than 1903, so it appears most likely that the bulk of this section was written during or just after 1903.

⁵ One noteworthy exception to this general situation is Epictetus: Matteo Ricci's 1605 work *Ershiwu yan* 二十五言 is a partial translation, with significant modifications, of the *Encheiridion* into Chinese (see Spalatin 1975). I thank PJ Ivanhoe for reminding me of this point.

⁶ The only Qing period work on Plato longer than Wang's of which I am aware is Chen (1903), which is a Chinese partial translation of Nakae (1885), which is in turn a Japanese translation of Fouillée (1879). However, Chen (1903) is only a translation and does not provide any commentary beyond that contained in the material it translates, so Wang's work has distinct value in being the longest native Chinese attempt to make sense of Plato and respond to his thought during the Qing.

by a very traditionally-trained Chinese scholar, and one with rather Confucian leanings.⁷ Moreover, that evaluation is based on what was, at least for the time, a fairly concerted attempt to understand Plato. That is another main reason that Wang's work is especially interesting. (In the translation that follows, Wang's comments have been formatted as indented paragraphs to set them apart, which mirrors how they are formatted in the original. Section numbers have been added for the convenience of modern readers.)

As Yuan (2011: 13) notes, because Wang's book was not actually published until 1919, and Chinese understanding of the West had progressed substantially in the time that elapsed since it was initially composed, it was quickly overshadowed by other work in the 1920s, and so did not substantially shape the course of subsequent Chinese studies of Plato and other Greek thinkers. Even though Wang's work thus was not historically influential and became largely forgotten, it remains interesting in its own right as an example of the kind of work being done by Chinese scholars on Plato at the end of the Qing dynasty, and their appraisal of Plato's thought.

⁷ Based on examination of other writings by Wang, Don Price characterizes Wang's outlook as a "combination of traditional moral values as ends and *Realpolitik* as means" with the following observations:

[Wang's] judicious comments on the contending old and new text versions of the classics, which gave rise to heated exegetical controversy, bespoke a certain critical reverence for the Confucian canon; he himself emphasized the practical value of Confucius's teachings. It was his concern for the practical problems of statecraft, no doubt, which led him to appreciate the uses of control and manipulation in government. Contrary to the moralism of neo-Confucian purists, he credited the famous ancient practitioner of *Realpolitik*, Guanzi, with the supreme Confucian virtue of benevolence (*ren*), on the strength of his great contribution to the peace of ancient China. (Price 1974: 56. Wade-Giles romanization in the original has been changed to *pinyin* here.)

One sees roughly this same outlook in Wang's *Xila xue'an*: a deep reverence for the Confucian tradition, but one that is not beholden to neo-Confucian orthodoxy, and one that displays an appreciation for certain ideas and approaches from outside the Confucian tradition as well.

WANG'S METHOD OF COMPOSITION AND HIS SOURCES

In his book, Wang never straightforwardly explains how he put together his study of Plato and the other thinkers he covers, but careful examination of the text allows us to reconstruct his methods and sources. At the time he was writing, other than the briefest snippets, none of Plato's texts had been translated into Chinese.⁸ Indeed, it was not until 1920 that the first complete Chinese translation of any Platonic text was published.⁹ Wang himself never went abroad, and in the report of his life in his autobiography, he gives no indication of having learned any foreign languages. So, he had no direct access to Plato's texts in the original or in any other language into which they had been translated. Instead, he relied wholly on accounts of Plato produced by other writers. The majority of these sources were from Japan, where scholars had taken an earlier lead in learning and writing about Western philosophy, and some of their publications were themselves translations from Western studies. Starting around 1900, Chinese scholars had begun translating these Japanese works into Chinese, and those Chinese versions provide the bulk of Wang's text.¹⁰ In addition to the Japanese sources, Wang also drew from some of the Chinese

8 For example, a few lines from the *Meno* were translated into Japanese by Nōse (1893: 227–28), and those lines were likely translated into Chinese in Ye (1901). Wang appears to draw from Ye's work in places—see note 97 below—so he probably had access to that bit of translation, though I have not found any place where he actually references it.

9 See Wu (1920), which is a translation of the *Republic*.

10 Among the Japanese authors from whom Wang copies, there are two for whom I have not been able to identify a published Chinese translation that Wang was following. One is Nakajima (1898). A few journals from right around 1900 announced that a translation was forthcoming, but I have been unable to locate the subsequent publication. On the other hand, two library catalogs from the 1930s (Shanxi gongli tushuguan 1933: 91, and Zhejiang shengli tushuguan 1935: 110) list a volume published in Japan with the title *Xiyang shanggu zhexueshi* 西洋上古哲學史, which appears to be a partial Chinese translation of Nakajima that likely included his section on Plato and that was published at the right time to have been used by Wang. Furthermore, at a couple of points in the *Xila xue'an* (e.g., *juan* 3: 2b), Wang references a text with the title *Shanggu zhexueshi* 上古哲學史, which seems most likely an abbreviated version of the title listed in those catalogs, so that book—Zhang (1903)—is probably Wang's source for the material from Nakajima. (The two catalogs list different publishers, with the Shanxi catalog listing it as 元真社, and the Zhejiang catalog listing it as 金任父. The latter appears to be an error—perhaps the name of a book donor?—as I can find no Japanese publisher with that name from that period, whereas Genshinsha 元真社 is a well-documented publisher of that time. Therefore, the listing given in the references here follows the Shanxi catalog.) So far, the only remaining copy of Zhang (1903) that I have been able to locate is held by

works produced by Protestant missionaries, and again some of that material was also a translation from other Western sources. Finally, it seems clear that Wang's text is also influenced by some of the Chinese writers who went abroad and then published Chinese treatises on what they had learned of Western thought. One of the most prominent examples at the time was Yan Fu 嚴復 (1854–1921), who in 1898 published the *Tianyan lun* 天演論, a Chinese translation-cum-paraphrase of some of the work of Thomas H. Huxley on evolution, which included references to Greek philosophy.¹¹ Yan's work became widely read in its day, and obviously made an impact on Wang's writing as well.

Wang's method of writing the work, then, consisted largely in collecting and copying other Chinese writings on Plato, to which he added further pieces that he marked as notes or comments. In copying from others, though, he almost never copied his sources verbatim. Comparison with those sources reveals that he frequently made minor modifications to their wording (sometimes for the worse), and he occasionally omitted some material, along with rearranging the presentation in certain cases. Whatever value the work's account of Plato lacks in originality due to being mostly copied from others, however, it makes up for in its broad coverage of sources. Although Wang did not copy every existing Chinese discussion of Plato, his work still gives one a fairly broad snapshot of the knowledge of Plato available to Chinese readers in the opening years of the twentieth century and right before the fall of the Qing dynasty.¹²

the Jilin University Library (but with the title erroneously typed as 西洋上西哲学史 and the publisher erroneously typed as 元员社). However, I have not been able to access that copy, and so I have not been able to verify that Wang used Zhang's translation in particular. The other Japanese work for which I cannot identify a published Chinese translation is Abe (1896). As highlighted in note 156 below, pieces of a Chinese translation of that work were inserted into Wang and Zhou (1903), but it is not clear who did them. The latter volume mostly reprints work from elsewhere, which suggests that someone else did that translation of Abe, but I have not been able to find any such publication.

¹¹ There is some debate about exactly what counts as the earliest publication of the *Tianyan lun*, as certain versions were printed before 1898. The 1898 edition, though, apparently had the greatest impact. It is unclear what edition Wang Shunan had read. For references, I have used the reprint of that 1898 edition in a collection of Yan's works from 1986.

¹² According to my research, Wang drew from at least nine different works by eight Japanese authors, three works by Western missionary authors, and one work by a Chinese author (Yan Fu) who was working directly from Western texts. So, Wang's range was quite broad. Four of Wang's sources are reprinted in Wang Lan and Zhou Liu (1903), and both in terms of the overall order of presentation and at more particular points, Wang Shunan appears to be following that compilation

As a vehicle for understanding Plato, Wang's method also brings with it certain problems. For example, sometimes the sources from which he draws diverge in how they render certain Platonic views into Chinese. Because Wang himself had no real way of seeing that these different formulations were all referring to one and the same thought in Plato, he merely copies the multiple different formulations into his text. As a result, his account is—from the perspective of a modern reader who knows Plato well—disjointed, confused, and repetitive at times. Furthermore, a certain amount of distortion clearly creeps in during the process. To borrow one of Plato's own descriptions, Wang's picture at points stands four times removed from Plato himself, e.g., when a summary of Plato that was originally in English, German, or French was rendered into Japanese, then translated into Chinese, and then copied (with modifications) by Wang. The Chinese translators were prone to misunderstand the Japanese texts occasionally, and those misunderstandings in turn are taken over (and sometimes exacerbated) by Wang. A particularly egregious set of errors due to this process occurs in §26–27 of the text, where material that was not originally about Plato at all gets presented as part of the summary of Plato's views. Also, Wang had no basis on which to adjudicate between different readings of Plato, so highly Christian-inflected accounts by Western missionaries are included alongside accounts deriving from Western scholars with a more standard, non-Christian interpretation of Plato.

Despite such problems, much of what Wang says about Plato will be readily recognizable and reasonably accurate in the eyes of modern scholars. Wang's treatment does, though, reflect a number of nineteenth-century preoccupations for both Western and Chinese thinkers (e.g., economics and evolution). In that regard, Wang's work also provides an interesting snapshot of how larger intellectual trends intersected with scholarship on Greek philosophy in that age.

This last point brings us to the topic of Wang's comments. At multiple points in the work, a paragraph is introduced with the words *Shunan an* 樹柎案 (“Shunan comments”). From the commentarial literature on the Chinese Classics, such phrasing would normally suggest that what follows is Wang's own opinion on what has preceded it. In a number of cases, though, comparison with various sources indicates that what follows this phrasing is also copied from some other source (these instances are noted in the translation). It is unclear why Wang presented the copied material this way,

over the original Chinese publication (see, e.g., note 146 below), so Wang may also have been building on some of the work of collecting disparate accounts of Plato done by others.

rather than, say, simply including it under the main exposition. Perhaps the most likely explanation is that he meant to signal his strong endorsement of the statements marked as *an* 案, but whatever the reason, readers should be aware that not everything presented as a comment is Wang's own original remark.

In many other cases, though, Wang's comment does appear to be wholly original, or at least contains original elements added on to material that is copied from elsewhere. In most such instances, Wang compares or contrasts Plato with elements of the Chinese tradition, most frequently Confucian texts. The comparisons typically cast Plato in a favorable light, whereas the contrasts portray him negatively. Overall, Wang's view seems to be that Plato is similar to the Confucians in many respects, though perhaps still inferior to them insofar as he deviates from them.

ON THE TEXT AND THE TRANSLATION

The *Xila xue'an* was published as part of a large collection of Wang's works titled the *Taolu congke* 陶廬叢刻. The translation here is based on a copy owned by the University of Michigan that was scanned and made available to researchers via HathiTrust.org (Permanent url: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015091728900>).¹³ Wang Shunan's son Wang Yongfu 王勇敷 wrote a preface to the work explaining that at one point when Wang Shunan was moving his household to a post where he had been assigned, the family was crossing the Yellow River and their boat hit some rocks. As a result, many of their belongings got wet, including the unpublished manuscript for the book, the last part of which was

¹³ Another copy of the text is also available to the public via Ctext.org (<https://ctext.org/library.pl?if=gb&file=83103>). However, that copy is missing at least two pages of Wang's text, for reasons that are unclear (perhaps they were missing from the book that was scanned, or the scanner skipped over those two pages). Due to that problem, and unless it were to be corrected, the Ctext copy is currently inferior to the HathiTrust version. Some readers may not have access to the HathiTrust copy, and to my knowledge no punctuated copy of the *Xila xue'an* has ever been published, so in order to make the text more accessible to interested readers, I have provided a punctuated version of Wang's section on Plato (based on the HathiTrust copy) as an appendix to this translation. In cases where I propose emendations to Wang's text, those are discussed only in the footnotes to the English text.

damaged beyond recovery. Wang Shunan then let the manuscript sit for over a decade, planning to try to redo the lost sections, but never got around to it, and his son—fearing that his father’s work might disappear completely unless preserved—had it printed to ensure that it would remain for posterity. The damaged sections, on Aristotle and Epicurus, came after the section on Plato, which seems relatively intact. (Given Wang Shunan’s methods, if the section on Aristotle had not been damaged in that way, it probably would have been the longest sustained Chinese treatment of Aristotle from the Qing dynasty!) Even so, the text shows signs of not having been fully prepared for publication before it was printed. Additionally, errors may have crept in during the printing process, as there are certain characters that appear to be wrong. In such cases, I have occasionally relied on the original Chinese and Japanese sources from which Wang Shunan was borrowing in order to correct or make sense of his text when it is problematic. All such cases are noted in the translation.

Wang’s Chinese text contains some interlinear notes, which mostly provide non-essential information. In order to facilitate a smoother reading experience, I have converted them to footnotes, rather than trying to reflect their placement in the main text. Since it seemed useful for the reader to have certain other information not provided by Wang on the page as footnotes as well, I have therefore adopted a practice of marking all footnotes as being either mine or Wang’s original note. (In a couple of instances, where Wang’s original note also merits comment, I have added my own notes into the same footnote as his, making clear where I elaborate upon his original note.)

Since one of the more interesting features of the work is the way it describes Plato using Chinese terminology, some of which is laden with either Confucian or Buddhist associations, I have marked a number of such cases in the text by providing the characters and their pronunciation in *pinyin*. In order to avoid making it too cumbersome to read, though, I have not done so for other cases of key terminology where, in my opinion, the terms would carry no special historical “baggage” for most Chinese readers.

The greatest challenge in translating Wang’s work has been to identify the sources from which he is copying, since he rarely names the authors he is following, and, even when he does, he does not list which of their works he is using. While I believe I have succeeded in identifying the vast majority of the places where he is copying others and his sources for those passages, I am not currently in a position to be certain that I have correctly differentiated *all* of the places where he is copying others from those

where he is providing his own original wording. Regardless of that problem, I hope that readers will still find this translation—and the ways in which Wang presents and comments on Plato—useful and stimulating for what it reveals about one of the earliest and longest accounts of Plato in Chinese.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Kim Borum, Joonho Lee, Michael Nylan, Peng Guoxiang, Yumi Suzuki, and John Wynne for help with various questions during the process of producing this work. I am especially grateful to He Jianye at the CV Starr East Asian Library at UC Berkeley for bibliographic research assistance that went way above and beyond the call of duty. I also thank PJ Ivanhoe and Bryan Van Norden for helpful comments on an earlier version. A substantial portion of the research and writing of this translation was done during a visiting semester at the University of Toronto in fall 2024, and I thank that institution for the use of its facilities and its hospitality.

TRANSLATION

§ 1

Plato (Bailaduo 百拉多)¹⁴ was a descendant of Solon of Athens. He was born in Aegina (Aijina 哀基那)¹⁵ in 427 BCE. His father was Ariston. His mother was Perictione.¹⁶ After being born, Plato grew up to be tall and stout, with the bodily strength of two men. In his youth he trained in military practices and was especially good at gymnastics. His skills in swordsmanship, running, and jumping were top among his peers.¹⁷ At first, he followed his grandfather's name and was called Aristocles. Later, his teacher nicknamed him Plato, which means "big shoulders." Plato was raised in a wealthy and noble family. However, he bent himself to learning, became capable in poetry, and studied the Milesian, Italian, and Eleatic schools of thought. He was fond of the doctrines of Pythagoras, Heraclitus, and Anaxagoras, and focused on following his natural talents. When he was twenty years old, he heard the way of Socrates, and subsequently followed him around in his wandering meetings.¹⁸ There was a military campaign,

14 {Original note.} One text writes the name as Pulaitou (浦賴透), another as Bailatu (百拉圖), another as Yalidaji (雅里大吉 [Aristocles]), another as [Pu/Bai]lade (拉的), and another as Fulade (弗拉的). {Translator's note.} The first transliteration, Pulaitou, is used by Richard (1898). The final transliteration, Fulade, is used by multiple texts, including Inoue (1886), Luo (1902), Nishimura (1890), and Guomin congshu she (1903). I have been unable to determine which are the other texts that use the other versions noted here, but I suspect that Yalidaji 雅里大吉 is an error for Yalidage 雅里大各, which is listed in Yan (1898: 1384, 1461). In further instances below where I have not been able to identify the source for some alternative transliteration(s) of a Greek name noted by Wang, I have not bothered to reiterate that point.

15 {Original note.} One text writes the name as Aiqina (愛奇納).

16 {Original note.} Some called her Pone (Pannai 潘耐). {Translator's note.} Here Wang seems to be following Nakajima (1898: 63), who gives the pronunciation as ポーネ, whereas Diogenes Laertius records the alternate name as "Potone."

17 {Translator's note.} Some of the wording of this sentence seems to be drawn from Yan (1898: 1384).

18 {Translator's note.} The Chinese phrase rendered as "wandering meetings" (*you hui* 游會) is strongly reminiscent of typical Chinese descriptions of Confucius and Mencius, who "wandered" (*you* 游/遊) among the various states of their age

and upon returning triumphantly after victory in the battle, he was given an official position.¹⁹ But after dwelling among those vulgar officers, he despised their conniving ways, and so he abandoned his official position and returned to serve Socrates for the next ten years.²⁰ When his teacher died, he protested the undeserved hatred of the citizens for him [i.e., Socrates], and upheld the doctrines of his teacher with even greater fidelity and resolve. He paid a call to Euclides in Megara, and visited Theodorus in Sicily.²¹ Having obtained these²² teachers' subtle words and secret instructions, he then traveled to Egyptian Cyrene, and on to Italy, becoming thoroughly acquainted with the worthy elders there. He returned to Athens and quietly gathered men with noble aspirations, and instructed them in philosophy and mathematics. In 388, he again traveled to Sicily, where his views on how to live offended Dionysius (Danying 但英) the First²³ of Syracuse, who out of anger at such insulting nonsense handed him over to Sparta. Their ambassador Pollis (Panlishi 潘利士)²⁴ in compliance with the king's command sold

and met with the rulers, seeking an opportunity to implement their ideals.

¹⁹ {Translator's note.} The wording of this and the next sentence seems to be based on Williamson (1877: 57a). Williamson's 1877 essay on Plato was reprinted (with slight modifications) together with a number of his other essays and some work by Joseph Edkins and Timothy Richard in a collection titled *Guijiao huican* 古教彙參 (with an English title given as “Ancient Religions”) in 1882, and subsequently reprinted twice by 1899. Wang Shunan apparently had consulted the *Guijiao huican*, as he mentions it a handful of times in the *Xila xue'an* (e.g., *juan* 3: 9a), but does not indicate which edition he had read. The only surviving copy of the first 1882 printing that I have been able to locate is at the East China Normal University Library 华东师范大学图书馆, but I have not been able to access that copy, and so for references I have instead used the initial publication of Williamson's essay in 1877.

²⁰ {Translator's note.} Again, the Chinese phrasing here is highly reminiscent of typical Chinese tales of Confucian scholars who joined the imperial bureaucracy but then became disenchanted with it.

²¹ {Translator's note.} Wang's account here derives largely from Diogenes Laertius, but Diogenes gives Theodorus' location as Cyrene instead of Sicily. Based on this sentence and the next one, it seems that either Wang was relying on some source that misrepresented the account by Diogenes Laertius, or Wang misunderstood what was said in his source.

²² {Translator's note.} The Chinese here is ambiguous. It could also mean that Plato obtained the subtle words and secret instructions of “his teacher” (i.e., Socrates) from Euclides and Theodorus.

²³ {Original note.} One text writes the name as Taiwengshushi (台翁叔士) the First.

²⁴ {Original note.} One text writes the name as Polishi (頗黎士). {Translator's note.} This transliteration appears in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 34) and was then reprinted in Wang and Zhou (1903: 6).

him in Aegina as a slave, but his master Anniceris belonged to the Cynic school²⁵ and knew that he [Plato] was a great scholar (*ru* 儒)²⁶ of Athens, and so released him to return to his state.²⁷

In 368, Dionysius the Second became the successor king of Syracuse, and sent an emissary laden with cash to summon him. But because he did not get along with his brother-in-law, and the things that he said [were to be done] were not in fact carried out,²⁸ a member of the Pythagorean school named Archytas (Ya'erkedashi 亞爾可達士) helped him [Plato] with money, and he then returned to Athens. In 361 he again went to Syracuse, but his policies still were not granted implementation, and so he then gave up this aspiration and did not go abroad again. He dwelled in the Academy (Yaketemei 亞克特美)

25 {Translator's note.} In his recounting of the story, Diogenes Laertius writes that Anniceris was from Cyrene. Wang seems to be following Nakajima (1898: 64), who apparently confuses “Cyrene” for “Cynic.”

