

THE
"POLITICS" OF ARISTOTLE,

TRANSLATED INTO ENGLISH

WITH INTRODUCTION, MARGINAL ANALYSIS
ESSAYS, NOTES AND INDICES

BY

B. JOWETT, M.A.

MASTER OF BALLIOL COLLEGE

PROFESSOR OF GREEK IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
AND LECTURER IN THEOLOGY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF LEYDEN

1/2

VOL. I

CONTAINING THE INTRODUCTION AND TRANSLATION

Oxford

AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

1885

[All rights reserved]

Bekker numbers are the standard form of citing the works of Aristotle. 1252a (below) means that The Politics begins on p. 1252 of the Greek text of Aristotle's works, edited by German philologist August Bekker.

THE POLITICS.

BOOK I.

We are reminded

Ed.
Bekker,
1252 a.

EVERY state is a community of some kind, and every community is established with a view to some good ; for mankind always act in order to obtain that which they think good. But, if all communities aim at some good, the state or political community, which is the highest of all, and which embraces all the rest, aims, and in a greater degree than any other, at the highest good.

The state being the highest community aims at the highest good.

2 Now there is an erroneous opinion ^a that a statesman, king, householder, and master are the same, and that they differ, not in kind, but only in the number of their subjects. For example, the ruler over a few is called a master ; over more, the manager of a household ; over a still larger number, a statesman or king, as if there were no difference between a great household and a small state. The distinction which is made between the king and the statesman is as follows : When the government is personal, the ruler is a king ; when, according to the principles of the political science, the citizens rule and are ruled in turn, then he is called a statesman.

Plato treated the difference between household, royal, and political rule as a difference only of degree.

3 But all this is a mistake ; for governments differ in kind, as will be evident to any one who considers the matter according to the method ^b which has hitherto guided us. As in other departments of science, so in politics, the compound should always be resolved into the simple elements or least parts of the whole. We must

But it is really a difference in kind, as will be clear if we resolve the state into its elements.

^a Cp. Plato Politicus, 258 E foll.
VOL. I. B

^b Cp. c. 8. § 1.

1. 1. therefore look at the elements of which the state is composed, in order that we may see ^a in what they differ from one another, and whether any scientific distinction can be drawn between the different kinds of rule^a.

2. He who thus considers things in their first growth and origin, whether a state or anything else, will obtain the clearest view of them. In the first place (1) there

(1) Union of male and female.

must be a union of those who cannot exist without each other; for example, of male and female, that the race may continue; and this is a union which is formed, not of deliberate purpose, but because, in common with other animals and with plants, mankind have a natural desire to leave behind them an image of themselves.

(2) Of ruler and subject.

And (2) there must be a union of natural ruler and subject, that both may be preserved. For he who can foresee with his mind is by nature intended to be lord and master, and he who can work with his body is a subject, and by nature a slave; hence master and slave ³ have the same interest. Nature, however, has distinguished between the female and the slave. For she is not niggardly, like the smith who fashions the Delphian knife for many uses; she makes each thing for a single use, and every instrument is best made when intended for one and not for many uses. But among barbarians no distinction is made between women and slaves, because there is no natural ruler among them: they are a community of slaves, male and female. Wherefore the poets say,—

‘It is meet that Hellenes should rule over barbarians^b;’

as if they thought that the barbarian and the slave were by nature one.

The family the first stage of society.

Out of these two relationships between man and ⁵ woman, master and slave, the family first arises, and Hesiod is right when he says,—

‘First house and wife and an ox for the plough;’

^a Or, with Bernays, ‘how the different kinds of rule differ from one another, and generally whether any scientific result can be attained about each one of them.’

^b Eurip. Iphig. in Aulid. 1400.