26 {Translator's note.} The Chinese word *ru* 儒 often meant “Confucian” in earlier times, but in Wang's time was also frequently used to mean “a learned person,” which is how he appears to use it. As his essay continues, though, he does point out several places of overlap between Plato and specifically Confucian views. The labeling of Plato as a *ru* is not original with Wang; at least one earlier precedent is found in the account of this same story in Yan (1898: 1384), though Wang's wording here suggests that he is not copying Yan directly.

27 {Translator's note.} This last part of the sentence is somewhat reminiscent of the retelling in the *Qincao* 琴操 of a famous story about Confucius, where Confucius was surrounded by soldiers from Kuang 匡 and his life was in danger. According to that version, Confucius started singing, and a huge wind blew up and knocked the soldiers over. The text continues, “At that point, the men of Kuang then understood Confucius to be a sage,” and so they let him go (see, e.g., Sun [1832] 1909: *juan* 2, 12a–b). The paragraph break at the end of the sentence here is inserted for the benefit of English readers and is not a feature of the original.

28 {Translator's note.} The Chinese here is ambiguous, because the grammatical subject of the sentence is not made explicit. From the account in Diogenes Laertius and Plato's letters, it is the king (Dionysius II) who had a falling out with his brother-in-law (Dion), and who made promises to Plato that he did not keep. However, the sentence could also be read as saying that Plato did not get along with Dion and was unable to put his doctrines into practice. Nakajima (1898: 64) apparently says the latter, but given other discrepancies between Wang's version and Nakajima's, I have chosen to leave the ambiguity in the original.

garden,²⁹ and set up a lecture hall there.³⁰ He did not accept tuition from people. [Would-be] students shouldered lamps and carried rations on their backs and walked thousands of *li* to follow him.³¹ In teaching people, he emphasized [proper] method.³² Once one had grasped the [proper] method, then naturally one would be able to know what one had not known previously. When among the people at his door there were those who were not willing to put forth intense effort, then he would turn them away and not accept them. He put a sign by the door to his classroom that said, “Only those who understand the study of forms (*xing* 形)³³ are allowed to enter my chambers.” Later people regarded

29 {Original note.} One text writes the name as Ajiadamiye (阿加達米耶). Another writes it as Agedimei (阿蛤地美).

{Translator’s note.} The former of these transliterations appears in Wang and Zhou (1903: 107) and is probably copied from Ye (1901)—see note 97 below. The latter of these transliterations appears to derive from Williamson (1877: 57a).

30 {Original note.} The garden was a distance of three *li* from the city. {Translator’s note.} A distance of one *li* was about one third of a mile.

31 {Translator’s note.} This sentence is borrowed, with modifications, from Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 19b). In general, Zhou seems to be following other sources, but I am not able to identify the source in this particular case.

32 {Translator’s note.} The word *fa* 法 is rendered here as “method,” but it could also mean “model.” On the latter construal, this could include reference to the theory of Forms. It is unclear exactly what sense Wang intends.

33 {Translator’s note.} I have translated this phrase literally, in order to reflect the confusing nature of the original Chinese text, which can make it sound as if students would already need to know the Forms before studying the Forms with Plato. Part of the confusion can be resolved by noting that the term *xing* 形 here is *not* the same term that is used for the Ideas/Forms elsewhere in the essay. More importantly, in this instance Wang is following Richard (1898), which is in turn a Chinese translation of Wood (1885). The original English reads, “Let no one enter who is not a geometrician” (Wood 1885: 210). Richard renders “geometry” as *xingxue* 形學, which is far different from the more standard Chinese rendering of it as *jihexue* 幾何學. Wang himself uses the latter term elsewhere in the essay, so perhaps he did not realize that Richard’s term meant the same thing, and so just copied Richard’s sentence. [Richard does not specify which edition of Wood he is translating, so for references I have listed the earliest edition, but he might have been working from one of the later editions (e.g., an 1879 edition produced in England). Likewise, Wang does not indicate which edition of Richard he was using. According to Zhao (2014: 48–49), the first printing of Richard’s translation was in 1898, with a second printing in 1901, and Wang could have been using either, so again I have simply listed the earliest edition in the reference list. Based on the information available to me, it appears that no copy of the 1898 edition survives, and I am aware of only one remaining copy of the 1901 edition, which is held by the Shanghai Library 上海图书馆, but which I have not been able to access. The next earliest copy that remains is a 1923 edition held by the National Library of China. For those interested in consulting

him highly, and treated [the name of] his garden as the name of his school of thought. His writings are prolific and profound. They mostly convey³⁴ the doctrines of his teacher, with some of his own views mixed in.³⁵ His essays take the form of question-and-response between host and guest,³⁶ with Socrates as the respondent. Even today when people in Europe speak about the learning of ancient times, they are sure to mention Socrates and Plato. In 348, he died at the age of 80.³⁷ The world acclaims him one

that edition, a copy is available online at: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:地球一百名人傳>. However, it should be noted that the 1923 edition is not a mere reprint of the earlier work. After its initial publication in 1898, a few pieces of the work—not including the section on Plato—were also published in the serial *Wanguo Gongbao* 萬國公報. When one compares those pieces (e.g., Richard 1899) with the corresponding portions of the 1923 edition, it becomes clear that Richard's original versions were written in a style meant to closely imitate classical or literary Chinese, while in the 1923 edition his style has been converted by someone to be closer to colloquial Chinese. Given Wang Shunan's procedure of copying, Wang's text most likely preserves the original styling of Richard's section on Plato, but without access to the 1901 edition, I have not been able to verify that fact.]

34 {Translator's note.} The word *cheng* 稱 can also mean “praise,” but its sense as simply “convey” or “report” seems the more likely intended meaning here.

35 {Translator's note.} The wording of this and the next two sentences seems to be borrowed from Yan (1898: 1384).

36 {Translator's note.} The wording “host and guest” (or “ruler and retainer”) is a typical Chinese description of the dialogic settings for much of the material in the *Analectis* and the *Mencius*, since when Confucius and Mencius traveled to various states, they were the “guests” (or would-be “retainers”) of the lords, who thus played the role of “hosts,” and many passages in those texts begin with the ruler asking some question of Confucius and Mencius.

37 {Original note.} In [my other book] *The Spring and Autumn Annals of Ancient Greece* (*Xila chungqiu* 希臘春秋), his age at death is given as 83. This is an error. {Translator's note.} Here and in a handful of other notes in the *Xila xue'an*, Wang mentions that other book of his. According to Wang's biography, he completed the *Xila chungqiu* three years after the *Xila xue'an*, which would put it around 1905/1906, and Wang's own preface to the *Xila chungqiu* is dated to 1906. However, it is not clear when this and the other such notes referring to the *Xila chungqiu* were added here. They could have been added right when the *Xila xue'an* was printed in 1919, but since none of the other notes show any hints of being such a late addition, it seems more likely that they were added right around the time that Wang considered this manuscript complete and stopped adding to it. If we assume that Wang's memory about the order in which the two works were finished is correct and that he is referring back to a *completed* version of the *Xila chungqiu*, then that would suggest that Wang at least revisited the manuscript for the *Xila xue'an* around 1906. On the other hand, as noted earlier (note 4 above), the published sources on which Wang draws for this Plato section do not seem to go beyond 1903.

of the Seven Worthies (*xian* 賢) of ancient Greece.³⁸ In the course of his life, Plato never married and had no offspring. He did not enter the city nor set foot in the theater, and took propounding his studies as his sole task. There is a later Western saying: "To be as dour as Plato." When Plato took up his scales and made appraisals of others, his evaluations were incisive and apt. Subsequent people who practice critique prize his books like a goldmine. Initially, Greece followed the Babylonian method of dividing each day into twelve periods. Plato first invented the dripping-water [i.e., water-clock] method, and this became the beginning of the use of dripping water to mark time in the West.³⁹

Shunan comments:⁴⁰ Plato's philosophy for the most part arose from the cities of Egypt, and it endured for a thousand years. After another thousand years, the people of Europe followed Catholicism only, and there were none who propounded philosophy. During the Ming dynasty, Turkey occupied the Roman cities, and the famous scholars of Greece moved to the various states of western Europe. Thereupon, philosophy again flourished and they all took the doctrines of Plato as their basis. When Europeans speak of the top ten most famous writers in the world from ancient times to the present, Plato is sure to be among their ranks. His teaching can be likened to how Venus [*jin xing* 金星, lit. "the golden star"] occupies the center of the heavens,⁴¹ illuminating the whole cosmos. For

38 {Translator's note.} This wording follows Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 20a). It is a little unclear whether this is supposed to refer to the so-called "Seven Sages" of ancient Greece. If so, it is mistaken, as Plato was not listed among the seven. If not, then it is not clear what other list of "Seven Worthies" this might be referencing. In addition, Zhou and Wang's wording here suggests that they are thinking in terms of a parallel with the so-called "Seven Worthies of the Bamboo Grove" (*zhulin qixian* 竹林七賢), a famous group of scholars from the Wei-Jin period of Chinese history.

39 {Original note.} Even though Plato invented the dripping-water method [for keeping time], ordinary Greeks still divided the day into seven parts, with four for daytime and three for nighttime. The four periods of the day were: dawn, morning, midday, dusk. The three periods of the night were: lamp-lighting time, midnight, predawn. {Translator's note.} This last sentence in the main text seems to be taken from Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 20a).

40 {Translator's note.} Although this section is marked as Wang's comment, most of the content is drawn from the section on Plato in Richard (1898).

41 {Translator's note.} Over the course of this essay, Wang uses the potent Chinese word *tian* 天 in such a wide variety of

over two thousand years without interruption, there have been those among the various states who have taken him as their teacher. The great American scholar (*ru* 儒) Emerson (Aimoshen 艾默深)⁴² said, “Plato is the study of principle (*lixue* 理學), and the study of principle is Plato.”⁴³ He likely means that among all those throughout the ages who have discussed the study of principle, none have been able to go beyond his [i.e., Plato’s] boundaries. Now a further comment:⁴⁴ Although Plato faithfully believed in the

senses that it is simply impossible to translate it consistently. Depending on the context in which it appears, I have rendered it as “heavens,” “Heaven,” or “natural.” For certain compounds with established English translations (e.g., *tianwen* 天文 as “astronomy”), its presence is not reflected in the English wording at all.

42 {Translator’s note.} There is a typo in Wang’s text here, which gives the transliteration of Emerson’s name as Aishenmo (艾深默) instead of Aimoshen (艾默深) as it appears in Richard (1898). I have emended Wang’s text in accordance with Richard’s original.

43 {Translator’s note.} Emerson’s original is “Plato is philosophy, and philosophy Plato” (Emerson 1850: 28). Wang’s word choice here is taken directly from Richard (1898), but it still presents a challenge. Prior to this point, he used *zhexue* 哲學 to render “philosophy,” but here he switches to *lixue* 理學, which is a much more loaded term in the Chinese context, as it was typically used to refer to the Cheng-Zhu version of Confucianism that originated in the Song dynasty. I have rendered it as “the study of principle” both in order to mark the switch in phrasing and to highlight the connotations of the term. Perhaps Wang himself (as with Richard) just intended it to mean the same thing as “philosophy,” but his Chinese readers, who would not have read Emerson, would not have known that Emerson was originally using the term that Wang previously renders as *zhexue* 哲學.

44 {Translator’s note.} The first six sentences here derive from Kanie (1899: 50–51), which was translated into Chinese in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 34) and then reprinted in Wang and Zhou (1903: 6). It is unclear whether Wang Shunan was working from the original publication or the reprint. At least in one later case (see notes 138 and 156 below), Wang seems to have been drawing from a version in Wang and Zhou (1903) over the original publication. The Chinese translator is not named anywhere in either publication, but comparison with Kanie’s original shows that the translation does not always capture all portions of Kanie’s sentences. In the foreword to his book, Kanie says that he consulted works on the history of philosophy by “[Eduard] Zeller, [Kuno] Fischer, [Johann Eduard] Erdmann, [Friedrich] Ueberweg, [Wilhelm] Windelband, [Richard] Falkenberg, [(Emile-)Alfred or Theodor?] Weber, [Albert] Schweigler, etc.” Kanie also indicates that he has read (at least some of) Plato’s works, likely in some German translation. Given this wide range of possible sources for his account of Plato, it is probably hopeless to try to identify any specific Western author from whom he has taken his wording in this and other passages, and his descriptions may well be simply his own summary of what he has learned from his reading.

doctrines of his teacher Socrates, nevertheless in what he added to, subtracted from, and corrected in them, his views were more complete when compared to his teacher’s doctrines. Socrates had a theory of concepts. Based on this, Plato created the theory of Ideas. Socrates had a theory of the unity of knowledge and virtue.⁴⁵ Based on this, Plato created theories of ethics and politics. As for what he discussed about anthropology and physics, these are subjects on which Socrates had never spoken. His [Plato’s] philosophical thought is deep and great. It is a case of what Xunzi refers to when saying that “Blue dye surpasses the indigo plant [in blueness, even though it comes from that plant], and ice is colder than water [even though it comes from water].”⁴⁶

§ 2

Plato’s works are copious. Those that have been passed down to today are:⁴⁷

- *Alcibiades I* (Ya’erxuebotai di-yi 亞爾雪伯台第一)
- *Alcibiades II* (Ya’erxuebotai di-er 亞爾雪伯台第二)
- *Rival Lovers* (Enduanlashitui 恩端拉士推)⁴⁸

45 {Translator’s note.} Wang’s phrasing here is very close to the famous slogan of Wang Yangming, *zhixing heyi* 知行合一 “the unity of knowledge and action.”

46 {Translator’s note.} Wang is not quite quoting the *Xunzi* verbatim here. Compare Hutton (2014: 1) for the original. Also, Wang is not the first to compare Plato and Socrates using these lines from the *Xunzi*. Nishimura (1890: 231) makes this comparison, which was then partly translated into Chinese by the Guomin congshu she (1903: 13–14), and Wang borrows extensively from that translation later on here, so it may have inspired this comment, though Wang’s wording here does not closely resemble any of those precedents. Interestingly, this comparison is an original observation in Nishimura, whose account of Western philosophers is otherwise drawn from the translation of Fouillée (1879) in Nakae (1885).

47 {Translator’s note.} In the list that follows, I have given the romanizations of the Chinese titles in modern Mandarin pronunciations for the sake of consistency with other romanizations in this translation, but readers should be aware some of them are probably closer to the Greek original if read with a pronunciation like that of Cantonese (or other dialects closer to middle Chinese) instead. It should also be noted that Wang’s transliterations are not the standard transliterations that are used nowadays.

48 {Translator’s note.} Wang is following Nakajima (1898: 67), who gives a transliteration of the Greek title (Ἀντερασται),

- *Apology* (Aipuluoqie 哀浦羅茄)
- *Charmides* (Quemitai 雀密台)
- *Clitophon* (Geliduofeng 葛力多封)
- *Symposium* (Kangweifeng 康維奉)⁴⁹
- *Cratylus* (Keletuila 柯勒推拉)
- *Critias* (Kelidai 柯力戴)
- *Crito* (Kelitu 柯力圖)
- *Epinomis* (Aipinaomi 愛畢腦密)
- *Euthydemus* (Ousaitaimai 歐塞台麥)
- *Euthyphro* (Ousaifulong 歐塞弗龍)
- *Gorgias* (Gaoqie 高茄)
- *Hipparchus* (Kasejiu 喀色鳩)
- *Hippias Major* (Kaba da 喀霸大)
- *Hippias Minor* (Kaba xiao 喀霸小)
- *Ion* (Youhe 宥何)
- *Laches* (Laike 賴克)
- *Laws* (Lage 拉葛)⁵⁰
- *Lysis* (Laixue 來雪)
- *Menexenus* (Mannaizhina 曼耐芝納)
- *Meno* (Manna 曼那)
- *Minos* (Minao 密腦)
- *Parmenides* (Bamainitai 巴麥尼台)
- *Phaedo* (Bituo 彼沱)

rather than a translation of it. Nakajima lists the titles in alphabetical order according to whichever title he is using, but in order to conform to the titles with which English readers are more likely to be familiar, I have given the most typical English title, which in cases like the current one—and some others below—obscures the alphabetical order that Nakajima had originally used.

49 {Translator's note.} Wang is following Nakajima (1898: 67), who gives the Latin version of the title (*Convivium*).

50 {Translator's note.} Wang is again following Nakajima (1898: 68), who gives the Latin version of the title (*Leges*).

- *Phaedrus* (Bitele 彼特勒)
- *Philebus* (Feilabo 非拉伯)
- *Statesman* (Panlidike 潘力的克)⁵¹
- *Protagoras* (Boluotuigela 柏羅推哥拉)
- *Republic* (Laibolelijia 來伯勃力駕)⁵²
- *Sophist* (Suofeishitai 梭非士太)
- *Theages* (Saiqi 塞奇)
- *Theaetetus* (Caituode 才脫德)
- *Timaeus* (Timahe 鐵馬何)

In addition to these texts, there are thirteen letters⁵³ and seven dialogues that are suspected of not being genuine works [of Plato].

Shunan comments: From ancient times to the present, there have been many who argued about the authenticity and inauthenticity and similarities and differences of the above-mentioned texts by Plato that have been transmitted. Nakajima Rikizō's *History of Philosophy* reports that the Englishman Grote (Guoluode 郭羅德) claims that all the works transmitted to today are authentic, and there are no spurious works [among them]. The German researcher Schaarschmidt (Xiaosimide 蕭杞密德) claims that the authentically Platonic texts are only these nine: *Phaedrus*, *Protagoras*, *Symposium*, *Gorgias*, *Republic*, *Timaeus*, *Theaetetus*, *Phaedo*, *Laws*. Windelband (Wende'erpentuo 溫德耳盆沱) takes the authentic works to be: *Apology*, *Phaedo*, *Euthyphro*, *Lysis*, *Laches*,

⁵¹ {Translator's note.} Wang is again following Nakajima (1898: 69), who gives the Latin version of the title (*Politicus*).

⁵² {Original note.} In one text the name is written as Laibaolike (賴保利克). It means a republic. {Translator's note.} Wang is following Nakajima (1898: 69), who gives the Latin version of the title (*Republica*). Since the common English title is also based on the Latin title, Wang's explanation at the end looks unnecessary, but to Chinese readers, the transliteration of the title is meaningless.

⁵³ {Original note.} Some say there are eighteen letters.

Charmides, Hippias Minor, Alcibiades I, Protagoras, Gorgias, Euthydemus, Cratylus, Meno, Theaetetus, Phaedrus, Symposium, Philebus, Republic, Timaeus, Laws, Critias. Zeller (Chaila 柴拉) takes the authentic works to be: *Republic, Timaeus, Laws, Phaedo, Gorgias, Hippias,*⁵⁴ *Theaetetus, Protagoras.* The preceding determinations are based on examining their theses and style. Furthermore the texts of Aristotle (Yalaside 亞拉斯德) cite these as evidence on multiple occasions, and thus they can be trusted. Also, [Zeller says that] it is close to correct if one regards as authentic the *Sophist, Statesman, Philebus, Meno, Lysis, Charmides, Laches, Cratylus, Euthydemus, Parmenides, Euthyphro, Hippias Minor, Critias, Apology,* and *Crito.* Ueberweg (Youbowei 宥伯偉) says that when it comes to the authenticity or inauthenticity of the texts [said to come] from Plato, one ought to decide on the basis of Aristotle's citations. The most certain ones are these three texts: *Republic, Timaeus, Laws.* Aristotle clearly says that these are works of Plato and quotes them. Next are these four texts: *Phaedo, Symposium, Phaedrus, Gorgias.* Their titles appear in Aristotle's texts, and even though he does not explicitly say that they are works by Plato, he implies that they are. Next after that, the three texts *Meno, Hippias Minor,* and *Menexenus* also appear in Aristotle's texts, but he does not say whose works they are. Next, he also quotes lines from the *Theaetetus* and *Philebus,* but does not mention the titles. Next, there is material resembling the theses of the *Sophist* that he quotes, and which he implies are the oral instructions of Plato, perhaps for teaching

⁵⁴ {Translator's note.} Wang's Chinese text here does not specify whether this refers to the *Hippias Major* or *Hippias Minor*. The error can be traced back to Nakajima (1898: 71), which also does not specify which *Hippias* is being referenced here. That omission looks to me like the result of a typesetting error, since there is also a listing comma that is clearly missing from the sentence right after this point as well. Since the text of Nakajima (and Wang) then goes on to list the *Hippias Minor* as probably authentic in Zeller's view, that may suggest by contrast that this instance should be the *Hippias Major*. If so, however, that would seem to be a mistake, because Zeller did not accept the *Hippias Major* as authentic—see, e.g., the English translation of Zeller by Alleyne and Goodwin (1888: 86 and 505n49). Since Nakajima does not provide any precise references for where he finds this claim in Zeller, it is hard to know what Nakajima intended and whether he may have misread Zeller on this point.

his disciples. Next, in the case of the *Statesman*,⁵⁵ *Apology*, *Lysis*, *Laches*, and (maybe) *Protagoras*,⁵⁶ Aristotle talks about them together with Plato in such a way as to imply [that Plato wrote them]. For the *Euthydemus* and *Cratylus*, the evidence is the same. With regard to the preceding matters, everyone has different opinions, and it is very difficult to decide [who is right]. However, among the specialists in this area, again and again those who examine Plato's teachings determine the authentic books as: *Gorgias*, *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, *Theaetetus*, *Republic*, *Timaeus*. They also consider that those works of Plato that have been transmitted to the present were all composed within a span of fifty years. However, the views in these books differ from each other, their chronology differs,⁵⁷ and there is no definitive evidence for which are the authentic works of Plato, and which books were written when. As a result, it is also not possible to determine his definitive philosophical doctrines.

§ 3

Plato's philosophy is divided into three parts: (1) theoretical philosophy, namely the theory of Ideas, (2) physics, and (3) ethics.⁵⁸ Socrates' theory of concepts took concepts to be true knowledge. Plato, on the other hand, said that concepts are formed on the basis of things. As for the fundamental realities, these are called Ideas. In general, Plato frequently paid careful attention to the teachings of Parmenides, and deeply understood the principles of perception and its corresponding objects. Therefore, he took the

55 {Translator's note.} There appears to be a typo in the text at this point, where the final character in the title appears as 兒 rather than 克.

56 {Translator's note.} There appears to be another typo here, because the character 推 is missing from the middle of the title.

57 {Translator's note.} Wang's wording here is ambiguous. At this juncture, he is not completely following Nakajima, which also makes it harder to determine his meaning, and so this translation is tentative.

58 {Translator's note.} This division seems to be based on Inoue (1886: 55) via Luo (1902: 19b), but the rest of the paragraph that follows here comes from Kanie (1899: 53–55) via the Chinese rendering in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 36) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 7–8).

reality of Ideas as [grounding] the possibility of epistemological rationality. People's perceptions are changing and impermanent, and so what is called the pure, eternal, and unchanging reality is not something that the senses can grasp. One should rely on rationality to recognize things one by one, accumulating [understanding of] all individual things to gradually reach the goal that consists in a limitless phenomenon. Thus, individual things definitely cannot be Ideas. What are called the Ideas should be permanently present and unchanging—call them eternal models and true realities. Their numbers are infinite. In this manner, the Ideas use ordinary concepts in the metaphysical study (*xing er shang xue* 形而上學) of reality. For each case constituting an ordinary concept there is [also] a corresponding Idea. It is not merely physical bodies that have these [corresponding] Ideas; [their] qualities and powers are also like this. It is not merely natural things that have these [corresponding] Ideas; manufactured things are also like this. It is not merely noble and valuable things that have these [corresponding] Ideas; foul and lowly things are also like this. In his later years, Plato said that the highest among the Ideas is called the Good, and every reality and every thought has the Idea of the Good as its goal.

Shunan comments: Inoue Enryō⁵⁹ says that Plato is someone who establishes a new view by following Socrates' [views of the] source of the virtue of wisdom to establish

59 {Translator's note.} In what follows here, Wang's wording is drawn mostly from the Chinese translation of Inoue's *Tetsugaku yōryō* 哲學要領 by Luo (1902: 19b–20a). Multiple editions of Inoue's *Tetsugaku yōryō* 哲學要領 existed when Luo was writing, and since Luo does not provide any definite reference, it is not immediately clear which edition he is following. Based on comparison between Inoue's original version in 1886 and his revised edition of 1891, it appears that Wang and Luo are following some pre-1891 edition. For convenience, in the reference list I have listed the edition here as the original 1886 version, but readers should be aware that this listing may not be perfectly accurate.

the ideas⁶⁰ in the realm of the mind.⁶¹ Plato divides the sources of human knowledge into three: perceptions, conceptions, and ideas. Perceptions come from experience of external things. Conceptions arise from the multitude of perceptions. It is only the substance of the ideas that is originally ungenerated and imperishable, and does not come from the experience of perception. As for perceptions, each person differs [in what perceptions they have], but in the case of ideas, they are entirely uniform (*yili pingdeng* 一理平等), everyone has them, and there are no differences among them. Furthermore, thoughts that arise from perception can be expunged from within the mind, but the ideas that are originally possessed within [the mind] cannot be eliminated—thus they are called permanently present and unchanging [items]. And so, the ideas are the foundation for all learning and all thinking, while perceptions and conceptions are merely one part of their⁶² surface-level expression. In sum, Plato says that the source of human knowledge depends entirely on the ideas, and the substance of the ideas is called “divine” (*shen* 神). According to these principles, he explains the three areas of learning: theoretical philosophy, physics, and ethics. Theoretical philosophy discusses the substance of the ideas. Physics discusses the effects they exert

60 {Translator’s note.} Wang’s wording here creates a challenge for the translation, because he switches from following Nakajima to following Inoue, and their vocabularies differ. In particular, Inoue uses *lixiang* 理想 to refer to the Forms, which in Chinese is a different word from the word *guannian* 觀念 that Wang had been using up to this point in drawing from Nakajima. At the end of this paragraph, Wang clarifies that the two have the same referent. In English, though, there are only so many different words one can use to render and keep distinct the different terms at play in the Chinese text. To try to deal with the problem, I have chosen to render *lixiang* as “ideas” (lower case) and *guannian* as “Ideas” (upper case) to try to reflect that these are different words, but are ultimately supposed to mean the same thing.

61 {Translator’s note.} When the Chinese term *xin* 心 appears here outside of certain idiomatic compounds, I have mostly rendered it as “mind,” since in this context it is being used to discuss Platonic views that would most naturally be described in English using “mind” or “mental.” However, in a few places where the traditional sense of *xin* as “heart” is more apt, I have rendered it that way. Readers should be aware that the same Chinese term is being used for both cases.

62 {Translator’s note.} There seems to be a typo in the Chinese text at this point, as it contains the character 基, which makes no sense in the syntactical context. I take it to be an error for 其, and that seems to be confirmed by both Inoue’s and Luo’s texts, which also have 其 in the sentence that Wang is following here. I have translated accordingly.

on the myriad things. Ethics discusses their relation to the human mind.⁶³ Further comment: the ideas are [the same as] the Ideas. Overall, this view opened the way for the Idealist school of later times, and is lacking in objective evidence.

§ 4

Further, Plato says that the perceptual contacts of one's five senses know merely the crude traces of things.⁶⁴ As for the original constitution of things, if one does not exhaustively investigate, then one will have no way to know it. Why is this? [It is because] everything with which one has perceptual contact through the five senses is ultimately no more than a misleading appearance (*xiang* 相)⁶⁵ of the world. Now suppose there were a prison underground, and collected there were several prisoners, who had been tied up in it and were sitting in a group facing each other, and sunlight from the outside was not able to enter. After a while, light enters through a crack, and thereupon in the darkness are barely revealed misleading shadows. When the prisoners see them, then drowsily, groggily, they are only slightly able to make out the largeness, smallness, differences, and similarities of things. But then one tries asking them, "What is this thing made of? What can that thing be used as material for?" The prisoners would not know. This is the condition one occupies in this world when observing things. What

63 {Translator's note.} Based on comparison with Inoue's text, there seems to be another typo here, where Wang seems to be missing a character 上 that appears in Inoue's and Luo's texts just as it does in the sentence prior to this one. My translation is based on presuming that the sentence was supposed to contain 上 at the corresponding position here.

64 {Translator's note.} This section seems to derive ultimately from Fouillée (1879: 87–88), which was initially translated into Japanese by Nakae (1885: 283–84), but was also copied with modifications in Nishimura (1890: 230). A digested Chinese translation by the Guomin congshu she that mostly follows Nakae but also shows traces of influence from Nishimura was published in 1903, and Wang's text here is nearly identical to that one (see Guomin congshu she 1903: 10). Another, more complete translation of Nakae's sections on Socrates, Plato, Aristotle into Chinese was also done in 1903 (see Chen 1903), but comparison indicates that Wang was not using this latter text. Nakae's translation misunderstands some of the details in Fouillée's original description of the Story of the Cave, which explains some of the inaccuracies in Wang's account.

65 {Translator's note.} The term *xiang* 相 was often used in Chinese texts to translate the Buddhist notion of *rūpa*, so Wang's explanation of Plato's views casts them in a light similar to Buddhism, a comparison that he makes explicit later.

is referred to as "the underground prison" is the world. The "misleading shadows" are the various things. The "fire" is the sun.⁶⁶ Ordinary people's mistaking the misleading shadows for the real phenomena is just like this. Such is the [only] understanding that can be obtained by one's six root-faculties (*liu gen* 六根).⁶⁷

Shunan comments: As for what is key in Plato's teachings, its emphasis is on thought.⁶⁸

It says that thought is not something contingent, but is rather a pattern shown to humans by God. First there is the pattern, and then there is the thought. The thought is [of?] the real principle (*shi li* 實理), and the rest are empty things. Even if they were not empty, they would be merely the framework for thought. His doctrines have substantial overlap with Buddhism. Confucius said, "Learning that is without thought will leave you

66 {Translator's note.} In the Chinese original from which Wang is copying, there is a mention of the fire inside the cave earlier in the passage, but Wang has omitted it, which then makes its introduction here abrupt and puzzling. It is not entirely clear why Wang did not copy the missing sentences, and whether that is just a mistake or intentional. The story as it appears in the version from which Wang is copying does not make much sense, so it would not be surprising if he omitted it intentionally to make better sense of the story. On the other hand, if he did, then it seems like the retention of this sentence was a mistake. Either way, this portion of the text is one place showing how Wang's manuscript was not fully polished before being published.

67 {Translator's note.} Here Wang uses another Buddhist term in explaining Plato's views. The six root-faculties are: eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and mind.

68 {Translator's note.} The first six sentences of this comment most likely derive from Richard (1898), but I am not able to verify this origin, because as noted earlier (note 33 above), I have not been able to see either the 1898 or 1901 editions that presented his original translation into classical Chinese. The 1923 edition of Richard (vol. 3, p. 13) contains the following sentences: "第一名理，是在講思索。說思索不是偶然的，是從古上天指示人的樣式。現有樣式，後有思索……又創講以思為實。與佛教所論的真如似近，思外皆虛。就是不虛，亦不過是思的現形呢。" For readers who know literary Chinese, it is not hard to see how Wang's text might reflect an earlier version of these sentences that was written in a more classical style. In addition, it is worth noting that although Richard's work is primarily a translation of Wood (1885), comparison between Richard's text and Wood's original shows that Richard is taking some significant license at this juncture, as the corresponding paragraph in Wood (1885: 210) talks only about Realism and makes no mention of God or Buddhism.

lost. Thought that is without learning will put you in danger.”⁶⁹ Would [Plato] thus count as one who holds to the middle without bias?

§ 5

Plato adopted Socrates’ methods of inductive reasoning, and moreover invented the methods of analysis, synthesis, generalization, and classification.⁷⁰ When used for philosophical research, the method of analysis divides wholes into smaller parts, which one enumerates and examines one by one in order to determine [the content of] a whole Idea. The method of synthesis extends investigation to the various smaller parts and unites them, and is a method for obtaining the whole substance of an Idea. The method of generalization recognizes sameness amidst difference, and the method of classification seeks differences amidst sameness. If one employs these [methods] to research [what are] the true principles (*zhen li* 真理), one can in the end complete the whole system of philosophy. And so, in recognizing these various methods of [grasping] Ideas, Plato names them as dialectic, and this is how he speaks of their sequence.

Shunan comments: Plato’s theoretical philosophy uses the method of synthesis, whereas Aristotle uses the method of analysis. Plato, by means of the Ideas, illuminates and unites fundamental principles (*yuanli* 原理) to judge of the truth and falsity of things and affairs. Aristotle, on the other hand, approaches each affair and each thing

69 {Translator’s note.} *Analects* 2.15.

70 {Translator’s note.} This whole section, including Wang’s comment, is drawn from the Chinese translation by Luo (1903: 269–70) of Uchiyama (1891: 344–45). Uchiyama himself seems to be giving a digested account drawn from Inoue Tetsujirō (1883). The wording of the first sentence here can be traced back in particular to Inoue (1883: 24a–b), and at that juncture Inoue is translating Lewes (1867: 232). I have therefore used the original English terminology from Lewes in translating the Chinese text here. (Inoue does not indicate which edition of Lewes he was consulting. Comparison with various editions suggests that his edition did not predate the 1867 one, and therefore I have listed that for reference.) Lewes *ad. loc.* points back to Van Heusde (1827: 97–98) for his account (again, I give the earliest edition for reference, since Lewes does not specify the edition).

individually, enumerating and examining them, in order to discover their fundamental principles. Plato descends from the abstract to arrive at concrete things and affairs, whereas Aristotle ascends from concrete things and affairs to arrive at the abstract. In sum, Plato uses a subjective method, while Aristotle uses an objective method. Ancient [Greek] philosophy was mostly biased in favor of the subjective sort of method, until Aristotle first came on the scene and remedied that.

§ 6

Among the people of that time were some who debated with each other over whether the myriad things had any fixity, but without any resolution.⁷¹ Plato said: “Try placing a thing here. Some will be round, and some will be square—there is no fixity to physical form. Some will be black, and some will be white—there is no fixity to color. Even though there is no fixity to physical form and color, there is fixity to how the various physical forms and colors are manifested in appearances that are reflected in the mind.” He simply feared that if the intelligence had no fixity, then one could not ensure any fixity to all things.

Shunan comments: Plato claimed that the myriad things all have an element of the true to them, but everything that people’s eyes can see is all illusory.⁷² People must do their

⁷¹ {Translator’s note.} This whole paragraph is largely taken from Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 19b), and in turn derives ultimately from Williamson (1877: 57b) via Williamson’s *Guijiao huican* 古教彙參 (see note 19 above). In his prefatory material, Zhou (1901) lists the *Guijiao huican* among the sources for his work, but does not indicate which edition he is using. Even though Wang Shunan had read the *Guijiao huican*, in this instance he appears to follow the rewording of Williamson’s work in Zhou (1901), rather than copying directly from the *Guijiao huican*. As for Williamson himself, it is unclear what source, if any, he is following—he may simply be loosely paraphrasing materials from Plato’s dialogues or the biography of Plato in Diogenes Laertius.

⁷² {Translator’s note.} The first two sentences of this comment derive from Malin [Macklin] and Li (1901: 12b), but were also copied into Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 20a). It is unclear whether Wang was working directly from the former work, but in a case later in this essay (see note 153 below) where Zhou modifies another piece of Malin [Macklin] and Li (1901), Wang follows Zhou’s wording over the original, so it is quite possible that in this case as well he is copying from Zhou. Malin

utmost to use⁷³ the visible illusions before their eyes to seek the invisible truth. Such is the main point of his learning.

§ 7

His physics states that the Ideas are unique, whereas individual things are multitudinous.⁷⁴ The Ideas are eternally unchanging, whereas individual things are so frequently undergoing generation, destruction, and change as to be incomprehensible. The Ideas are pure, whereas individual things are adulterated. The Ideas have perfect reality, whereas individual things exist between the real and the unreal. Such are the distinctions between them. As for individual things, they come to be from the combination of Ideas and matter. Matter is indefinite, changing and unstable, not real, and not rational. Ideas and matter are completely opposite in their natures, and cannot be directly combined with each other. Between them there is something that has the effect of mediating these two, and it is named the “world-soul” (*shijie jingshen* 世界精神).⁷⁵ The world-soul has the power of movement, and it controls all phenomena and all life. It is from the orderliness there is in phenomena that human rationality is established. For this reason, the world-soul is positioned between the Ideas and the phenomenal realm,

[Macklin] and Li (1901) is itself a loose Chinese translation of Macaulay’s essay “Lord Bacon.” It is likewise unclear which printing of Macaulay’s work Macklin and Li used for their translation, but see, e.g., Macaulay (1876: 452) for the section that Macklin and Li are covering in this section that has wound up in Wang Shunan’s text.

73 {Translator’s note.} Here Wang diverges from Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 20a) and Malin [Macklin] and Li (1901: 12b). Those two sources have *qu* 去 (“reject”), whereas Wang has *qu* 取 (“take”). It is unclear to me whether this is an error or deliberate revision on Wang’s part.

74 {Translator’s note.} This section is drawn almost entirely from Kanie (1899: 55–57) via the Chinese rendering in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 37–38) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 8–9).

75 {Translator’s note.} This sentence seems to combine wording from Kanie and Inoue. In Kanie’s text, the term *shijie jingshen* 世界精神 is explicitly noted as a translation for the Greek term *demiourgos*, but since the literal meaning of *shijie jingshen* is very different than *demiourgos*, I have chosen to render it literally in English, rather than substituting “Demiurge” or “Maker” or the like. This rendering is potentially confusing, since in the *Timaeus* the Demiurge is distinct from the world-soul. It is not clear that Kanie himself understands that distinction, however, which may be why he uses this Chinese formulation.

and is said to serve as a limiting factor.⁷⁶ Although the world contains various living things, the human race is the most outstanding among them, and is not on a par with plants and animals. The human race is born from the world-soul. Its original substance is the same as that of the world-soul, and [like the world-soul] relies on what has no physical form to give rise to certain powers and create bodily motion. As for the relation of the soul to the Idea of Life, this Idea exists eternally, without beginning or end, and all the multitudinous living beings descend from this higher realm to become physical bodies. Those who are pure and unblemished will, in the afterlife, return to dwell in this higher realm. Those who are impure will fall into human bodies or animal bodies. After such a past, one frequently comes up with all manner of thoughts, and in general that is because those things which one contacts in the current world and of which one then forms an Idea are all things that one had experienced in the past, which one then remembers through the power of recollection. This is Plato’s doctrine of recollection.

§ 8

A god created the universal intellect,⁷⁷ which was formed from three types of different elements. The first is an indivisible simplicity. The second is a thing that is incapable of changing [on its own] that was

76 {Translator’s note.} In the original text of Kanie that is the source for Wang’s discussion, Kanie remarks that Plato likens the “world-soul” to notion of a “limit” (*peras*) in mathematical terms. That claim is reflected in the Chinese translation Wang is following, but Wang abbreviates it to the point where it is almost unintelligible in this context. (It might even be a typo in Wang’s text.)

77 {Translator’s note.} In this section, Wang returns to following Nakajima (1898: 76–77). Nakajima seems to use two different formulations to refer to the world-soul described in the *Timaeus*, *wanyou xinling* 萬有心靈 and *shijie jingshen* 世界精神 (which was rendered as “world-soul” above) so I have translated *wanyou xinling* as “universal intellect” here in order to reflect the difference in the Chinese phrasing. However, in switching from Kanie to Nakajima, Wang’s wording here creates another potential confusion, because Kanie equates the *shijie jingshen* with the Demiurge (and may not understand that the Demiurge is not the same as the world-soul), whereas Nakajima uses the term *shen* 神 by itself to refer to the Demiurge, and does not confuse it with the world-soul. Again, Wang may not (and probably does not) understand the difference the Demiurge and the world-soul as outlined in the *Timaeus*, so I have left the confusion in the English translation.

then divided and changed.⁷⁸ The third was something existing between the two preceding items. Using these three, the god created the universal intellect and distributed it throughout the entire body of the cosmos. Subsequently, he used isosceles-shaped elements to make earth, he used pyramid-shaped elements to create fire, he used icosahedron elements to generate water, and he used octahedron elements to create air. And human souls are just like the universal intellect's world-soul in being formed from the [same] three elements. The soul's position is in the head. Human souls contain an indivisible element, which constitutes people's perceptual faculties.⁷⁹ The element that exists between these two [i.e., the first two elements identified above] is the instrument of spirit. Human souls have three powers: spirit, desire, and reason. The former two belong to the perceptual [part of the soul], while the latter one belongs to the intellect. The reason that belongs to the intellect is generated in the pre-natal realm, and is an immortal thing. The perceptual [part of the soul] is a phenomenon of the current world and is subject to birth and death. The counterparts of reason are called the Ideas, while the objects of the perceptual [part of the soul] are affairs and things. These are the major points of Plato's world view.

§ 9

His ethics is based on his metaphysics and his anthropology.⁸⁰ He believes that one's soul, if discussed in terms of its substance, belongs to a world beyond the perceptible. Those people who in their lives become good can ascend to that world beyond the perceptible. The body is a prison for the soul, and creates the obstacles constituted by all its desires and powers. And so, human life must seek to use virtue

78 {Translator's note.} This garbling of *Timaeus* 35a–b seems to result from a misreading of Nakajima's text, which itself seems to misunderstand the original passage. Since Wang is probably following some Chinese translation of Nakajima that I have been unable to access (see note 10 above), it is unclear whether the misreading is present in that Chinese translation, or is introduced by Wang in the process of drawing from that translation.