^c Op. et Di. 405.

for the ox is the poor man's slave. The family is the association established by nature for the supply of men's every day wants, and the members of it are called by Charondas 'companions of the cupboard' [*ἄμοσιπῆρους*], and by Epimenides the Cretan, 'companions of the manger'^a [*ἄμοκάπους*]. But when several families are united, and the association aims at something more than the supply of daily needs, then comes into existence the village. And the most natural form of the village appears to be that of a colony from the family, composed of the children and grandchildren, who are said to be 'suckled with the same milk.' And this is the reason why Hellenic states were originally governed by kings; because the Hellenes were under royal rule before they came together, as the barbarians still are. Every family is ruled by the eldest, and therefore in the colonies of the family the kingly form of government prevailed because they were of the same blood. As Homer says [of the Cyclopes]:—

'Each one gives law to his children and to his wives^b.'

For they lived dispersedly, as was the manner in ancient times. Wherefore men say that the Gods have a king, because they themselves either are or were in ancient times under the rule of a king. For they imagine, not only the forms of the Gods, but their ways of life to be like their own.

When several villages are united in a single community, perfect and large enough to be nearly or quite self-sufficing, the state comes into existence, originating in the bare needs of life, and continuing in existence for the sake of a good life. And therefore, if the earlier forms of society are natural, so is the state, for it is the end of them, and the [completed] nature is the end. For what each thing is when fully developed, we call its nature, whether we are speaking of a man, a horse, or a family.

^a Or, reading with the old translator (William of Moerbek) *ἄμοσιπῆρους*, 'companions of the hearth.'

^b Od. ix. 114, quoted by Plato *Laws*, iii. 680, and in *N. Eth.* x. 9. § 13.

- I. 2. Besides, the final cause and end of a thing is the best, 9
and to be self-sufficing is the end and the best. 1253 a.

The state
exists by
nature.

Hence it is evident that the state is a creation of nature,
and that man is by nature a political animal. And he
who by nature and not by mere accident is without a
state, is either above humanity, or below it; he is the

‘Tribeless, lawless, hearthless one,’

whom Homer^a denounces—the outcast who is a lover of 10
war; he may be compared to a bird which flies alone.

Man, hav-
ing the gift
of speech
and the
sense of
right and
wrong, is
by nature
a political
animal.

Now the reason why man is more of a political
animal than bees or any other gregarious animals is
evident. Nature, as we often say, makes nothing in
vain^b, and man is the only animal whom she has en-
dowed with the gift of speech^c. And whereas mere 11
sound is but an indication of pleasure or pain, and is
therefore found in other animals (for their nature attains
to the perception of pleasure and pain and the intimation
of them to one another, and no further), the power of
speech is intended to set forth the expedient and inex-
pedient, and likewise the just and the unjust. And it is a 12
characteristic of man that he alone has any sense of good
and evil, of just and unjust, and the association of living
beings who have this sense makes a family and a state.

The whole
is prior to
the part,
the state to
the family
and indi-
vidual.

Thus the state is by nature clearly prior to the family
and to the individual, since the whole is of necessity 13
prior to the part; for example, if the whole body be
destroyed, there will be no foot or hand, except in an
equivocal sense, as we might speak of a stone hand; for
when destroyed the hand will be no better. But things
are defined by their working and power; and we ought
not to say that they are the same when they are no longer
the same, but only that they have the same name. The 14
proof that the state is a creation of nature and prior to
the individual is that the individual, when isolated, is not
self-sufficing; and therefore he is like a part in relation
to the whole. But he who is unable to live in society, or
who has no need because he is sufficient for himself, must

^a Il. ix. 63.

^b Cp. c. 8. § 12.

^c Cp. vii. 13. § 12.

15 be either a beast or a god : he is no part of a state. A I. 2.
 social instinct is implanted in all men by nature, and
 yet he who first founded the state was the greatest of
 benefactors. For man, when perfected, is the best of
 animals, but, when separated from law and justice, he
 16 is the worst of all ; since armed injustice is the more
 dangerous, and he is equipped at birth with the arms of
 intelligence and with moral qualities which he may use
 for the worst ends. Wherefore, if he have not virtue, he
 is the most unholy and the most savage of animals, and
 the most full of lust and gluttony. But justice is the
 bond of men in states, and the administration of justice,
 which is the determination of what is just^a, is the prin-
 ciple of order in political society.