79 {Translator's note.} Here there again seems to be a misreading of Nakajima, combining two separate clauses of his original text into one clause. As with the previous note, I am unable to determine whether the misreading was present in the Chinese source that Wang was copying, or whether he introduced the problem himself.

80 {Translator's note.} Here Wang again switches to following Kanie (1899: 58–59) via the Chinese rendering in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 38–39) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 9–10).

and wisdom to unite with the divine. Keeping within the limit of what will not harm the soul's development, one need not reject bodily yearnings, but should merely regulate one's joy and sorrow. The inescapable limit of happiness consists in the soul's according with morality (*daode* 道德). If I treat another person with impropriety (*wuli* 無禮), that is more shameful than if another person heaps improprieties on me.⁸¹ If one commits a transgression and is not punished for it, that is more shameful than being punished. Overall, in both cases [i.e., doing injustice to another, and transgressing without being punished for it] one loses harmony and peace in one's soul, and so cannot have happiness.

§ 10

The human soul takes the supreme good as its goal.⁸² Overall, the soul is equipped with various kinds of powers. The reason for whether the activities of its powers are fitting or not arises from whether or not the person is virtuous. If one wishes to distinguish between what is true and false within the soul,⁸³ one needs to possess intelligence, and so he [Plato] says that it [the soul] is equipped with intelligence. When the intelligence meets with its goal, then this generates the virtue of insight (*congming* 聰明).⁸⁴ Furthermore, that by which the human soul is equipped with bravery is spirit, and so he says it is equipped with spirit. Hence, its bravado is sufficient to give rise to virtue. In addition, there is that with which the desires equip one. If the desires do not lose their proper measure, this generates the virtue of

81 {Translator's note.} This text derives from Kanie, but the Chinese translator whom Wang is following here rephrases Kanie's point in markedly Confucian terminology (Kanie's original has *buzheng* 不正 instead of *wuli* 無禮) that is also then a striking reformulation of the Socratic/Platonic idea that it is worse to do injustice than to suffer it.

82 {Translator's note.} The first part of this section follows Nakajima (1898: 77).

83 {Translator's note.} This seems to misunderstand what Nakajima's text says, but as with previous instances, I cannot determine whether the fault is due to Wang himself or the Chinese translator he is presumably copying here.

84 {Translator's note.} Nakajima at this point is referencing wisdom, but since Wang had already used other Chinese terms for wisdom before and after this point, I have chosen a different expression in English to mark the different Chinese phrasing here.

moderation. And so, wisdom is the virtue of the rational [power of the soul].⁸⁵ It is the lord of the soul and controls the various other powers. Bravery is the virtue of the emotional [power of the soul]. It follows the orders of reason so as to battle pleasure and pain. Moderation is the virtue of the desirous [power of the soul]. It also follows the orders of reason to restrain the [soul's] emotional power.⁸⁶ When these each preserve their jobs and are mutually adjusted to and harmonized with one another, then amidst these three there comes to be the virtue of justice (*gongzheng* 公正). Justice [also] takes as its object the supremely good god(s), and so it moreover gives rise to the virtue of piety (*jingqian* 敬虔). All these various virtues issue from a person's Heaven-endowed nature (*tianxing* 天性). And so, one must simply work strenuously to reach one's [proper] goal. This is Plato's doctrine of ethics.

Shunan comments: Plato adjusted and harmonized teachings from three of the partial Socratic schools,⁸⁷ and he held a middle position [among them]. Namely, cut off avarice and banish recklessness and falsity, so as to silently accord with the Heavenly god(s). On the inside, do not be obscured by yearnings; on the outside, do not be tainted by things. Do not drift into immoderate pleasures, and do not incline to ascetic (*keji* 克己)

85 {Translator's note.} Starting with this sentence, Wang switches to following Kanie (1899: 59) via the Chinese rendering in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 39) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 10).

86 {Translator's note.} Here Wang follows the anonymous Chinese translator, who departs notably from Kanie's text. Kanie's original says that moderation follows reason in order to restrain the desires of the power in the soul responsible for perception.

87 {Translator's note.} Earlier in his book, in a part not translated here (*juan* 3, 10a–b), Wang identifies four “partial (*xiao* 小, lit. “lesser” or “minor”) Socratic schools”: Megaric, Elian, Cynic, and Cyrenaic. In doing so, he follows Nakajima (1898: 53), who in turn appears to be following Ueberweg. (It is unclear which edition of Ueberweg's book Nakajima was following, and whether he was working from the original German or an English translation. For reference, here I have simply used what appears to be the first printing of the first English translation. See Morris (1871: 88) for the relevant part of Ueberweg's work.)

practices.⁸⁸ Be empty, still, quiet, and dim.⁸⁹ Depart the dusty world and cut off vulgar ways. Return to your original nature (*benran zhi xing* 本然之性) so as to achieve the ideal. These are Plato’s goals. His ethical teachings follow the doctrines of Socrates but advance to the theory of Ideas, and so make ethics stand on its own as a science—this is where Plato has many meritorious contributions.⁹⁰ Only when it comes to his views on the nature of the cosmos does he repeatedly mix in myths (*shenyu* 神語, lit. “god tales”) and so has many contradictions. As for when he says that the world’s fundamental principle (*yuanli* 原理) is the Good and that it has a set goal—this is an unalterable judgment.

§ 11

Plato is good at discussing the relations between Heaven and humanity.⁹¹ He says that God (*shangdi* 上帝) is an overseer without beginning or end; his wisdom is inexhaustible; his power is infinite; with

88 {Translator’s note.} Earlier in the book (*juan* 3, 7b), Wang uses the phrase *keji* 克己 to describe practices such as those of the Cynics, so it is clear that he is not using it in its traditional Confucian sense. He appears to be following Nakajima (1898: 57–58) in using the term this way.

89 {Translator’s note.} Here, Wang borrows a phrase (*chongmo xiyi* 冲漠希夷) from the opening line of the commentary by Fazang 法藏 (643–712) on the *Treatise on Awakening Mahāyāna Faith* (*Dasheng qixinlun yiji* 大乘起信論義記). Wang seems to be understanding the phrase somewhat differently than what it means in its original context, which makes it a little difficult to know how best to construe it here, and so this translation is tentative. This and the next two sentences are highly Buddhist in flavor, though the subsequent remark about “one’s original nature” is also a common Neo-Confucian expression.

90 {Translator’s note.} The remainder of this paragraph is drawn from two separate paragraphs in Kanie. This first sentence comes from Kanie (1899: 58) via the Chinese rendering in *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 38) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 9), while the final two sentences come from an earlier part of Kanie (1899: 56) via *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 37) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 9). However, Wang alters the last part of the last sentence to make the endorsement even stronger than in the original Chinese translation of Kanie.

91 {Translator’s note.} This section largely follows Zhou (1901: *juan* 13, 19b). In this first sentence Zhou appears to be following Yan (1898: 1461), and in the rest Zhou is drawing from Williamson (1877: 57b). Williamson was a missionary, and

supreme and everlasting strength he creates the myriad things. There is the arising of an original goodness, but it is opposed by a badness that comes about later. It is like when there are weeds among one's grain sprouts (*miao* 苗), and if one plucks the weeds and gets rid of them, then the sprouts will thrive even more. A person's consciousness⁹² develops and becomes insight, and a person's insight operates as a power. Each person is a microcosm, but forms one body with God. God has endowed them with the heart of a benevolent (*ren* 仁) person.⁹³ Everyone should perfect this heart of a benevolent person [within them] and fill out their capacity for being a benevolent person, so as to repay God. Otherwise, one is not a person of God.

so it is not surprising that his account presents Plato's thought with a prominent Christian inflection. I have not been able to identify any particular source that Williamson is following, and it may well be that he is presenting a summary and paraphrase based on his own interpretation. Suffice it to say that Williamson was hardly alone in taking such a view of Plato at that time. For a striking parallel to the last few sentences, consider the following summary of Plato given the same year by Cocker (1877: 91), who was in the United States at the time: "(1) The personality of God is, *per se*, the Absolute Good, that is, the perfect intelligence, freedom, and benevolence of God, is the highest good. (2) The actualized or perfectly realized personality of man, that is, the complete development of his intelligence, freedom, and benevolence, is the highest good for man—resemblance of human personality to the Divine." There is no evidence that Williamson and Cocker knew of each other, and other than both being from Britain originally (Williamson was from Scotland, and Cocker from England), they had almost nothing else in common, so it is clear that ideas like this about Plato were simply "in the air" during that period.

92 {Translator's note.} Here, following Zhou and Williamson, Wang again switches to yet another term for the soul, *linghun* 靈魂, which I have rendered as "consciousness" in order to distinguish it from the other Chinese terms in use in the essay.

93 {Translator's note.} For Chinese readers, this remark would almost surely call to mind the views of Mengzi, whose claim that humans are innately endowed with a disposition toward benevolence (*ren* 仁) had long been Confucian orthodoxy by the time this piece was written. The analogy with sprouts (*miao* 苗) earlier in the passage is also highly reminiscent of one of Mengzi's favorite analogies (e.g., *Mengzi* 1A6, 2A2, 7B37). Williamson may well have deliberately chosen such phrasing to suggest a compatibility between Plato, the Christian tradition, and native Chinese thought. See also note 61 above on the translation of the Chinese term *xin* 心.

§ 12

Plato says that when the god created the world, in every case where he could achieve the highest good, he already did so exhaustively, and even if he were to command that there be another world beside this world, he surely would not be able to exceed this world.⁹⁴ Moreover, even so-called harms and evils are a pathway to bringing about good fortune and benefit. They are insufficient to be [regarded as] a fault of the god.

Shunan comments: When it comes to claims about the existence or non-existence of the god(s), if the scholars of later ages all have different opinions, it is because of those who do not understand that [belief in] godly ways and the teaching thereof have unsurpassable power and their transformative effects are most godlike. Among all countries of the world, regardless of what their government, rituals, and customs are like, none fail to use this as the leading element in transforming [their people]. Overall, in the hearts of everyone there is some such impression [i.e., about the existence of gods]. Thus, scholars follow along with this and advocate for it [i.e., the existence of gods] to serve as an aid for encouraging goodness and preventing evil, and when it comes to organizing religion and upholding morality, none fail to take this as a standard in doing so.

§ 13

Plato once said that the products of love among souls are greater than those of love among bodies.⁹⁵ The difference in their importance is so sizeable that it cannot be stated in a single day. How can this be

94 {Translator's note.} This whole paragraph derives from Nakae (1886: 101) via the Chinese translation of Chen and Meng (1902: 41a–b).

95 {Translator's note.} This section seems to derive ultimately from Fouillée (1879: 95) via the Japanese versions in Nakae (1885: 306) and Nishimura (1890: 227) that were then put into Chinese in Guomin congshu she (1903: 9).

claimed? Even though human bodies have a product, at the time of [a person's] birth the time for their flourishing and then death is already present. As for what is produced by human souls, it can leave a glorious reputation for a thousand years. And so, in one's learning and efforts, the important thing is to make one's psyche (*qipo* 氣魄)⁹⁶ so surpassingly great that after a thousand past eras it is as though one still lives, and [the important thing is] definitely not merely to leave behind an enduring line of worthy descendants.

§ 14

In discussing the main points of education, [Plato] said that education is the method whereby one causes each person's body and mind to reach their best state according to the superior or inferior quality of their resources and material.⁹⁷ It is also a skillful method that uses what is stimulating to entice the mind of the student and cause it to delight in accomplishment [of learning]. However, there is also a pitfall in using only enticements, and so one who is a father cannot be lax, but should command his child to attempt what is difficult. To simply accede to what the child likes is a way that harms the child.

Shunan comments: As for the method of using what is stimulating to entice the student, nowadays education experts all endorse this proposal, but the pitfall of laxity is indeed hard to avoid. Confucius said, "If one cares for [the people], can one fail to make them

⁹⁶ {Translator's note.} Instead of using the word *jingshen* 精神 to refer to the soul, as the text had previously, here it switches to a different term, *qipo* 氣魄, which is close in its sense. In order to reflect the switch in the translation, I have used "psyche" to render the latter term.

⁹⁷ {Translator's note.} The ultimate source of this section and the much of the next are Nōse (1893: 229–30). A portion of that work was translated into Chinese as Ye (1901). I have not been able to compare the latter directly with Wang's text, but according to Liu (2023), Ye's work was basically copied into Wang Lan and Zhou Liu (1903: 107), which does provide a close match to Wang Shunan's text. The volume by Wang Lan and Zhou Liu was released in September 1903, and so if Wang was done composing this work by early 1903 as he says in his biography, then he may have been drawing directly from Ye's text, though as noted below (see note 146), there are also indications that he may have been working from just the Wang and Zhou reprint.

labor?"⁹⁸ And Han Feizi said, "Kindly mothers have spoiled children."⁹⁹ Nevertheless, Plato's dictum is unalterable.

§ 15

As for the methods of education, Plato emphasizes gymnastics and music. For intellectual development, he demands the practice of arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, rhetoric, philosophy, etc., in order to refine [the student's] great intellectual prowess. For moral development, he explains that gods, parents, and the laws of the state should be respected. Overall, he uses religious sensitivity to nurture morality in human relations, and the beautiful arts are especially important, because a person's consciousness advances from beauty toward goodness.¹⁰⁰ The good and the beautiful are one and the same Idea. For this reason, the beautiful arts have great power and can evoke every emotion. When subordinated to philosophy, they become aids to education. Poetry, song, and music should all be rectified. For them to receive government supervision and have forbidden what is incorrect is the foundation of morality in society. These are Plato's main ideas about education.

Shunan comments: Plato's methods of education are approximately the same as those of the Three Dynasties.¹⁰¹ According to the *Zhouli*, the Grand Minister over the Masses is to make use of the Six Arts to teach the myriad people.¹⁰² Rituals and music are

98 {Translator's note.} *Analects* 14.7.

99 {Translator's note.} *Han Feizi*, "Xianxue," HKCS 50/152/7.

100 {Translator's note.} See note 97 above. From the beginning of the section to the end of this sentence, Wang is following Nōse (1893: 230) probably via Ye (1901); compare Wang Lan and Zhou Liu (1903: 107). After this point, Wang Shunan switches to following Kanie (1899: 61–62) via the Chinese edition by *Fanyi shijie* (1902: 40–41) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 11), until the last sentence before his comment.

101 {Translator's note.} The "Three Dynasties" refer to the Xia, Shang, and Zhou dynasties, whose founding periods were traditionally cast in Chinese history as periods of sagely governance that produced peace and prosperity for all.

102 {Translator's note.} See the *Zhouli*, HKCS 2.1/21/3–4: 以鄉三物教萬民而賓興之。一曰六德，知、仁、聖、義、忠、和；二曰六行，孝、友、睦、婣、任、恤；三曰六藝，禮、樂、射、御、書、數。

practices for moral development, calligraphy and calculation are practices for intellectual development, and archery and charioteering are practices for physical development, but the transformation of the people and perfection of customs takes rituals and music as especially fundamental. Plato can be called someone who deeply understood the reasons [for such things]. In the schools of the various countries of Europe nowadays, the methods for teaching people are all expansions of Plato's doctrines.

§ 16

Plato says that he wishes to nurture [people's] characters.¹⁰³ Accordingly, he describes the ideal education. In this ideal education, whatever does not conform to true principles (*zhen li* 真理) is not to be taught. Even if history contains something that breaches the true principles, he also rejects it. This is what he means by saying that there must be no doctrines whose purpose is not connected with knowledge of the Ideas. Even so, some tasks are not what an individual can accomplish, and then the state should establish laws to promote them. Those who are going to be rulers or soldiers must each be taught in accordance with their Heaven-endowed nature how to suitably fulfill the purpose of living their life and dwelling in this world.

Shunan comments: In subsequent ages, this became the basis for establishing compulsory education for citizens.

¹⁰³ {Translator's note.} In this paragraph, Wang returns to following Nakajima (1898: 79). The Chinese text of the first sentence is ambiguous on its own, and I have rendered it according to its original meaning in Nakajima, where it refers more specifically to nurturing the guardians' characters.

§ 17

Plato's political thought is closely related to his ethics.¹⁰⁴ Overall, ethics is principal, and politics follows it. People should first cultivate themselves, and then this will reach to the state. The state should take the moral development of its citizens as primary. All virtues have philosophy as their foundation. And so, if one wishes to construct a perfect state, one must ensure that philosophers wield the supreme power so as to carry out all political matters. If the people are not capable of philosophy, then they cannot be allowed the power to participate in government and thereby harm the state's governance. However, philosophers are not often seen in the world, and so the perfect state can only evolve from government by the few.¹⁰⁵ Furthermore, what upholds the state and protects it from foreign humiliations are its soldiers. Below these are the farmers, craftsmen, and merchants, who are the ruled and cannot participate in government. And so, in the state, there are three classes: (1) the rulers, (2) the soldiers who assist the rulers, and (3) the ruled. These can be compared to the three powers of the soul. The rulers are reason. The soldiers are emotion. The ruled are desires. The primary virtue of the rulers is wisdom. The primary virtue of the soldiers is bravery. The primary virtue of the ruled is moderation. If the state wishes that its citizens will each fully carry out their jobs, it must give them education. The government should select men and women who are peers in body and soul and marry them. As for the raising of children, it should educate them with the techniques of music and gymnastics, so as to nurture them to become soldiers, and should further instruct them in mathematics and dialectic, so

¹⁰⁴ {Translator's note.} Here Wang returns to following Kanie (1899: 59–61) via *Fanyi Shijie* (1902: 39–40) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 10).

¹⁰⁵ {Translator's note.} At the time Wang was writing, the Chinese term here (*guatou zhengti* 寡頭政體) was sometimes but not always used to translate the word "oligarchy." It is not clear that either Kanie or the anonymous Chinese translator whom Wang was following intended it as a translation of "oligarchy" in this particular instance, and since rendering it as "oligarchy" here would automatically constitute a significant misrepresentation of Plato's writings, I have translated it in a more neutral way. However, readers should be aware that there remains a possibility that it could have the meaning of "oligarchy," and if so, the sentence expresses a highly erroneous claim about Plato.

that they can have the qualifications to rule others. When they reach the age of fifteen,¹⁰⁶ only then are they made to participate in the state's governance.

Shunan comments: As applied to citizens of a state, the process of evolution proceeds from division toward unity, and from heterogeneity toward purity. From primitive times onwards, it united the jumbled and uneven masses in discrete groups, and outstanding individuals among them then stepped forward to become leaders of these discrete groups. Thereupon, the citizens of the state were first divided, and those in charge of ruling and those being ruled, those capable of exerting control and those who are controlled, were sharply separated and could not be united. As evolution continued, the division between serving and employing became more manifest, and the appropriate tasks of rulers and citizens became more evident. These political powers were repeatedly handed off and splintered in the transfer minutely, like the way that the hundred crafts do not infringe upon one another. Overall, the division of citizens comes from their heterogeneity, but evolution is, at shallower or deeper levels, silently operating in their midst. When the degree of evolution of citizens' virtue and quality is not yet sufficient to share in profound reasons and yet one hastily wishes to have them participate in government power and plan the state's affairs, not only is this of no help, but moreover problems will follow it. In my observation, the Greeks talked daily of citizen government, yet superiors and inferiors struggled with each other in roiling chaos, and this was precisely enough to become an aid for takeovers by powerful clans and hegemonic rulers. Plato took a lesson from this, and so he separated the citizens of the state into three levels. He first used their heterogeneity to divide them, and then used the techniques of education to change the hearts of the citizens, for the sake of having the situation proceed from division toward unity, and from heterogeneity toward

¹⁰⁶ {Translator's note.} The text of Kanie (1899: 60) clearly says "fifty" (五十), but both the *Fanyi Shijie* version (1902: 40) and Wang and Zhou (1903: 10) misprint the figure as "fifteen" (十五), and Wang Shunan simply follows that error. The fact that he does so seems to be clear evidence that he was not at all consulting the original Japanese text when composing this work.

purity. This is, overall, a clear example of evolution in accordance with nature, and not something that deviates from it.

§ 18

[Plato] also says that if a state is able to preserve well that which is fundamental, then it will resemble an individual.¹⁰⁷ Whenever an individual harms his finger, his whole body is aware of the pain, and the [ideal] state is also like that. And so, an individual is simply a state on a small scale, and a state is simply an individual on a large scale.

Shunan comments: When in later ages Bluntschli (*Bolunzhili* 伯倫知理) and others have proclaimed the doctrine of the state as an organic body, their wellspring issues from Plato.¹⁰⁸

¹⁰⁷ {Translator's note.} This whole section, including Wang's comment, is taken from Ukita (1900) via a partial Chinese translation and paraphrase published in *Youxue yibian* (1903a) that also draws from Nakae (1885). The *Youxue yibian* version was reprinted with mostly minor modifications in Wang and Zhou (1903). While Wang Shunan does not say which printing he was using, later on (see note 146 below) there is an indication that he was using the reprint instead of the original version, but for references I will give the location in both printings. The content in this section originally comes from Ukita (1900: 19), and appears in *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 2) and Wang and Zhou (1903: 168–69). The grammar of Wang Shunan's first sentence here is somewhat ambiguous, and I have translated it in accordance with the Chinese translation he was copying, which is clearer syntactically.

¹⁰⁸ {Translator's note.} The anonymous Chinese translator adds this remark as a summary of what Ukita (1900) says, and it is not a direct translation of Ukita's work. Ukita (1900: 113–14) gives a long quote from Johann Kaspar Bluntschli that mentions the idea of the state as an organic entity. It is unclear whether Ukita was working from Bluntschli's original German text or a translation of it into some other language. An English version of the passage that Ukita quotes and that ostensibly forms the basis for the remark by the Chinese translator can be found in the translation of Bluntschli by Ritchie et al. (1895: 38–39).

§ 19

Plato's theory of laws takes head-of-household government as the origin of the state, but in discussing the beginnings of society, he traces it back to the economical division of occupations.¹⁰⁹ His doctrine states: people need myriad kinds of things, but a single person's strength is not sufficient to supply everything that person seeks. Thereupon, people pooled their strengths together in cooperation, and from among the innumerable public-serving occupations, they each adopted one occupation. And so, society arose from this, and what [Plato] calls the public-serving, essential occupations are divided into merely four: (1) the farmer, (2) the potter, (3) the tailor, (4) the shoemaker. The farmer's plowing does not merely suffice to provide for his own needs, but also includes production of food for the other three. In the same manner, the potter makes household implements. In the same manner, the tailor fashions clothing. In the same manner, the shoemaker makes footwear. Each produces the quadruple¹¹⁰ of what he himself needs and provides for the uses of the others. When things are like this, there are three benefits to it. First, people each have things for which they are capable or incapable. When each takes up just one occupation, then they can focus on that in which they excel. Second, when they each take up just one occupation and do not divide their efforts among other tasks, then the results achieved are sure to be tremendous. Third, since [in this manner] people's time¹¹¹ can be saved and opportunities can receive an energetic response, then the production of goods will accordingly be greater, better, and easier. Also, Plato's method of dividing up occupations does not rely on individuals' free choice, but

109 {Translator's note.} As before, much of this section is taken from Ukita (1900: 19–21) via *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 2–3) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 169). Toward the end, though, the Chinese translator seems to misunderstand what Ukita is saying about the four virtues, and that misunderstanding is reproduced in Wang's version as well.

110 {Translator's note.} Wang's text here has *si bu* 四部, whereas the Chinese translator has *si bei* 四倍, following Ukita's text. Although Wang sometimes simplifies or deviates from the wording of the Chinese translator, 四部 does not make sense here, so I gather that 部 is a miscopied or misprinted character, and have translated in accordance with the Chinese translator's version instead.

111 {Translator's note.} The *Youxue yibian* translation has just the word "time" (*shi* 時) here, whereas the version in Wang and Zhou has "people's time" (*ren shi* 人時). Wang Shunan's text also says "people's time," which is thus one hint that he was using the reprint rather than the original publication of the translation.

rather awaits the state's determinations. Furthermore, the division of occupations he relates is not merely implemented for the economy, but is, moreover, applicable to governance. Every organization in society should be rooted in people's quality and nature, and so people must not lack these four virtues, namely what he calls wisdom, bravery, moderation, and justice.

Shunan comments: Discussants say that Plato's discussion of the efficiency in division of occupations is on a par with that of Adam Smith.¹¹² Smith believed that people's Heaven-endowed natures are equal, and some simply become laborers, while others become philosophers. These are all nothing more than the results of the division of occupations, and he did not understand the reason for dividing up occupations, and in this respect Plato's doctrine looks to be more astute than Smith's. When Mengzi says¹¹³ that those who labor with their minds rule others, while those who labor with physical strength are ruled by others, or again when he talks about [the need to engage in] trading and exchanging goods and works so as to use what is abundant to supplement what is deficient—these are all just what Plato means.

§ 20

Plato also takes it that the differences between those ruling and those ruled, and the differences between men and women, are all rooted in natural gradations, and one cannot forcibly make them equal.¹¹⁴ There are three grades of people: some are gold-natured, some are silver-natured, and some are iron-natured. And it is the responsibility of the rulers to examine and differentiate their natures so

¹¹² {Translator's note.} Most of Wang's comment is simply a continuation of the passage he borrowed from Ukita (1900: 20–21) via *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 2) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 169), but the part about Mengzi at the end appears to be an original addition by Wang.

¹¹³ {Translator's note.} Of the two paraphrases of the *Mengzi* that follow, the first is from 3A4 and the second is from 3B4.

¹¹⁴ {Translator's note.} All of this paragraph is taken from Ukita (1900: 21–22) via *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 3) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 170).

as to cause each to take up their [proper] occupation. When the rulers have given them an occupation in accordance with their Heaven-endowed natures, then people should do this work for the rest of their life, and must not change plans. Thus, if there are any who excel the masses by being multitalented and multiskilled, they are a harm to the masses, and should be exiled from the state. Actors are also able to imitate various kinds of people, and are not suited to the method that each is to hold only one occupation, and so they should also be banished and forbidden. Thus, his method for division of occupations is not merely based on expediency for each individual, but is also something absolutely necessary for the development of people's characters.

Shunan comments: The chapter "Fuguo" by Xunzi says, "The products of the hundred crafts are means to nurture a person, but even the most capable cannot engage in every craft, nor can people each fill every official post. If they live apart and do not help each other, then they will be impoverished. If they live together but have no social divisions, then they will struggle with each other. Poverty is a catastrophe, and struggle is a disaster. If you wish to save them from catastrophe and eliminate disaster, then nothing is better than to make clear social divisions and so employ the masses."¹¹⁵ This and Plato's doctrine mutually resemble one another, but Plato says that being multitalented and multiskilled is a harm to the masses, and so he oppresses the citizens of the state and does not permit there to be any virtuoso who excels the masses—this is an extremely one-sided approach.¹¹⁶ Furthermore, although actors are able to imitate various kinds of people, that is simply what is fitting for their occupation. How could this be a harm to the division of occupations? What a truly erroneous view!

¹¹⁵ {Translator's note.} Translation from Hutton (2014: 83).

¹¹⁶ {Translator's note.} Interestingly, here and in the remainder of his comment, Wang appears to be quite pointedly disagreeing with his sources. Ukita (1900: 22) labels Plato's position "perspicacious" (Jp. *takken*, Ch. *zhuojian* 卓見), which is also reflected in the Chinese translation that Wang is copying.

§ 21

Plato's ideal makes assets, women, and children all owned in common by the rulers.¹¹⁷ The state's younglings are the seeds of its survival. However, sometimes a parent is besotted with private affection, sometimes they covet profit for the sake of their children, sometimes they crave fame for the sake of their children, or sometimes they engage in favoritism toward their wife—these are all a blight upon the state. If throughout the state assets are owned in common, then the state will have no robbers, and police and judges can all be dispensed with and forsaken. If throughout the state women and children are owned in common, then the problems caused by private loves and favoritism can be cut off, and lasciviousness will not arise. And so, individuals are not allowed to own assets, and are not allowed to own wives and children: they all belong to the state. Accordingly, the state examines the qualities of its men and women and marries them to each other. Women who are tough are mated to men who are gentle, and men who are tough are wived with women who are gentle. When toughness and gentleness are matched so as to give birth to good new citizens, then contentiousness, litigation, and every other societal disturbance can be cut off. Plato's ideal state is like this.

Shunan comments: As for Plato's doctrine of uniting families and assets, his disciple Aristotle refuted it, believing that breaking up small families in order to establish a big family was something that circumstances would not permit even in the most ancient and primitive times when the family system was at its simplest, and even though civilization advanced and everyone could break out of thinking just in terms of families, still they could not break up small families and become united into one.¹¹⁸ Overall,

117 {Translator's note.} This paragraph derives from Ukita (1900: 23–24) via *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 3–4) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 170), but Wang simplifies some of the Chinese translator's text.

118 {Translator's note.} Most of this comment derives from Fouillée (1879: 134–35), via the translation by the Guomin congshu she (1903: 11–12) of Nakae (1885: 431–32). However, while Nakae's translation follows Fouillée fairly well, the Guomin congshu she translation simplifies Nakae's text significantly, rearranges it (in the current instance) to include pieces from the section on Aristotle in its section on Plato, and at one point appears to inject its own wording that does not really match anything in Nakae. In deviating from Nakae, the Guomin congshu she text uses wording that is rather

uniting material goods is sometimes the introduction of chaotic government, but uniting souls is the premier vehicle for republicanism. Moreover, if assets are united, then everyone's approach will be that they secretly say: "Surely someone else will take responsibility for them. I do not need to put in the effort myself." For this reason, I do not put in effort, and other people behave like me—this only opens up problems of quarrels and neglect. Not only does it fail to benefit government, but moreover it is harmful to the state. Further comment: In Plato's ideal, there is not one thing that can be enacted.¹¹⁹ The way of a true king does not cast out human feelings, and there has never been anyone who contravened human feelings and yet was able to establish a state. The *Record [of Ritual]* states: "Drinking, eating, and the relations of men and women—the major desires of human beings lie therein."¹²⁰ One who is good at establishing the state causes each person to be provided with what they desire, and causes each person to thrive in the life they lead. Then, superiors and subordinates will take comfort in each other under a Heaven that does not belabor them, and the state will develop on its own. In terms of the flourishing of the Grand Union,¹²¹ this is what Gu Tinglin means when talking about accumulating the private benefits of the masses in order to achieve common benefit for all under Heaven.¹²² The "Liyun" says that

ambiguous in context and hard to follow, but Wang adopts it verbatim, which in turn makes his text somewhat difficult to understand. As a result, the translation of this sentence and the next one is tentative.

119 {Translator's note.} From this sentence to the end of this paragraph, the contents all seem to be Wang's own original contributions.

120 {Translator's note.} *Liji*, "Liyun." In what follows, Wang refers to this chapter of the *Liji* multiple times. The line quoted here is from HKCS 9.23/62/11. The parallel between Plato and the *Liji* is not totally original with Wang. Liang (1902: 12) suggests this parallel as well, and may have been the inspiration for Wang, since later on here Wang draws from that work, but Wang goes into much greater detail than Liang does, and is more opinionated.

121 {Translator's note.} The "Grand Union" (*datong* 大同) is a label for the ideal state of society that is envisioned in the opening lines of the "Liyun" chapter of the *Liji* (HKCS 9.1/59/27).

122 {Translator's note.} Gu Tinglin 顧亭林 is an alternative name of the Ming dynasty scholar Gu Yanwu 顧炎武 (1613–1682). The saying that Wang attributes to him here is a loose paraphrase of points made in section five of Gu's famous essay "Junxian lun" (郡縣論).

during the orderly period of the Grand Union, people “did not confine their care for parents to just their own parents, nor did they confine their care for children to just their own children.”¹²³ This, in sum, is Mengzi’s meaning when he says to “give that which is due the elderly to one’s own elders and extend it to the elders of others, and give that which is due the young to one’s own youths and extend it to the youths of others.”¹²⁴ Thus, [the “Liyun”] says: “The elderly got to finish out their lives. Those in their prime got to be employed. The youth got to grow up. Widowers and widows, the childless and the orphaned, the disabled and the sick—all received nurture. Men had their proper allotments, and women had somewhere to turn.”¹²⁵ This is an ideal in which all under Heaven are just like one family, and China is just like a single person,¹²⁶ but this is not the same as Plato’s reckless doctrine in favor of common ownership of assets and common ownership of wives and children. Cases from later ages of vile people who advocated for equalization of wealth and common ownership of goods but thereby instigated great chaos are recorded unceasingly by historians. If one includes women and children and also holds them in common, then ritual and righteousness and all sense of decency and shame will be used to sweep the ground and be finished. This would amount to leading everyone under Heaven to become beasts. Moreover, as for demanding that marriages between men and women follow the state’s use of its compelling authority to match them, not only is there no such government, but this also disregards the free natures of men and women. [Confucius said,] “What does Heaven ever say? Yet the four seasons are set in motion by it, and the myriad creatures receive

123 {Translator’s note.} *Liji*, “Liyun,” HKCS 9.1/59/24.

124 {Translator’s note.} *Mengzi* 1A7.

125 {Translator’s note.} *Liji*, “Liyun,” HKCS 9.1/59/25.

126 {Translator’s note.} The first half of this sentence is modified from *Liji*, “Liyun,” HKCS 9.22/62/5. In its original context, the term *zhongguo* 中國 is not used in its contemporary sense as “China,” and it is unclear exactly how Wang intends it in this instance. Elsewhere in this essay, though, Wang does seem to use *zhongguo* to refer to China in its modern sense, and so I have rendered it that way here as well, for the sake of consistency.

their life from it.”¹²⁷ As for [Heaven and Earth’s] intermingling and [the myriad things’ subsequent] transformation and coalescence,¹²⁸ what room is there for human plans amidst that? In addition, even if the match is a good one, its results will not necessarily reflect that: the great sage Shun was born to the Blind Man, having a father and mother who were ignorant and awful,¹²⁹ while the worthless Shang Jun was born to Shun and E’huang, who were worthy and pure—so what more is there to say? Taking up such a benighted policy [as what Plato proposes] and wishing to see it implemented is something that should be unacceptable to even an island ruler.¹³⁰

127 {Translator’s note.} *Analects* 17.19. Translation from Slingerland (2003: 208).

128 {Translator’s note.} Here Wang alludes to a line from the “Xici zhuan” 繫辭傳 (*Zhouyi*, HKCS 66/83/17–18): 天地網緼，萬物化醇. The line is somewhat ambiguous in itself, and it is unclear exactly how Wang understands it. I have translated it in accordance with one prominent interpretation of it (i.e., by Zhu Xi), but the translation remains tentative. Wang’s main point, as I take it, is that sexual attraction is a natural phenomenon like other cosmic processes, and attempted human manipulation or circumvention of such processes is unlikely to succeed.

129 {Translator’s note.} Here Wang draws from some wording in a remark in the *Shangshu* 尚書, “Yaodian” 堯典, HKCS 1/2/4, that is also widely used in other early texts describing Shun’s parents.

130 {Translator’s note.} Wang’s mention of an “island ruler” (*dao zhu* 島主) here is abrupt and difficult to understand. I suspect that he is reacting to a remark in one of his sources that he does not quote. In particular, as discussed in note 138 below, Tajima (1897a: appendix 6–7, or 1897b: 74–75) is the source of some of Wang’s text, via a Chinese translation (likely Wang and Zhou 1903: 249). At one point, Tajima gives a quote from Ingram (1888: 13)—perhaps misunderstanding Ingram along the way—with the result that the Chinese translation winds up saying that Plato’s ideal city would need to be established on “an isolated island cut off by the sea” (*juehai yi gudao* 絕海一孤島). Wang Shunan may be picking up on that remark, in which case his point here is that even in such an ideal circumstance for Plato’s envisioned government, Plato’s policies still would not be appropriate.

§ 22

Plato also understood that his ideal state would be difficult to realize.¹³¹ Only if the legislator uses this ideal as a target will the laws gradually be of benefit to the people. This ideal state can be labeled rule by the worthy, but is in fact a form of rule by nobility. When this sort of state collapses, then it becomes a timocracy.¹³² At that time, a mindset desirous of profit and fame arises, the people favor martial prowess and work at banditry, while the rulers denigrate philosophy and are keen for power, and then the state again collapses and becomes an oligarchy.¹³³ In such a time, virtue and righteousness are used to sweep the ground, and gold becomes all-powerful. The state then gives birth to two opposed kinds: one is those who are abundantly wealthy, and the other is those who are extremely poor. The poor commit crimes that increase daily, and they fall prey to punishments.¹³⁴ The wealthy engage in luxury without restraint, and they do not work at any productive occupation. Thereupon, the lower classes of society develop anger at the unfairness and the disaster of revolution is born. As a result, [the state] becomes a democracy. In such a time, clamor for freedom and equality springs up. The regulations governing father and son, teacher and disciple, and master and slave are broken, and the succeeding age is a tyranny. In sum, because of the excesses of rule by every common person,¹³⁵ a counter-movement

131 {Translator's note.} This paragraph comes from Ukita (1900: 24–25) via *Youxue yibian* (1903a: 3–4) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 170–71).

132 {Translator's note.} The Chinese text here, *fuzu zhengzhi* 富族政治, might suggest oligarchy or plutocracy rather than timocracy, but the term is labeled in both Ukita's original and in the Chinese translation as a rendering of the word "timocracy."

133 {Translator's note.} Wang's Chinese term here is *guashu zhengzhi* 寡數政治, which he takes directly from the Chinese translation he is following, and differs slightly from the term *guatou zhengti* 寡頭政體 used earlier in this essay (compare note 105 above). At this juncture, Ukita's original has 寡頭政治 (Jp. *katō seiji*), which is explicitly labeled as a translation for "oligarchy."

134 {Translator's note.} There appears to be an error in Wang's text here. It reads *xingpi* 形辟, which is not very intelligible. The corresponding point in the Chinese translation has *xingpi* 刑辟, which does make good sense, and so my translation follows that text instead, as an emendation to Wang.

135 {Translator's note.} I have translated Wang's text as it stands here, but Wang has *minminzhi* 民民制, which is an odd,

is born. As a result, it arrives at a false politician seizing the state's power. Extreme freeness changes over into extreme enslavement, and among the worst governments, none exceeds this.

Shunan comments: In the Greek era, they daily spoke of government by the people, creating a commotion that went on for years without respite, but in the end powerful and cunning scoundrels took advantage of the opportunity and stole the state, changing it over to rule by a tyrant.¹³⁶ Among disasters for those living as common people, this is especially searing. Even today, those who read histories feel lingering pain at it. Plato lived right at this moment, and so he mentally constructed a state manifesting a grand union. Even though he knew that his doctrine would be difficult to implement, still he did not shy away from laboring his mouth and humbling his body to forcefully proclaim it without cease,¹³⁷ probably because he wished to do something to alleviate the problems of that period. Even though later on the books on laws that he wrote tend to be a bit more practical, he still wishes for various policies such as limiting the citizens who do fieldwork, forbidding the custom of early marriage, and having the government oversee farmers, craftsmen, and merchants.¹³⁸ In sum, even though he [later on] allows

repetitive phrasing that looks like it might be an error. Ukita has *minzhuzhi* 民主制 (Jp. *minshusei*), the *Youxue yibian* translation has *minzheng* 民政, and Wang and Zhou (1903: 171) have *minzhi* 民制. Since Wang Shunan nowhere else follows the Japanese original text over the Chinese translation, it is unlikely that he was trying to reprint Ukita's wording. It seems more likely that he was following the Wang and Zhou version instead of *Youxue yibian*, and 民 simply got printed twice.

136 {Translator's note.} Here Wang switches terminology and uses a Chinese transliteration for "tyrant" (*dailande* 代蘭得) that he had not used before. The transliteration is not his own invention, though. It was apparently first introduced to China by Joseph Edkins (艾約瑟) in a Chinese translation of Fyffe (1875: 27–28) titled *Xila zhiliu* 希臘志畧 that was included in a larger collection of translated material (see Ai 1886).

137 {Translator's note.} Here there appears to be an error in Wang's text, which has *gua* 聒 but should instead be *gua/guo* 聒, given the idiomatic phrase in which the character occurs here. The translation follows the latter as an emendation.