Seeing then that the state is made up of households, 3.
 before speaking of the state, we must speak of the <sup>The family
or house-
hold.</sup>
 1258b. ^{Its parts.} management of the household^b. The parts of the
 household are the persons who compose it, and a com-
 plete household consists of slaves and freemen. Now
 we should begin by examining everything in its least
 elements ; and the first and least parts of a family are
 master and slave, husband and wife, father and children.
 We have therefore to consider what each of these three
 2 relations is and ought to be :—I mean the relation of
 master and servant, of husband and wife, and thirdly of
 parent and child. [I say *γαμικὴ* and *τεκνοποιητικὴ*, there
 being no words for the two latter notions which ade-
 3 quately represent them.] And there is another element
 of a household, the so-called art of money-making, which,
 according to some, is identical with household manage-
 ment, according to others, a principal part of it ; the
 nature of this art will also have to be considered by us.

Let us first speak of master and slave, looking to the <sup>Master
and slave.</sup>
 needs of practical life and also seeking to attain some
 4 better theory of their relation than exists at present. For
 some are of opinion that the rule of a master is a science,

^a Cp. N. Eth. v. 6. § 4.

^b Reading with the MSS. *οικονομίας*.

I. 3. and that the management of a household, and the mastership of slaves, and the political and royal rule, as I was saying at the outset^a, are all the same. Others affirm that the rule of a master over slaves is contrary to nature, and that the distinction between slave and free-man exists by law only, and not by nature; and being an interference with nature is therefore unjust.

4. Property is a part of the household, and therefore the art of acquiring property is a part of the art of managing the household; for no man can live well, or indeed live at all, unless he be provided with necessaries. And as in the arts which have a definite sphere the workers must have their own proper instruments for the accomplishment of their work, so it is in the management of a household. Now, instruments are of various sorts; some are living, others lifeless; in the rudder, the pilot of a ship has a lifeless, in the look-out man, a living instrument; for in the arts the servant is a kind of instrument. Thus, too, a possession is an instrument for maintaining life. And so, in the arrangement of the family, a slave is a living possession, and property a number of such instruments; and the servant is himself an instrument, which takes precedence of all other instruments. For if every instrument could accomplish its own work, obeying or anticipating the will of others, like the statues of Daedalus, or the tripods of Hephaestus, which, says the poet^b,

‘of their own accord entered the assembly of the Gods;’

if, in like manner, the shuttle would weave and the plectrum touch the lyre without a hand to guide them, chief workmen would not want servants, nor masters slaves. Here, however, another distinction must be drawn: the instruments commonly so called are instruments of production, whilst a possession is an instrument of action. The shuttle, for example, is not only of use; but something

^a Plato in Pol. 258 E foll., referred to already in c. 1. § 2.

^b Hom. Il. xviii. 376.

Property includes instruments lifeless and living.

The slave is a living instrument.

1254a.
4

else is made by it, whereas of a garment or of a bed I. 4.
 there is only the use. Further, as production and action
 are different in kind, and both require instruments, the
 instruments which they employ must likewise differ in
 5 kind. But life is action and not production, and therefore
 the slave is the minister of action [for he ministers to
 his master's life]. Again, a possession is spoken of as a
 part is spoken of; for the part is not only a part of
 something else, but wholly belongs to it; and this is also
 true of a possession. The master is only the master
 of the slave; he does not belong to him, whereas the
 slave is not only the slave of his master, but wholly
 6 belongs to him. Hence we see what is the nature and
 office of a slave; he who is by nature not his own but
 another's and yet a man, is by nature a slave; and he
 may be said to belong to another who, being a human
 being, is also a possession. And a possession may be
 defined as an instrument of action, separable from the
 possessor.

His
 master's
 life is a life
 of action, to
 which he
 ministers.

Who is the
 slave by
 nature?

But is there any one thus intended by nature to be a 5.
 slave, and for whom such a condition is expedient and
 right, or rather is not all slavery a violation of nature?

Is there
 a slave by
 nature?

There is no difficulty in answering this question, on
 2 grounds both of reason and of fact. For that some
 should rule, and others be ruled is a thing, not only
 necessary, but expedient; from the hour of their birth,
 some are marked out for subjection, others for rule.

And whereas there are many kinds both of rulers and
 subjects, that rule is the better which is exercised over
 better subjects—for example, to rule over men is better
 3 than to rule over wild beasts. The work is better which
 is executed by better workmen; and where one man rules
 and another is ruled, they may be said to have a work.
 In all things which form a composite whole and which
 are made up of parts, whether continuous or discrete, a
 distinction between the ruling and the subject element
 4 comes to light. Such a duality exists in living creatures,
 but not in them only; it originates in the constitution of

Handwritten notes:
 2 1/2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
 10

I. 5. the universe ; even in things which have no life, there is a ruling principle, as *in musical harmony*. But we are wandering from the subject. We will, therefore, restrict ourselves to the living creature which, in the first place, consists of soul and body : and of these two, the one is by nature the ruler, and the other the subject. But then we must look for the intentions of nature in things which retain their nature, and not in things which are corrupted. And therefore we must study the man who is in the most perfect state both of body and soul, for in him we shall see the true relation of the two ; although in bad or corrupted natures the body will often appear to rule^{1254 b.} over the soul, because they are in an evil and unnatural condition. First then we may observe in living creatures both a despotical and a constitutional rule ; for the soul rules the body with a despotical rule, whereas the intellect rules the appetites with a constitutional and royal rule. And it is clear that the rule of the soul over the body, and of the mind and the rational element over the passionate is natural and expedient ; whereas the equality of the two or the rule of the inferior is always hurtful. The same holds good of animals as well as of men ; for tame animals have a better nature than wild, and all tame animals are better off when they are ruled by man ; for then they are preserved. Again, the male is by nature superior, and the female inferior ; and the one rules, and the other is ruled ; this principle, of necessity, extends to all mankind. Where then there is such a difference as that between soul and body, or between men and animals (as in the case of those whose business is to use their body, and who can do nothing better), the lower sort are by nature slaves, and it is better for them as for all inferiors that they should be under the rule of a master. For he who can be, and therefore is another's, and he who participates in reason enough to apprehend, but not to have, reason, is a slave by nature. Whereas the lower animals cannot even apprehend

Everywhere in nature there is the distinction of higher and lower, of ruler and ruled.

* Or, 'of harmony [in music].'

reason ; they obey their instincts. And indeed the use I. 5.
 made of slaves and of tame animals is not very different ; There are slaves by nature and freemen by nature, but the difference is not always marked.
 for both with their bodies minister to the needs of life.
 10 Nature would like to distinguish between the bodies of
 freemen and slaves, making the one strong for servile
 labour, the other upright, and although useless for such
 services, useful for political life in the arts both of war
 and peace. But this does not hold universally: for
 some slaves have the souls and others have the bodies of
 freemen. And doubtless if men differed from one
 another in the mere forms of their bodies as much as the
 statues of the Gods do from men, all would acknowledge
 that the inferior class should be slaves of the superior.

11 And if there is a difference in the body, how much more
 in the soul ? but the beauty of the body is seen, whereas
 1255 a. the beauty of the soul is not seen. It is clear, then, that
 some men are by nature free, and others slaves, and that
 for these latter slavery is both expedient and right.

But that those who take the opposite view have in a 6.
 certain way right on their side, may be easily seen. The view that slavery is contrary to nature examined.
 For the words slavery and slave are used in two senses.
 There is a slave or slavery by law as well as by nature.
 The law of which I speak is a sort of convention, ac-
 cording to which whatever is taken in war is supposed to
 2 belong to the victors. But this right many jurists im-
 peach, as they would an orator who brought forward an
 unconstitutional measure: they detest the notion that,
 because one man has the power of doing violence and
 is superior in brute strength, another shall be his slave
 and subject. Even among philosophers there is a dif-
 3 ference of opinion. The origin of the dispute, and the
 reason why the arguments cross, is as follows: Virtue, Might and right, how related.
 when furnished with means, may be deemed to have the
 greatest power of doing violence: and as superior power
 is only found where there is superior excellence of some
 kind, power is thought to imply virtue. But does
 4 it likewise imply justice?—that is the question. And,
 in order to make a distinction between them, some