138 {Translator's note.} This and the following sentence are ultimately borrowed from Ingram (1888: 13–14), but via a route that I have not entirely been able to determine. The Japanese scholar Tajima Kinji 田島錦治 produced a translation-cum-paraphrase of this section of Ingram, which appeared in at least two works of his, Tajima (1897a: appendix 6–7, and 1897b: 74–75). [Hokkaido University reports having a copy of the latter work that purports to date from 1891, which would make it

possession of private wealth, in fact he still wishes to limit and hamper it, so as to seek equality.¹³⁹ During the Warring States period, China’s scholars (*ru* 儒) looked upon the upheavals of that era with exhausted eyes, and each put forward an ideal state, writing books and establishing teachings to illuminate the world. Zhuangzi’s ideal depended on using the rule of supreme virtue and the transformative power of enigmatic union, as was done in the most ancient times, to move and change the people.¹⁴⁰ His teaching and what is meant in Plato’s [idea of a] grand union very much resemble each other. As for Xunzi, [his ideal] depends on imitating the later kings, honoring the regulations of a true king, settling the ranking of superiors and subordinates, and making clear what it means to serve or to employ another. His words say: “If divisions of goods are all even, then they cannot be made ample enough. If people’s authority is all equal, then they cannot be unified. If all the masses are equal in status, then they cannot be put to use. However, just as there is Heaven and Earth, there is a difference between above and below. An enlightened king must first arise and then he can arrange the state so that it has established order. As for the fact that two nobles cannot serve each other, and two

the earliest copy, but I have not been able to examine and verify that information. Otherwise, the publication data in Tajima 1897b would suggest that 1897 was the earliest edition.] Two related and loose translations of this passage into Chinese were done: one by Liang Qichao 梁啟超 under the pseudonym “New citizen of China” (*Zhongguo zhi xinmin* 中國之新民) (Liang 1902: 11–12), and the other in Wang and Zhou (1903: 248–49). The latter is likely copied from the former, but contains additional material that does not appear to come from Tajima and whose source I have been unable to trace. (A separate Chinese translation of Tajima 1897b appeared serialized in the journal in *Fanyi shijie* 1902–1903 and was later collected in a single volume as *Zuoxin she* 1903, but the additional language in Wang and Zhou 1903 does not match that.) Since Wang Shunan later in this essay borrows wording that does not appear in Liang’s translation, it seems more likely that he is borrowing from the Wang and Zhou translation, but since I have not been able to identify the source of the additional sections of the Wang and Zhou translation, it remains possible that Wang Shunan was drawing those parts from some other original publication that Wang and Zhou happened to fold into their volume.

139 {Translator’s note.} Given the criticism of equality (based on the *Republic*) referenced earlier in §22 here, this remark may seem schizophrenic, but in Ingram’s original, the point is merely about ensuring (roughly) equal property among the families in Magnesia, and not about equal worth of persons or equal political power. It is not entirely clear, though, that Wang understands the relevant differences here.

140 {Translator’s note.} Here Wang alludes to material in chapter ten of the *Zhuangzi*.

base men cannot employ each other, this is the Heavenly order of things. If people's authority and position are equal and their desires and dislikes the same, then goods cannot be made sufficient for them, and they will certainly struggle.¹⁴¹ If they struggle then there will certainly be chaos, and if there is chaos then they will be impoverished. The former kings hated this chaos, and so they established ritual and righteousness in order to divide up mankind, so as to cause ranking of poor and rich and noble and base, so that they might take charge of them. This is the basis for nourishing all under Heaven."¹⁴² His teaching and Plato's theory of having a legal regulation dividing the people into three grades are close to each other. In many cases, the ideals from various states in the East and the West agree without it being planned. This is what is meant by [the saying that] "This mind will be the same, because this principle is the same."¹⁴³

§ 23

Plato not only believed that the government of the state is to adapt in accordance with the qualities of the people, but moreover he took governing as the world's highest art.¹⁴⁴ Overall, an art's status as higher or lower is determined based on its ability to benefit from other arts, and the way that governing is an art is such that it is the aim of all the other hundred arts. In his planning of the state's affairs, [Plato]

141 {Original note.} The commentary of Yang Liang says that the character *dan* 澹 ("tranquil") [in the original text of the *Xunzi*] is to be read as *shan* 贍 ("sufficient"), and that [the sentence] is talking about when there cannot be enough goods.

{Translator's note.} The English translation here already follows Yang's reading, which may make Wang's comment look redundant, but Chinese readers would find it helpful, because he quotes the Chinese text with the original word *dan* 澹.

142 {Translator's note.} See Hutton (2014: 69–70).

143 {Translator's note.} This saying comes from Lu Jiuyuan 陸九淵 (Lu Xiangshan, 1139–1193). Wang probably has the broader context of the saying in mind: "If a sage were to arise in the area of the eastern seas, this mind [of his] will be the same [as my mind], because this principle is the same. If a sage were to arise in the area of the western seas, this mind [of his] will be the same [as my mind], because this principle is the same" (Lu 1823: *juan* 33).

144 {Translator's note.} This section is taken from Ukita (1900: 25) via *Youxue yibian* (1903b: 1) or Wang and Zhou (1903: 171).

desires that a state's homegrown supply can answer its homegrown needs.¹⁴⁵ He places strict limits on landholdings within the state, forbids early marriage, and exposes infants, so as to prevent the population from increasing, because overall he is working to ensure that the allocation of assets in society will daily move toward what is even and fair.

Shunan comments: Malthus (Ma'erda 馬爾達) says that as the myriad species reproduce, they all follow a geometric progression, and if those who perish do not far outnumber those who survive, then very shortly there will be no empty space on this planet.¹⁴⁶ Such a view, along with Plato's, cannot avoid [constituting] a heart that is barbaric and cruel.¹⁴⁷ Plato himself said that God has endowed [people] with the heart of a benevolent (*ren* 仁) person, and that everyone should perfect this heart of a benevolent person [within them] and fill out their capacity for being a benevolent person, so as to repay God.¹⁴⁸ That being the case, then how could a benevolent person's government policies be like this?

¹⁴⁵ {Translator's note.} In this and the next sentence, Ukita is paraphrasing the same section of Ingram (1888: 13–14) that is paraphrased by Tajima (1897a: appendix 6–7, and 1897b: 74–75) (see note 138 above), which is why this section may sound somewhat repetitive from the previous section. Since Ukita's work was published after Tajima's, it is possible that Ukita was drawing the material from Tajima rather than directly from Ingram, though Ukita nowhere mentions Tajima.

¹⁴⁶ {Translator's note.} Although marked as a comment, this sentence is lifted almost verbatim from a footnote in Wang and Zhou (1903: 171), a footnote that does not reflect anything in Ingram's or Ukita's originals, but is purely for the benefit of a Chinese reader who is not otherwise familiar with Malthus. In *Youxue yibian* (1903b: 1), a footnote with roughly the same meaning but quite different wording appears at the same juncture. This discrepancy between the two notes seems to be clear evidence that Wang Shunan was drawing from Wang and Zhou (1903), rather than the *Youxue yibian* translation.

¹⁴⁷ {Translator's note.} In Ingram's original text, he explicitly says that Plato's prescriptions "are inspired more by political and moral motives than by the Malthusian fear of failure of subsistence" (Ingram 1888: 14), and this sentence is reflected in the translation that Wang Shunan is copying, so he must have seen it, though he does not copy that part. Wang's criticism of Plato here thus amounts to a clear rejection of any purported moral justification of Plato's policies.

¹⁴⁸ {Translator's note.} See §11 of the present essay.

§ 24

Plato also says that if the state gets to enjoy happiness, the happiness of the masses is not something about which to inquire.¹⁴⁹

Shunan comments: Plato exalts the state while devaluing the people, probably because at that time such was the habit of noble families, and so he did not give thought to how [this part of] his teaching was unsound. Aristotle said: The state is formed through the joining together of the citizens.¹⁵⁰ If one disregards the happiness of the citizens in order to seek the happiness of the state, just where would that so-called happiness reside? If implementing severe government can bring about the happiness of the state, can that cause the citizens to make severe sacrifices? Can it plunge them into extreme perils? This theory of Plato's is truly difficult to comprehend. Moreover, Plato's view usually merges the state and family and treats them as one. That the origin of the state proceeds from the family is indeed correct. However, the natures of the two are different, so one cannot subsume them under a single theory. Family relations are a matter of the higher controlling the lower, and are vastly unequal, such as in the case of the father commanding and the son obeying, or the husband leading and the wife following. In the case of the state, everyone is equal, and even when an official issues an order, this is still a matter of one equal person overseeing another equal person, and so are not like the relations of higher and lower in the family. Official appointments are limited in their years, and so are not like those that are conveyed without a stopping point. Thus, some occupy the position of lord, while others take up the responsibilities of ministers, some command and others follow, and these [positions] rotate and do not become fixed. It

¹⁴⁹ {Translator's note.} This sentence comes from Fouillée (1879: 135), via the translation by the Guomin congshu she (1903: 12) of Nakae (1885: 432). However, Nakae's translation seems to somewhat misrepresent Fouillée's sentence, and the Guomin congshu she translation distorts it a step further.

¹⁵⁰ {Translator's note.} From here until the second comment in this section, all the wording is taken from Fouillée (1879: 135), via the translation by the Guomin congshu she (1903: 12–13) of Nakae (1885: 432–34).

can thus be said that government is delegated by the people, and that officials are the servants of the people. How could the state and family relations be assimilated as one? Further comment: Plato advocates the power of the state, while Aristotle advocates government by the people. The two are pointed in different directions. Probably Plato reflected on the upheavals due to the instability and contentiousness of government by the people in his day, and so put forward this teaching out of exasperation, but did not understand the failings of his policies. The *Documents* says, “The people are the root of the state. When the root is firm, the state will be at peace.”¹⁵¹ There has never been a case where someone can put the state at ease while the people are not at ease, and so Aristotle’s teaching is unalterable. However, the reason for the interconnectedness of family and state is something where Aristotle still falls a bit short.¹⁵²

§ 25

Plato also said that his arithmetic was not something he wished for people to use on ordinary objects.¹⁵³ Ordinary objects were mere traces [of reality], and one was to use this [arithmetic] to seek the essences

151 {Translator’s note.} *Shangshu* 尚書, “Wuzi zhi ge” 五子之歌, HKCS 8/11/11. Wang substitutes *wei* 為 for *wei* 惟 in the original.

152 {Translator’s note.} Although Wang does not spell out his idea in full here, he presumably has in mind something like the typical Confucian idea that the cultivation of moral relationships in the family is what provides the basis for a well-ordered state.

153 {Translator’s note.} This section is an abbreviated version of wording from Zhou (1901: 20a), which is borrowing and paraphrasing Malin [Macklin] and Li (1901: 12b). As noted earlier, this last work is a loose Chinese translation of Macaulay’s essay “Lord Bacon.” See Macaulay (1876: 449–50) for the ultimate source of this passage. The story about Plato and Archytas reported here originally comes from Plutarch, *Moralia, Quaestiones Convivales* 8.2.1 (718E–F) and *Life of Marcellus* 14.5–6. This Archytas is most likely the same Archytas as mentioned in §1 here, but Wang uses two different Chinese transliterations of the same Greek name, either because (since he is relying on two accounts from different sources) he does not realize that these two transliterations stand for the same name, or perhaps because he did not come back to edit these two sections in light of each other—Wang is otherwise quite reliable in pointing out to readers when different Chinese transliterations are used for the same Greek names.

from them. Learning is to take exhausting principle (*qiong li* 窮理) as its guide, use laws for policy, and regard crafts as inessential for ordering the state. His friend Archytas (Aikete 愛刻特) once used mathematics to create a machine. Plato upbraided him, saying: “This is the business of the crafts, not the business of philosophy (*gezhi* 格致).”¹⁵⁴

Shunan comments: Plato’s discussion of philosophy and that of China’s later Confucians (*ruzhe* 儒者) very much resemble each other.¹⁵⁵ Overall, their studies work at the greatest thing, and so concrete manifestations within the realm of physical form (*xing er xia zhi qi* 形而下之器) are not worth their attention, but they fail to understand that neither the Way nor concrete manifestations can be disregarded in a one-sided manner.

§ 26

When Plato wrote the *Oeconomicus*, he diligently recorded and described the conditions of life at the time.¹⁵⁶ Among the various kinds of occupations, he especially revered farming, though he also valued

154 {Translator’s note.} In the Chinese text from which Wang is drawing here, *gezhi* 格致 is used to translate the word “philosophy,” and so I have rendered it that way, even though it differs from the term that Wang used earlier, *zhexue* 哲學, which he adopted from Japanese writers. It is not clear that Wang understood that the two terms had the same referent.

155 {Translator’s note.} Although Wang typically uses the term *ru* 儒 to mean just “scholar,” the wording of the remark that follows here strongly suggests that he specifically has in mind neo-Confucian thinkers (especially those of the Cheng-Zhu tradition, who frequently were accused of committing the error that Wang mentions), so I have rendered this usage as “Confucian” instead.

156 {Translator’s note.} A truly bizarre error has crept into Wang’s account here, though it is not entirely his fault. The wording of this paragraph is taken from Wang and Zhou (1903: 249–50), and the error originates in that text. The section on Plato there appears to be largely copied from Liang (1902: 11–12), which in turn was a partial translation of Tajima (1897a: appendix 6–7, and 1897b: 74–75), which itself was a translation-cum-paraphrase of Ingram (1888: 13–14), as noted earlier. However, a full translation of Ingram’s work into Japanese was done by Abe (1896), and comparison between the text of Wang and Zhou (1903) and Abe (1896) shows that someone—whom I have been unable to identify—translated pieces from Abe into Chinese and inserted them into Liang’s translation to make up the text that appears in Wang and Zhou (1903). In the process, the translator, or whoever made the insertions, apparently misunderstood a number of sentences in

manufacturing and commerce. At one point he examined the conditions of trade and manufacturing and researched the reasons for how they operated, to cause them to flourish more each day, saying that the protection of the state relies entirely on these two for its maintenance. In discussing the nature of money, he says that when it comes to exchanges of goods, money serves as a medium of exchange. Because of this, goods can be exported, and so how could money be a malady for the state? Thus, he especially hopes for the flourishing of trade with other states. When encountering foreign traders, he would be sure to treat them most respectfully in accordance with ritual propriety, saying, "Such people as those are the instruments by which I can enrich the state." In adjudicating the disputes of merchants, one must issue judgments calmly and speedily, working to ensure that they are not victims of undeserved abuse, because he takes this to be the method for attracting them.

Shunan comments: At that time, the various states of Greece mostly looked down on commerce, and Sparta in particular adopted the method of banning it and closing themselves off. Overall, in that era when states were not yet opened up, the customs of more than half were like this. Plato witnessed the problems, and he opposed them one by one. Discussants say that the birth of economics in fact happened in 1776 when Adam Smith's *The Wealth of Nations* first appeared to the world in that year. They do not understand that in the natural evolution of things, there has never been anything that is generated abruptly, and no cases of effects without causes. When there are human groups then there is division of occupations, when there is division of occupations then there is trade, where there is trade then there is money. The phenomena in all these

Ingram and Abe that were originally about *Xenophon* as being about Plato instead, and Wang Shunan simply copies their mistake. Everything in this paragraph originally belongs to the section on Xenophon. Given that Wang had already listed all of Plato's works at the beginning of the essay, it is a bit surprising that he did not realize the conflict between what he copied from the Wang and Zhou (1903) text and what he says earlier. The only explanation I can imagine is that since he probably did not know any English, he perhaps did not grasp that when Wang and Zhou (1903) listed the title in English alongside the Chinese translation *Jingjixue* 經濟學, he did not see or appreciate it as a title. I have still translated it as the title of Xenophon's work in order to highlight the error, but alternatively the first words of the paragraph could have been translated as "When Plato wrote on economics..." If that was how Wang understood it, then it would explain why he saw no conflict between this statement and his earlier account.

various kinds of advances are wellsprings, and Smith is the great ocean where they collect.

§ 27

Plato's attitude toward the slave system is that he directly approves it, saying, "These are the means by which to cause the year's revenue to increase."¹⁵⁷ Such slaves should be treated according to strict laws, and in order to prevent them from fleeing, they should be branded so as to be recognized. In addition, the profits they generate are to be used in a cycle of sales and purchases that will increase their numbers. They are to be made to serve in the production of commodities, and given a little share to provide for them.¹⁵⁸ The men of state will then be at leisure to investigate political studies, and must not be made to do labor that would distract their minds.¹⁵⁹

Shunan comments: The slave system was prevalent in Greece. Great scholars (*ru* 儒) of that time, such as Plato and Aristotle, all regarded slaves the same as horses and oxen.

¹⁵⁷ {Translator's note.} As with the previous section (see note 156 above), the first three sentences of this section are originally about Xenophon and were erroneously added to the section on Plato in Wang and Zhou (1903: 250), which Wang Shunan is copying with modifications here.

¹⁵⁸ {Translator's note.} This sentence comes from Tajima (1897a: appendix 6, or 1897b: 74) via Wang and Zhou (1903: 249). Unlike the sentences preceding it here, this sentence is about Plato in the original, where it is modified from a sentence in Ingram (1888: 14).

¹⁵⁹ {Translator's note.} This sentence comes from Fouillée (1879: 134), via the translation by the Guomin congshu she (1903: 11) of Nakae (1885: 429–30). The word (*shiren* 士人) rendered here as "men of state" is "citizens" in Fouillée's original, but Nakae renders Fouillée's term as *kokushi* 國士, which has a more narrow meaning in Japanese than just "citizen," and then follows it with 士人. It is unclear exactly how the Chinese translator (or Wang Shunan) understands the wording, but given that background, I have rendered it more in line with what Nakae's text suggests.

This is what is meant by the saying that "Customs move people, and even the worthy are not immune."¹⁶⁰ This [practice] is the worst among what is most unbenevolent.

160 {Translator's note.} Versions of this saying go back to ancient times, but the particular variant that Wang quotes here appears to originate in the postface of the *Zhong Xi jishi* 中西紀事 of Xia Jie 夏燮 (1800–1875), which was first published in 1865, though it is unclear whether Wang read that particular edition or a reprint. The sentiment he expresses is an echo of what one sees in Tajima (1897a: appendix 10, and 1897b: 78) and in the translation in Wang and Zhou (1903: 250), but with a much more poignant twist.

REFERENCES

- Abe, Toranosuke 阿部 虎之助, tr. 1896. *Tetsuri keizaigakushi* 哲理經濟學史. Tokyo: Keizai Zasshisha 經濟雜誌社. (Accessed at: <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/en/pid/799484>)
- Ai, Yuese 艾約瑟 (Joseph Edkins), tr. 1886. *Xila zhiliie* 希臘志畧, in *Xixue qimeng shiliuzhong* 西學啓蒙十六種, ed. Hede 赫德 (Robert Hart). Shanghai: Zong shuiwu sishu 總稅務司署.
- Alleyne, Sarah Frances, and Alfred Goodwin, tr. 1888. *Plato and the Older Academy*. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=i8AYAAAAIAAJ>)
- Chen, Peng 陳鵬, and Meng Qi 孟起, tr. 1902. *Lixue gouxuan* 理學鉤玄. Shanghai: Guangzhi shuju 廣智書局. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.c087421854>)
- Chen, Peng 陳鵬, tr. 1903. *Xila san da zhexuejia xueshuo* 希臘三大哲學家學說. Shanghai: Guangzhi shuju 廣智書局. [Reprint in Chen Jianhua 陳建華, ed. 2015. *Guangzhou Dadian* 廣州大典, vol. 393. Guangzhou shi: Guangzhou chubanshe 廣州出版社.
- Cocker, Benjamin F. 1877. *Handbook of Philosophy: Notes of Lectures Delivered at Michigan University During 1876–7*. Ann Arbor: Courier Steam Printing House. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=1zziAAAAMAAJ>)
- Dai, Liangzuo 戴良佐. 2001. *Jindai fangzhimingjia Wang Shunan* 近代方志明家王樹楠. *Xinjiang difangzhi* 新疆地方志 1: 62–63.
- Emerson, Ralph Waldo. 1850. *Representative Men: Seven Lectures*. London: John Chapman.
- Fanyi shijie* 翻譯世界, tr. 1902. *Zhexueshi (xu)* 哲學史(續), in *Fanyi shijie* 翻譯世界 2: 23–41.
- Fouillée, Alfred. 1879. *Histoire de la philosophie*, 2nd ed. Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave.
- Fyffe, Charles Alan. 1875. *History of Greece*. London: Macmillan. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=HfsKAAAAYAAJ>)
- Guomin congshu she 國民叢書社, tr. 1903. *Shi da zhexuejia* 十大哲學家. Ningbo: Jigengzhai fenzhuang 汲綆齋分莊. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/nnc1.cu51355531>)
- Huang, Jiande 黃見德. 2006. *Xifang zhexue dongjianshi* 西方哲學東漸史. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe 人民出版社.

- Huang, Zuoting 黄佐廷, and Zhang Zaixin 張在新, tr. 1905. *Mai'er tongshi* 邁爾通史 (*A General History for Colleges and High-Schools*). Shanghai: Huamei shuju 華美書局. (Accessed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:NLC416-17jh003242-110139_邁爾通史.pdf)
- Hutton, Eric, tr. 2014. *Xunzi: The Complete Text*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Ingram, John Kells. 1888. *A History of Political Economy*. Edinburgh: Adam & Charles Black. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=DWNHAAAAYAAJ>)
- Inoue, Enryō 井上 円了. 1886. *Tetsugaku yōryō* 哲學要領. Tokyo: Reichikai 令知會. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=zuEYAAAAYAAJ>)
- Inoue, Tetsujirō 井上哲次郎. 1883. *Seiyō tetsugaku kōgi* 西洋哲学講義, v. (卷) 3. Tokyo: Sakagami Hanshichi 阪上半七. (Accessed at: <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/752844>)
- Kanie, Yoshimaru 蟹江義丸. 1899. *Seiyō tetsugakushi* 西洋哲学史. Hakubunkan 博文館. (Accessed at: <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/pid/752848/1/1>)
- Lau, D.C., and F.C. Chen, eds. 1992. *A Concordance to the Liji* 禮記逐字索引. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press. (Cited as *Liji*, HKCS)
- Lau, D.C., and F.C. Chen, eds. 1994. *A Concordance to the Zhouli* 周禮逐字索引. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press. (Cited as *Zhouli*, HKCS)
- Lau, D.C., and F.C. Chen, eds. 1995a. *A Concordance to the Shangshu* 尚書逐字索引. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press. (Cited as *Shangshu*, HKCS)
- Lau, D.C., and F.C. Chen, eds. 1995b. *A Concordance to the Zhouyi* 周易逐字索引. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press. (Cited as *Zhouyi*, HKCS)
- Lau, D.C., and F.C. Chen, eds. 2000. *A Concordance to the Han Feizi* 韓非子逐字索引. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press. (Cited as *Han Feizi*, HKCS)
- Lewes, George Henry. 1867. *The History of Philosophy from Thales to Comte*, 3rd. ed, vol. 1. London: Longman, Greens, and Co. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.31822019462175>)
- Liang, Qichao 梁啟超, tr. 1902. *Shengjixue (ji pingzhunxue) xueshuo yange xiaoshi* 生計學(即平準學) 學說沿革小史, in *Xinmin congbao* 新民叢報 7, 1–18. (Accessed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:NLC404-01J000591-11949_新民叢報_1902年7期.pdf)
- Liu, Chen 刘晨. 2023. "Meiyu" yijiekao: yi Liu Kun keju zhujian wei xiansuo "美育"译介考: 以刘焜科举朱卷为线索, *Meiyu xuekan* 美育学刊 14(4): 1–11.

- Lu, Jiuyuan. 1823. *Lu Xiangshan quanji* 陸象山全集. Jinxi huaitang shuwu 金谿槐堂書屋. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/hvd.32044067872291>)
- Luo, Boya 羅伯雅, tr. 1902. *Zhexue yaoling* 哲學要領. Shanghai: Guangzhi shuju 廣智書局. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uc1.c087421845>)
- Luo, Dawei 羅大維, tr. 1903. *Wanguo zongjiao zhi* 萬國宗教志. Shanghai: Jingjin shuju 鏡今書局. (Accessed at: https://commons.m.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SSID-13005753_萬國宗教志.pdf)
- Macaulay, Thomas Babington. 1876. "Critical, Historical, and Miscellaneous Essays," vol. 3. New York: Albert Mason. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=kzg7AQAAMAAJ>)
- Malin 馬林 (Macklin, William Edward), and Li Yushu 李玉書, tr. 1901. *Peigen xinxue gezhi lun* 培根新學格致論. In *Wanguo gongbao* 萬國公報 vol. 13, no. 7 (August 15, 1901): 10a–16a. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015067989882>)
- Morris, George S., tr. 1871. *History of Philosophy: From Thales to the Present Time*, vol. 1. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=rT7r4fUuuNUC>)
- Nakae, Chōmin 中江 兆民, tr. 1885. *Rigaku enkakushi* 理学沿革史. Tokyo: Monbushō henshūkyoku 文部省編輯局. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/753031>)
- Nakae, Chōmin 中江 兆民, 1886. *Rigaku kōgen* 理學鉤玄. Tokyo: Shūseisha 集成社. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/753033>)
- Nakajima, Rikizō 中島 力造. 1898. *Retsudentai Seiyō tetsugaku shōshi* 列伝体西洋哲学小史. Tokyo: Fuzanbō 富山房. (Accessed at: <https://dl.ndl.go.jp/en/pid/753039/1/50>)
- Nishimura, Tengai 西村 天外. 1890. *Wakan taisei kokon gakusha retsuden* 和漢泰西古今学者列伝. Tokyo: 弘文館 Kōbunkan. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/777069>)
- Nōse, Sakae 能勢 榮. 1893. *Naigai Kyōikushi* 内外教育史. Tokyo: Kinkōdō 金港堂. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/809544>)
- Ouyang, Hong 欧阳红, ed. 2007. *Taolu laoren suinianlu / nanwu shuwen* 陶庐老人随年录/南屋述闻. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中华书局.
- Price, Don. 1974. *Russia and the Roots of the Chinese Revolution, 1896–1911*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Richard, Timothy 李提摩太, tr. 1898. *Diqiu yibaimingren zhuan* 地球一百名人傳 (*The World's Hundred Famous Men*). Shanghai: Society for the Diffusion of Christian and General Knowledge.

- Richard, Timothy 李提摩太, tr. 1899. *Xinglixue liezhuan xiaoxu* 性理學列傳小序. In *Wanguo gongbao* 萬國公報 vol. 11, no. 8 (September 15, 1899): 12b–14a. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/mdp.39015067989908>)
- Ritchie, D.G., et al., tr. 1895. *The Theory of the State*. Oxford: Clarendon. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/uiug.30112002108105>)
- Rong, Mengyuan 榮孟原. 1953. *Zhongguo jindaishi libiao* 中國近代史歷表. Beijing: Sanlian shudian 三聯書店.
- Shanxi gongli tushuguan 山西公立圖書館. 1933. *Shanxi gongli tushuguan mulu chubian* 山西公立圖書館目錄初編. Taiyuan 太原: Shanxi gongli tushuguan 山西公立圖書館. (Accessed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SSID-12545029_山西公立圖書館目錄初編.pdf)
- Slingerland, Edward, tr. 2003. *Confucius: Analects, with Selections from Traditional Commentaries*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Spalatin, Christopher. 1975. "Matteo Ricci's Use of Epictetus' *Encheiridion*." *Gregorianum* 56 (3): 551–57.
- Sun, Xingyan 孫星衍, ed. (1832) 1909. *Qincao* 琴操. Tokyo: Shōzandō 松山堂. (Accessed at: <https://ndl.go.jp/pid/899026>)
- Tajima, Kinji 田島 錦治. 1897a. *Keizaigaku* 經濟學. Tokyo: Tōkyō Hōgakuin 東京法學院. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/799055>)
- Tajima, Kinji 田島 錦治. 1897b. *Saikin keizairon* 最近經濟論. Tokyo: Yuhikaku 有斐閣. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/799380>)
- Uchiyama, Shōnyo, 内山 正如. 1891. *Bankoku shūkyō taii* 萬國宗教大意. Tokyo: Hakubunkan 博文館. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/815011>)
- Ukita, Kazutani 浮田 和民. 1900. *Seijigakushi* 政治學史. Tokyo: Waseda daigaku shuppanbu 早稻田大學出版部. (Accessed at: <https://lab.ndl.go.jp/dl/book/1082523>)
- Van Heusde, Philip Willem. 1831. *Initia philosophiae platonicae*, v. 2, par. 2. Trajecti ad Rhenum, apud Joannem Altheer. (Accessed at: <https://books.google.com/books?id=gsEAAAAAYAAJ>)
- Wang, Hui'an 王会安. 1983. *Wang Shunan zhuanlüe* 王树枏传略. *Xinjiang difangzhi* 新疆地方志 2: 35–37.
- Wang, Lan 王闌, and Zhou Liu 周流, eds. 1903. *Taixi xue'an* 泰西學案. Shanghai: Mingquan she. (Accessed at: <https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/Category:泰西學案>)

- Williamson, Alexander 韋廉臣. 1877. *Xu Xilini yuanliu beikao* 續希利尼原流備考. In *Wanguo gongbao* 萬國公報 vol. 10, no. 455 (September 15, 1877): 57a–57b.
- Wood, Wallace, ed. 1885. *The Hundred Greatest Men*. New York: D. Appleton and Company. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/chi.57801173>)
- Wu, Xianshu 吳獻書, tr. 1920. *Bolatu zhi Lixiangguo* 柏拉圖之理想國. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan 商務印書館.
- Yan, Fu 嚴復. 1898. *Tiyanan lun* 天演論. Mianyang 沔陽: Shenshi jizhai 慎始基齋. Reprint in Wang Shi 王弼, ed. 1986. *Yan Fu ji* 嚴復集, v. 5. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中华书局. (Accessed at: <https://archive.org/details/2-1986-80411018>)
- Ye, Han 葉瀚, tr. 1901. *Taixi jiaoyushi* 泰西教育史. Shanghai: Jinsuzhai 金粟齋.
- Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編, tr. 1903a. *Zhengzhi xueshuo* 政治學說, in *Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編 4 (February 12): 1–4. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/c00.31924012784165>)
- Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編, tr. 1903b. *Zhengzhi xueshuo (xuqian)* 政治學說(續前), in *Youxue yibian* 遊學譯編 5 (March 13): 5–9. (Accessed at: <https://hdl.handle.net/2027/c00.31924093051120>)
- Yuan, Peng 袁鵬. 2011. *Bolatu zai jindai Zhongguo de chuanbo* 柏拉圖在近代中國的傳播. MA thesis, Peking University.
- Zhang, Han 章韓, tr. 1903. *Xiyang shanggu zhhexueshi* 西洋上古哲學史. Tokyo: Genshinsha 元真社.
- Zhao, Shaofeng 趙少峰. 2014. *Guangxuehui yu wan Qing xishidongjian* 廣學會與晚清西史東漸. *Shixueshi yanjiu* 史學史研究 154 (2): 44–54.
- Zhejiang shengli tushuguan 浙江省立圖書館. 1935. *Zhejiang shengli tushuguan tushu zongmu: ZhongRiwen shu diyiji* 浙江省立圖書館圖書總目:中日文書第一輯, vol. 1. Hangzhou: Zhejiang shengli tushuguan 浙江省立圖書館. (Accessed at: https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:SSID-11257058_浙江省立圖書館圖書總目_中日文書第1輯_上.pdf)
- Zhou, Weihuan 周維翰. 1901. *Xishi gangmu* 西史綱目. Publisher unknown. (Accessed at: <https://babel.hathitrust.org/cgi/pt?id=mdp.39015031901468&seq=1>)
- Zuoxin she 作新社, tr. 1903. *Zuijin jingjixue* 最近經濟學. Shanghai: Zuoxin she 作新社. (Accessed at: https://commons.m.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:NLC416-01jh003174-11966_最新經濟學.pdf)

APPENDIX: THE CHINESE TEXT OF THE PLATO SECTION OF WANG SHUNAN'S
*XILA XUE'AN*希臘學案·百拉多¹⁶¹

王樹枏著

§1

百拉多，一作浦賴透。一作百拉圖。一作雅里大吉。一作拉的。一作弗拉的。雅典梭倫之後。西元前四百二十七年生於哀基那。一作愛奇納。父曰亞利士董。母曰伯利格星。或稱潘耐。百拉多生而狀魁梧，膂力兼人。少習武事，精體操。擊刺、超距、搏躍之技冠其曹。初從其祖名稱亞利士多格拉。後其師字之曰百拉多。譯言大膊也。百拉多生長富貴之家。然折節為學能詩歌，兼攻米勒都、意大利、伊利亞諸哲學。好比撒臥拉斯、黑拉克利底、安那薩哥拉諸家之說，專以任己天職為務。年二十聞索克拉的之道，遂從之游會。有軍事戰而勝凱旋授之官。與俗吏處，鄙其狡獪，棄官而歸事索克拉的十年。師死，為訟冤國人疾之，而守其師說益篤以堅。復謁于吉立於梅革拉，訪提約多囉於西齊里，得其師微言秘旨，既游埃及古利奈，走意大利，盡交其賢豪長者。還雅典潛招有志之士以哲學數理教授之。三百八十八年再游西齊里，以生平政策干敘拉古斯但英第一，一作台翁叔士第一。怒其謗訕無理，送之斯巴達，其大使潘利士一作頗黎士。奉王旨鬻於哀基那為奴。主人恩尼吉利士什匿克學中人也，知其為雅典大儒，釋之還國。三百六十八年但英第二繼為敘拉古斯王，遣使厚幣招之。以與王義弟不和，說不果行，有為比撒臥拉斯學派者曰亞爾可達士助之貲，始歸雅典。三百六十一年復至敘拉古斯。其政策仍不獲施，始絕志不復出。居亞克特美園，一作阿加達米耶。一作阿蛤地美。設講幄。園距城三

¹⁶¹ This text is based on a digitized OCR version available on Ctext.org, which I have corrected according to the superior edition of the text available at HathiTrust.org. Smaller characters in green represent interlinear notes in the original. All punctuation here is my own. Section numbering has been added to match the sections in the translation.

里。不受人修脯。學者擔簦負糧走數千里從之。其教人，重在法。得其法，自能知所未知。及門之士不肯用苦心者則拒而不納。標其塾門曰：「非知形學者不可入吾室也。」後人重之，即以其園為學號。著作繁富奧衍，多稱師說，雜出己意。其文作主客問答體，答者索克拉的也。至今歐洲言古學者必稱索百。三百四十八年卒。年八十。《希臘春秋》作卒年八十三，誤。世稱希臘七賢之一。百拉多平生不娶妻無嗣，不入城市，不履戲場，惟孜孜以講學為事。後西諺云愁如百拉多矣。百拉多負衡人鑒品第精當。後人操月旦者珍視其書若採金之礦穴。初希臘沿巴比倫法分一日為十二時。百拉多始創滴漏之法。是為西方滴漏定時之始。百拉多雖創滴漏之法，然平民則分日為七分，晝四夜三。日之四分，一為黎明，一為上午，一為日中，一為日晡。夜之三分，一為燈時，一為半夜，一為將曉。

樹柎案：百拉多哲學大興於埃及都城，歷一千年之久。再閱千年，歐洲之人惟天主教是從，無講哲學者。至明時土耳其據羅馬都城，希臘名士多遷往歐西各國。於是哲學再興而皆以百拉多之說為本。歐人謂地球古今名人之著者十人，百拉多必與其列。其學如金星在天庭之中心普照大宇。諸國之奉為師者二千餘年不絕也。美國大儒艾深默曰：「百拉多即理學。理學即百拉多。」蓋言歷代之言理學者無能出其範圍也。今案：百氏雖篤信其師索克拉的之說，然損益而補正之者則較其師說猶為完備。索氏有概念論。氏則因之而創為觀念論。索氏有知德合一論。氏則因之而創為倫理學及政治學。至所論之人間學、物理學，則猶索氏所未嘗道者。哲學思想之宏深偉大。荀子所謂「青勝於藍，冰寒於水」者也。

§2

百拉多著述宏富。傳於今者曰亞爾雪伯台第一。曰亞爾雪伯台第二。曰恩端拉士推。曰哀浦羅茄。曰雀密台。曰葛力多封。曰康維奉。曰柯勒推拉。曰柯力戴。曰柯力圖。曰愛畢腦密。曰歐塞台麥。曰歐塞弗龍。曰高茄。曰喀色鳩。曰喀霸大。曰喀霸小。曰宥何。曰賴克。曰拉葛。曰來雪。曰曼耐芝納。曰曼那。曰密腦。曰巴麥尼台。曰彼沱。曰彼特勒。曰非拉伯。曰潘力的克。曰柏羅推哥拉。曰來伯勃力駕。一作賴保利克。共和國之意。曰梭非士太。曰塞奇。曰才脫德。曰鐵馬何。此外復有尺牘十三通、或云十八通。問答書七種恐非真作也。

樹柎案：以上所傳百氏所著之書真偽異同古今辨者甚多。中島力造哲學史云英人郭羅德謂今所傳者皆為真書，並無偽作。德國學者蕭杞密德謂氏之真書惟彼特勒、柏羅推哥拉、康維奉、高茹、來伯勃力駕、鐵馬何、才脫德、彼沱、拉葛九種而已。溫德耳盆沱則以哀浦羅茄、彼沱、歐塞弗龍、來雪、賴克、雀蜜台、喀霸小、亞爾雪伯台第一、柏羅推哥拉、高茹、歐塞台麥、柯勒推拉、曼那、才脫德、彼特勒、康維奉、非拉伯、來伯勃力駕、鐵馬何、拉葛、柯力戴為真書。柴拉則以來伯勃力駕、鐵馬何、拉葛、彼沱、高茹、喀霸、才脫德、柏拉推哥拉為真書。以上所定由其論旨及文體考之。且亞拉斯德書中多引以為考證者，是可信也。又有以梭非士太、潘力的克、非拉伯、曼那、來雪、雀密台、賴克、柯勒推拉、歐塞台麥、巴麥尼台、歐塞弗龍、喀霸小、柯力戴、哀浦羅茄、柯力圖為真書者亦近是也。宥伯偉曰：百拉多書之真偽，應於亞拉斯德所引用者論定之。其最確者為來伯勃力駕、鐵馬何、拉葛三書。亞拉斯德明言為百氏之著作而引用之者也。次則彼沱、康維奉、彼特勒、高茹四書。其名見於亞拉斯德書中。雖未明言為百氏之作而已暗示之。次則曼那、喀霸小、曼刪芝納三書亦見於亞拉斯德書中而未言為誰氏之作。次又引用才脫德、非拉伯之語而未言及書名。又次類似梭非士太之論肯雖有所暗示以為百氏之口述殆為教弟子而引用之者也。又潘力的兒、哀浦羅茄、來雪、賴克、及疑柏羅哥拉之諸書，亞拉斯德並其書其人而暗示之。歐塞台麥及柯勒推拉證據亦同。以上言人人殊，甚難判定。然斯學專門輩出考究百氏之學說而定其為真書者曰高茹。曰彼特勒。曰彼沱。曰才脫德。曰來伯勃力駕。曰鐵馬何。考百氏書之傳於今皆五十年間所筆記。其書意見各異，前後不同，何者為百氏之真書，何書為何時所著，均無確證。故其哲學上之確說亦不能定也。

§ 3

百拉多之哲學分為三部。曰論理學，即觀念論。曰物理學。曰倫理學。索克拉克之概念論以概念為真正智識。百氏則曰概念者由於事物而後成就。為根本之實在，是名觀念。蓋百氏常究心巴門義兌之學，深明感覺與對象之理。故以觀念之實在為認識理性之可能性。人之感覺變化無常，而所謂不雜他物、永遠不變之實在則非感官所能把捉。當賴理性一一認識，積一

切個物以漸次達於無極現象之目的。故個物者決不能為觀念。既名觀念當是常住而無變化，謂之永劫之型，謂之真正之實在。其數無量。如是觀念乃以普遍概念為實在之形而上學。凡構成普遍之概念者無不有相當之觀念。非惟實體有是觀念，性質能力亦復如是。非惟自然物有是觀念，而製造物亦復如是。非惟貴重物有是觀念，而污賤物亦復如是。百氏晚年謂觀念最高等者是名為善，一切實在、一切思維，皆以善之觀念為目的云。

樹枏案：井上圓了云百氏因索克拉的之智德本源以定心界之理想而更起一種之說者也。百氏分人智之本源為感覺、總念、理想三種。感覺者自外物之實驗而來。總念者因萬覺而生。獨理想之本體則本來不生不滅，非因感覺經驗而來者。感覺者，人人差異。理想則一理平等，人人所有，無不相同也。且從感覺所生之理念可從心內除出，而本內所有之理想不能滅絕，所謂常住不變者也。故理想者為諸學諸想之基礎，而感總者不過基表象一部分也。蓋百氏言人智之本源全在理想，其理想之本體名之曰神。因此理而說論理、物理、倫理之三學。論理學者，論理想之本質。物理學者，論萬物上所及之作用。倫理學者，論人心所及之關係也。案：理想即觀念。蓋開後世唯心一派而乏客觀之考證者也。

§ 4

又曰吾人五官之感觸特知物之粗迹。至於物之本質，非窮究無以知之。何也？凡五官之所感觸者終不外世界之幻相。今有一地窖焉，積罪人若干，繫縛其中，相向團坐，外間之日光不得入也。久之，外間之光由隙而入。於是黑暗之中微露幻影。罪人等見之，徐徐焉，于于焉，稍能分別物之大小異同，而試問之曰：「某物係何質所成？某物可作何等材料？」而罪人不知也。此吾人在斯世觀物之景狀也。所謂地窖者，世界也。幻影者，庶物也。火光者，太陽也。而常人之認幻影以為真實相有如此者。此吾人六根所得之學識也。

樹枏案：百氏為學之要，重在思。謂思非偶然而有，即上帝示人之式也。先有式而後有思。思者，實理。其餘皆虛物。即不虛，亦不過思之骨幹耳。其說頗與釋教相出入。孔子曰：「學而不思則罔。思而不學則殆。」其斯為執中而無頗者與？

§ 5

百氏採用索克拉的之歸納推論法，且發明分解法、總合法、概括法、彙類法。用之以為哲學上之研究，分解法者分全部小部。一一檢點之以確定全部之觀念。總合法者推究各小部分而合之，得全體觀念之法。概括法者異中認同。彙類法者同中求異。以此研究真理，終組成哲學之全系。故認識是等觀念之法，氏名之為辨證法，所以言其順序也。