I. 6. assert that justice is benevolence : to which others reply that justice is nothing more than the rule of a superior. If the two views are regarded as antagonistic and exclusive [i.e. if the notion that justice is benevolence excludes the idea of a just rule of a superior], the alternative [viz. that no one should rule over others*] has no force or plausibility, because it implies that not even the superior in virtue ought to rule, or be master. Some, 5 clinging, as they think, to a principle of justice (for law and custom are a sort of justice), assume that slavery in war is justified by law, but they are not consistent. For what if the cause of the war be unjust? No one would ever say that he is a slave who is unworthy to be a slave. Were this the case, men of the highest rank would be slaves and the children of slaves if they or their parents chance to have been taken captive and sold. Wherefore Hellenes do not like to call themselves 6 slaves, but confine the term to barbarians. Yet, in using this language, they really mean the natural slave of whom we spoke at first; for it must be admitted that some are slaves everywhere, others nowhere. The 7 same principle applies to nobility. Hellenes regard themselves as noble everywhere, and not only in their own country, but they deem the barbarians noble only when at home, thereby implying that there are two sorts of nobility and freedom, the one absolute, the other relative. The Helen of Theodectes says :—

Slavery
of captives
taken in
war.

Greek and
barbarian.

‘Who would presume to call me servant who am on both sides sprung from the stem of the Gods?’

What does this mean but that they distinguish freedom 8 and slavery, noble and humble birth, by the two principles of good and evil? They think that as men and 1255 b. animals beget men and animals, so from good men a good man springs. But this is what nature, though she may intend it, cannot always accomplish.

We see then that there is some foundation for this 9

* Cp. § 2.

difference of opinion, and that all are not either slaves I. 6.
by nature or freemen by nature, and also that there is
in some cases a marked distinction between the two
classes, rendering it expedient and right for the one to
be slaves and the others to be masters: the one practis-
ing obedience, the others exercising the authority which
10 nature intended them to have. The abuse of this au-
thority is injurious to both; for the interests of part and
whole^a, of body and soul, are the same, and the slave
is a part of the master, a living but separated part of
his bodily frame. Where the relation between them is
natural they are friends and have a common interest,
but where it rests merely on law and force the reverse
is true.

The previous remarks are quite enough to show that 7.
the rule of a master is not a constitutional rule, and
therefore that all the different kinds of rule are not, as
some affirm, the same with each other^b. For there is
one rule exercised over subjects who are by nature free,
another over subjects who are by nature slaves. The
rule of a household is a monarchy, for every house is
under one head: whereas constitutional rule is a govern-
2 ment of freemen and equals. The master is not called
a master because he has science, but because he is of a
certain character, and the same remark applies to the
slave and the freeman. Still there may be a science for
the master and a science for the slave. The science of (1) The
the slave would be such as the man of Syracuse taught, science of
who made money by instructing slaves in their ordinary the slave.
3 duties. And such a knowledge may be carried further,
so as to include cookery and similar menial arts. For
some duties are of the more necessary, others of the
more honourable sort; as the proverb says, 'slave before
4 slave, master before master.' But all such branches of
knowledge are servile. There is likewise a science of (2) The
science

^a Cp. c. 4. § 5.

^b Plato Polit. 258 E foll., referred to already in c. 1. § 2.

I. 7.
of the
master.

the master, which teaches the use of slaves; for the master as such is concerned, not with the acquisition, but with the use of them. Yet this so-called science is not anything great or wonderful; for the master need only know how to order that which the slave must know how to execute. Hence those who are in a position which places them above toil, have stewards who attend to their households while they occupy themselves with philosophy or with politics. But the art of acquiring slaves, I mean of justly acquiring them, differs both from the art of the master and the art of the slave, being a species of hunting or war^a. Enough of the distinction between master and slave.