樹柎案：百氏之論理用總合法。亞拉斯德則用分析法。百氏以觀念照合原理，判斷事物之真偽。亞氏則就一事一物而點檢之，以發見其原理。百氏自抽象而下及於實物。亞氏則自實物而上及於抽象。蓋百氏用主觀法。亞氏用客觀法也。古代哲學大半偏執於主觀之一法，自亞氏始出而補正之。

§ 6

時人有聚訟萬物有定無定而不決者。百氏曰：「試置物於此。或圓或方，形無定也。或黑或白，色無定也。然形色無定而著其形形色色之象以反照於心者則有定。」但恐智慧無定則不能必物之皆有定耳。

樹柎案：百氏謂萬物皆有一真者在焉。凡人目之所能見者皆幻也。人必盡取其目前可見之幻，以求其不可見之真。其為學大旨如此。

§ 7

其物理學曰：觀念唯一者也。個物數多者也。觀念永劫不變。個物時時生滅變化不可思議。觀念純粹。個物駁雜。觀念有完全之實在。個物存於實在非實在之間。此其辨也。夫個物者，觀念與物質結合而成者也。物質無有定限，變化無常，非實在，非理性。觀念與物質，其性質全相反，不能直接以相結合。其中有傳二者之作用者，名曰世界精神。世界精神有運動能力，統攝一切現象及一切生命。凡現象之有秩序者即人之理性所由立也。是故世界精神位於觀念與現象界之中，為界限云。世界有種種生物，最傑出者是為人類。非植動諸物比也。人

類自世界精神而生。其本質與世界精神同一，因於無形以起一種之能力而為身體運動。及精神於生命之觀念，是觀念者永永存在，無始無終，一切眾生自高等世界降為肉體。其人純粹無疵則身後當復還居高等世界。其不純粹者則墮落入於人體或動物體。吾人於過去後常生種種思維，蓋現世之所接觸而為觀念者皆為過去之所經驗，因記憶力而為回想，是為百氏之記憶說也。

§ 8

神者作萬有心靈，由三種之異原素而成。一為不得分解之單純性。二為不能變化之物而分解之而變化之。三為存於前此兩者之間者。神以此三者作萬有心靈，而配分於宇宙之全體。其後由楔形之原素以作土，由金字塔形之原素以造火。由二十面之原素以生水，由八面之原素以造空氣。而人類之精神亦若萬有心靈之世界精神由三原素而成。精神之位列於頭部。人類精神之中有不得分解之原素，為人之感性機關。存於此二者之間之原素為膽力之器具。人之精神三能力：曰膽力，曰情欲，曰理性。前二者屬於感性。後一者屬於心靈。屬於心靈之理性，生於人生之前世界，是為不朽之物。感性為現世相而有生死。理性之對象是名觀念。感性之客體，是為事物。此百氏世界觀之大意也。

§ 9

其倫理學以形而上及人間學為基礎。以為吾人精神，由其本質論之，則屬於超感性之世界。人生而為善者乃得上昇於超感性世界。身體者精神之牢獄也，為一切欲望、一切能力之障礙。故人生必藉德智與神合一。以不害精神之發達為限，不必排斥肉慾，惟當節制快樂痛苦而已，幸福之必然限制在於精神之與道德。我無禮於人，其恥甚於人之以無禮加我。犯過失而不受罰，其恥甚於罰也。蓋二者皆失精神之平和，故不能有幸福。

§ 10

人類之精神以至善為目的。蓋精神備諸種之能力者也。其能力作用適不適之原因起於人之德不德。欲判別精神之真偽，須兼智力，謂之智力備。智力與目的相適則生聰明之德。又人之

精神為勇所以備膽力也，謂之膽力備。故勇氣足以起德。更有由情欲備者。情欲不失其度則生節制之德。故智者理性之德，為精神之君以統攝諸能力。勇者感情之德，服從於理性之命令以與快樂痛苦相戰。節制者情欲之德，亦服從理性之命令以制御其感情能力。各守其職而調和，此三者之間則為公正之德。公正者對於至善之神，故又起敬虔之德。凡此諸德皆發於人之天性。故吾人須黽勉以赴其目的而已。此百氏之倫理說也。

樹柅案：百拉多調和小索克拉的之三教以執其中。絕嗜欲，祛妄偽，以冥合於天神，內而不蔽於慾，外而不染於物，不流於無度之快樂，不偏於克己之修行，冲漠希夷，出塵絕俗，反本然之性以達其理想。此其目的也。其倫理學由索氏之說而進於觀念論，使倫理獨立為科學，氏之功為多。唯宇宙形質論往往混以神語，多有牴牾者。至所謂世界之原理為善而有一定目的，則不易之論也。

§ 11

百氏善言天人之際。謂上帝是無始無終之主宰。其智慧無窮，其能力無盡，以至強不息創造萬物。本來之善興，後來之惡相與為敵。譬如苗之有莠，芸其莠者而去之，而苗乃益茂也。人之靈魂發而為聰明，人之聰明運向為能力，人一小天地，與上帝一體者也。上帝以仁人心畀之。人人當完仁人心，充仁人量，以還之上帝，否則非上帝人也。

§ 12

百氏謂神之創造世界，凡其可以至於至善者皆已盡之。假令於此世界之外又有一世界亦必不能出於此世界之上者。且所謂害惡者，乃所以致福利之途。此未足為神咎也。

樹柅案：有神無神之說，後世學者言人人殊，不知神道設教其力最大而其化最神。地球上之諸國無論其政治禮俗何若，莫不以此為開化之先。蓋人人心中皆有此意象。故學者因而主張之以為勸善懲惡之助，而齊一宗教保持道德，莫不以此為範焉。

§13

百氏嘗言精神之愛比軀殼之愛所產生為更大。其間輕重不可同日而語。何以言之？如人之軀殼雖有產生，生時則榮歿時已焉。若精神之所產生，可以垂美名於千載。故吾人之學問事功要在使氣魄絕大千古如生，固不啻永遺賢嗣也。

§14

其論教育之宗旨曰：教育者所以使人之身心隨其資質高下各至於美備之法也。又以興味誘導生徒之心，使樂於成就之巧法也。但專用誘導者亦有流弊。故為父者不可姑息，宜令小兒嘗試艱苦。專投小兒之好乃害小兒之道也。

樹枏案：以興味誘生徒之法，今日教育家皆主此義，而姑息之弊，實所不免。

孔子曰：「愛之能勿勞乎？」韓非子曰：「慈母有敗子。」然則百氏之言為不可易也。

§15

氏於教育之法重體操與音樂。其於智育則令習算術幾何天文修辭哲學等以磨淬其高深之智力。於德育則說神親國法之當尊敬。大抵以宗教之感應養人倫之道德，而美術猶要。人之靈魂從美而進乎善也。善與美者同一觀念。是故美術有大勢力，乃能誘起一切感情。隸於哲學而為教育之輔。詩歌音樂皆當改正，受政府監督而禁其不正者為社會道德之基。此其教育之大意也。

樹枏案：百氏教術與三代畧同。《周禮》大司徒以六藝教萬民，禮樂即德育之事，書數即智育之事，射御即體育之事，而化民成俗猶以禮樂為本。百氏可謂深明其故者矣。今日歐洲諸國學校教人之法皆擴張百氏之說者也

§ 16

百氏謂欲養成人物，因論理想上之教育。夫理想上之教育，凡不合真理之事皆不以為教。雖歷史有出於真理外者，亦擯斥之。是即氏之所謂與關於觀念之知識不可無目的之說也。然事有非個人所能為者，則國家宜設法律以促之。其為主權者抑為軍人者皆不可不以其人之天性而教之以適於處身涉世之的。

樹枏案：此後世國民強迫教育之所由立也。

§ 17

其政治學與其倫理學有密接之關係。蓋以倫理為主，政治為從。人當先修其身而後及於國家。國家當以國人之德育為先。一切之德皆以哲學為之基礎。故欲構成完全之國，必令哲學者操主權以行政治一切。人民不能哲學則不可使得參政之權以阻害國政。然哲學之人，世不多覩，故完全之國不可不由寡頭政體而進化。又所以保持國家防禦外侮者軍人是也。下此農工商賈乃被治者，不能參政。故國中有三階級：一，治者；二，軍人之佐治者；三，被治者。是可比於精神之三能力焉。治者為理性，軍人為感情，被治者為欲望。治者之主德為智。軍人之主德為勇。被治者之主德為節制。國家欲國民各盡其職，不可不施之以教育。政府當選身體精神相等之男女而昏配之。其舉子也，教之以音樂及體操之術，以養成軍人，更授以數學及辨證論，使可以有治人之資格，年至十五始令參與國家之政治。

樹枏案：國民天演之事由分而之合，由駁而之純。自洪荒開闢以後合總總不齊之眾以成為一羣。其傑出者遂出而為一羣之酋。於是國民始分而主治與受治、能制與所制者，判然而不能相合。演之既久而事使之分益著，君民之誼益明。其政治之權又復遞析迭分釐為百工不相侵越。蓋民之分由於民之駁，而天演之淺深層累實默為轉運於其間。當民德民品演進之程未足與於高深之故而驟欲使之參政權、謀國事，非徒無益而弊且隨之。吾觀希臘日言民政而上下搶攘沸亂，適足為強宗霸主竊奪之資。百氏有鑒於此，故釐國民為三級，先即其駁者而分

之，而後以教育之術變易民心，以為由分而合，由駁而純之地。此蓋天演自然之公例，而非有所左右於其間也。

§ 18

又曰國家能善保其綱紀與個人相似。凡個人傷其一指則全身知痛。國家亦然，故個人小國家也。國家大個人也。

樹柅案：後世伯倫知理等唱國家有機體之說，其濫觴則自百氏發之也。

§ 19

氏之法律論以家長政治為國家之起原，而其論社會之開始則歸於經濟上之分業。其說曰：人之所需者千種萬類。一人之力必不能應其所求。於是協力合作，於無數公共職業之中，執其一業。故社會起焉而其所謂公共必需之職業則僅分四種：一，農夫；二，泥水工；三，縫人；四，履人。農夫之所耕不僅足供一身之需，并三等人之食物而亦產焉。泥水工以造家產，縫人以治衣服，履人以造履具。皆四部其一人所需之物而供他人之用。如此則有三利焉。一：人各有能有不能。各職一業則能專其所長。二：人各職一業而不分務於他事則其所得結果必大。三：人時日可節省、機致可活潑則物產因之益多，因之完全而容易。而其分業之法則不任個人之自由，而待國家之裁制。且所謂分業不但行於經濟上，又可用之於政治。凡社會之組織宜根於個人之品性。故人不可不具此四德，所謂智勇節制公正是也。

樹柅案：論者謂百氏論分業之效與斯密亞丹同。斯氏以為人之天性概為平等。或為勞働者，或為哲學家。皆不外分業之結果，而不知其所以分業之原因，則百氏之說視斯氏為猶精也，孟子所謂勞心治人，勞力治於人，及通工易事以羨補不足之說，皆百氏義也。

§ 20

氏又以治人者與被治者之別、男與女之別，皆根於天然之差等，不可強之使平。人有三等。或為金性，或為銀性，或為鐵性。而鑑別其性以使之各職其業則治人者之責任也。治人者既因其天性而與以職業則其人宜終身從事於此，不可改圖。故有多才多藝出於眾人者，則為眾之害，宜放之於國外。俳優亦能擬種種人物，不適用於各職一業之法，亦宜逐而禁之。故其分業法不僅因各人之便益，於人格之發達亦所必需也。

樹柎案：荀子《富國篇》云：「百技所成，所以養一人也。而能不能兼技，人不能兼官。離居不相待則窮。羣而無分則爭。窮者患也。爭者禍也。救患除禍則莫若明分使羣矣。」此與百氏之說相類，但百氏謂人之多材多藝為眾人之害，則壓制國民，不得使有出眾之才，殊為偏執。又優人雖能效種種人物乃其所業當然。此亦何能為分業害乎？真謬見也。

§ 21

氏之理想以為財產妻子皆治人者之所共有也。國之小兒，生存之種子也。然父母或溺於私愛，或因子而貪利，或因子而好名，或偏愛其妻，皆社會之蝨賊。一國共財產則國無盜賊，警察裁判皆可廢而不用。一國共妻子，則私情偏愛之弊絕，而姦淫不興。故個人不得有財產，不得有妻子，皆歸於國家。於是國家檢查男女之性質而使之相婚。剛悍之女，配之以柔和之男。剛悍之男，妻之以柔和之女。剛柔相合以育良善之新國民則爭奪訟獄以及一切社會不平之事可以絕矣。其理想之國家如此。

樹柎案：百氏統一家族財產之說，其弟子亞拉斯德駁之，以為破小家族以建立大家族，非惟上古獠狽家族制度最簡之時，勢有不能，即使文明進步，皆能破除家族思想，亦不能破小家族而歸於統一也。蓋形質之統一，或為亂政之媒。精神之統一，斯則共和政體之上乘也。且財產既歸統一，人人用意竊謂必有他人任之。我可無庸致力。由是我不致力，人亦如我，徒開怨鬥荒廢之弊。不但無益於政，且有害於國家也。案：氏之理想，無一可行。王道不外人情，未有

拂乎人情而能立其國者。記曰「飲食男女，人之大欲存焉。」善立國者使人人各給其所欲，人人各遂其所生。斯上下相安於無事之天而國家自致。夫大同之盛顧亭林所謂積眾人之私以成天下之公是也。《禮運》言大同之治，「不獨親其親，不獨子其子」。蓋即孟子「老吾老以及人之老，幼吾幼以及人之幼」之義。故曰：「老有所終，壯有所用，幼有所長。矜寡孤獨廢疾者，皆有所養。男有分，女有歸。」此乃天下一家，中國一人之理想。非若百氏之共財產、共妻子之妄說也。後世奸人倡均財共產以啟大亂者史不絕書。若并妻子而亦共之則禮義廉恥掃地而盡。是率天下為禽獸矣。且男女婚姻必由國家強勢以配合之，非惟無此政體，亦失男女自由之性矣。「天何言哉？四時行焉。百物生焉。」氤氳化醞又何容心於其間也。況配合雖善其效有未必果應者。以瞽瞍父母之頑嚚而生舜之大聖，以舜與娥皇之賢淑而生商均之不才，則又何說也。以此迂疎之政策而欲見之施行宜為島主之所不容也。

§ 22

百氏又知其理想之國家難於實行。唯立法者以此理想為的則法律漸有益於人民。此理想國家可稱為賢者政治。實貴族政治之一種也。此種國家一墮落則成為富族政治。于時功名利欲之心起，人民重武術而事於剽竊，治者輕哲學而熱於政權，則國家又墮落而成為寡數政治。時則德義掃地，黃金握萬能之力，國生反對之二種。一為暴富者。一為極貧者。貧者犯罪日多，罹於形辟。富者奢侈無度，不事生業。於是下等社會起不平之憤而革命之禍生。遂成為民主政治。時則自由平等之說興。父子師弟主奴之制破而繼世者則為僭主制度。蓋因民制過度反動力生。遂至偽政治家篡國政權。極端之自由主義變為極端之奴隸主義，而政體之最惡者無過此矣。

樹枏案：希臘之世日言民政蝸蟾沸羹，歲無寧宇，而豪猾之徒卒至乘間竊國，易為代蘭得之制。生民之禍斯為烈矣。讀史者至今有餘痛焉。百氏生丁其際，故心構一大同之國家。雖知其說之難行而不惜苦口辱身以強聒不已者，蓋欲一挽當時之弊也。其所著法律諸書後雖稍趨切實，然猶欲制限田作之市民，禁止早婚之習俗，及政府監督農工商業諸議。蓋雖許有私財而實欲限制干涉之以求

平等也。戰國之時，中國儒者蒿目世變，皆各出其理想之國家，著書立說以燭天下。莊子之理想在以上古至德之治、玄同之化移易其民。其說頗與百氏大同之義相類，而荀子則在法後王、尊王制、定上下之等，明事使之義。其言曰：「分均則不偏，執齊則不壹，眾齊則不使。有天有地而上下有差。明王始立而處國有制。夫兩貴之不能相事，兩賤之不能相使，是天數也。執位齊而欲惡同，物不能澹則必爭。楊倞注云澹讀為贍，謂物不能足也。爭則必亂。亂則窮矣。先王惡其亂也，故制禮義以分之，使有貧富貴賤之等，足以相兼臨者。是養天下之本也。」其說蓋與百氏分民三等法律限制之論相近。東西諸國之理想多有不謀而合者。所謂此心同，此理同也。

§ 23

百氏既以國家之政治隨人民之品行而變更，又以為政治者世界最高之藝術也。蓋藝術之高下由其能便於他藝他術之能力而定。政治之為藝術即凡百藝術之目的也。其經畫國事又欲一國內之給能應一國內之求。嚴限國之領土，禁早婚，棄小兒以防人口之增加，蓋務求社會之分配財產日趨於均平也。

樹柎案：馬爾達謂萬類生生，皆用幾何級數。使滅亡之數不遠於所存，瞬息之間地球乃無隙地。此等識見與百氏皆不免野蠻殘酷之心。彼氏自謂上帝以仁人心畀之。人人當完仁人心、充仁人量，以還之上帝者。然則仁人之政策顧如此哉？

§ 24

百氏又謂邦國得享幸福，眾民之福非所問也。

樹柎案：百氏尊國而抑民，蓋當時豪族積習而不顧其說之不安也。亞拉斯德曰：邦國者眾民相合而成者也。舍眾民之福以求邦國之福，所謂福者果何在乎？如行專制之政能為邦國福則可使眾民供專制之犧牲乎？可陷眾民於深熱之水火乎？

百氏此論誠難索解矣。百氏又往往視邦國與家屬混而為一。夫邦國之本，出於家屬，是固然矣。但二者之性質不同，不可一概而論。家屬者以尊統卑，至不平等，父令子從，夫唱婦隨是也。若夫邦國則人人平等，而官吏之發號施令亦不過以平等之人蒞平等之人，非家屬之尊卑可比也。官吏之任其職有年歲之限制，非傳之無窮可比也。故或居君之位，或膺臣之職，或令或從，循環無定，即謂政府由民之委任可也。官吏即民之僕隸可也。何得以邦國與家屬混同為一乎？案：百氏主國權而亞氏主民政。二者方針互異。百氏蓋有鑒於當日民政紛更搶攘之變，憤激而為此言，而不知其政策之失也。《書》曰：「民為邦本。本固邦寧。」未有民不安而能安其國者，則亞氏之言為不可易也。但家國相通之故，亞氏猶未達一間耳。

§ 25

百氏又言吾之算法非欲人用之事物。事物迹也。藉此以求其精者焉。學以窮理為指歸，以法律為政策，以工藝為非治國之要圖。其友愛刻特嘗用量法造一機器。百氏戒之曰：「此工藝之事，非格致之事也。」

樹柸案：百氏之言格致頗與中國後世儒者相類。蓋彼之學務乎其大者，故形而下之器不屑致意，而不知道與器者不容偏廢也。

§ 26

百氏著經濟學，凡關於當時生活上之狀態皆縷記而詳述之。其於各種生業之中獨推崇農學，而製造與商業亦重視之。嘗考察貿易製造之狀態而研究其所以然之故，俾其日益發達，謂國家之保護全恃此二者以維持之也。其論貨幣性質也，謂物品交換貨幣即交易之媒介。物則因是而輸出。貨幣安足為國家之病哉？故與他國貿易極望其發達。遇外商必鄭重禮遇之曰：「彼等皆吾富國之具也。」判斷商人之訴訟必以和平迅速出之，務使不受冤抑，以為招徠之術。

樹柸案：希臘諸國當日多輕視商業而斯巴達猶施禁絕錮閉之術。蓋國未開通之

世，大半積習若此。百氏目擊其弊，故一一反之。論者謂經濟學之誕生實在西曆一千七百七十六年以斯密亞丹之原富是歲始顯於世也。不知天演之事物未有突然而生、無其因而有其果者。有人羣即有分業，有分業即有交易，有交易即有貨幣。其種種演進之象實為濫觴。斯密氏則其滙歸之瀛海也。

§ 27

百氏於奴隸制度直認許之曰：「所以使歲入之加增也。」此等奴隸宜待以嚴法，防其逃逸則施烙刑以為之識，而更以所得之利循環鬻買以增加其數。使之服役於貨財所從出，分少許以給之。士人則安坐以考究政治學術，不可使有營作以分其心也。

樹枏案：奴隸制度盛行於希臘。當時大儒若百拉多、亞拉斯德，皆以奴隸視同馬牛。所謂習俗移人，賢者不免也。此最不仁之甚者也。

All issues of *Sino-Platonic Papers* are accessible to readers at no charge via our website.

To see the complete catalog of *Sino-Platonic Papers*, visit

www.sino-platonic.org