8.
Chrematistic, or the art of money-making. How related to the art of managing a household?

Let us now inquire into property generally, and into the art of money-making, in accordance with our usual method [of resolving a whole into its parts^b], for a slave has been shown to be a part of property. The first question is whether the art of money-making is the same with the art of managing a household or a part of it, or instrumental to it; and if the last, whether in the way that the art of making shuttles is instrumental to the art of weaving, or in the way that the casting of bronze is instrumental to the art of the statuary, for they are not instrumental in the same way, but the one provides tools and the other material; and by material I mean the substratum out of which any work is made; thus wool is the material of the weaver, bronze of the statuary. Now it is easy to see that the art of household management is not identical with the art of money-making, for the one uses the material which the other provides. And the art which uses household stores can be no other than the art of household management. There is, however, a doubt whether the art of money-making is a part of household management or a distinct art. [They appear to be connected]; for the money-maker has to consider whence money and property can be procured;

^a Cp. vii. 14. § 21.

^b Cp. c. 1. § 3.

but there are many sorts of property and wealth:— I. 8.
 there is husbandry and the care and provision of food
 in general; are these parts of the money-making art
 4 or distinct arts? Again, there are many sorts of food, Why men
lead differ-
ent kinds
of lives.
 and therefore there are many kinds of lives both of
 animals and men; they must all have food, and the
 differences in their food have made differences in their
 5 ways of life. For of beasts, some are gregarious, others
 are solitary; they live in the way which is best adapted
 to sustain them, accordingly as they are carnivorous or
 herbivorous or omnivorous: and their habits are deter-
 mined for them by nature in such a manner that they
 may obtain with greater facility the food of their choice.
 But, as different individuals have different tastes, the
 same things are not naturally pleasant to all of them;
 and therefore the lives of carnivorous or herbivorous
 6 animals further differ among themselves. In the lives
 of men too there is a great difference. The laziest are Nomadic
life.
 shepherds, who lead an idle life, and get their sub-
 sistence without trouble from tame animals; their flocks
 having to wander from place to place in search of pas-
 ture, they are compelled to follow them, cultivating a
 7 sort of living farm. Others support themselves by hunt- Hunting.
 ing, which is of different kinds. Some, for example, are
 pirates, others, who dwell near lakes or marshes or rivers
 or a sea in which there are fish, are fishermen, and
 others live by the pursuit of birds or wild beasts. The Agriculture.
 greater number obtain a living from the fruits of the
 8 soil. Such are the modes of subsistence which prevail
 among those *whose industry is employed immediately
 upon the products of nature*, and whose food is not
 1256b. acquired by exchange and retail trade—there is the
 shepherd, the husbandman, the pirate, the fisherman, the
 hunter. Some gain a comfortable maintenance out of
 two employments, eking out the deficiencies of one of
 them by another: thus the life of a shepherd may be

* Or, 'whose labour is personal.'

I. 8. combined with that of a brigand, the life of a farmer with that of a hunter. Other modes of life are similarly 9 combined in any way which the needs of men may require. Property, in the sense of a bare livelihood, seems to be given by nature herself to all, both when they are first born, and when they are grown up. For some 10 animals bring forth, together with their offspring, so much food as will last until they are able to supply themselves; of this the vermiparous or oviparous animals are an instance; and the viviparous animals have up to a certain time a supply of food for their young in themselves, which is called milk. In like manner we may 11 infer that, after the birth of animals, plants exist for their sake, and that the other animals exist for the sake of man, the tame for use and food, the wild, if not all, at least the greater part of them, for food, and for the provision of clothing and various instruments. Now if 12 nature makes nothing incomplete, and nothing in vain, the inference must be that she has made all animals and plants for the sake of man. And so, in one point of view, the art of war is a natural art of acquisition, for it includes hunting, an art which we ought to practise against wild beasts, and against men who, though intended by nature to be governed, will not submit; for war of such a kind is naturally just ^a.

Nature's provision for the maintenance of life.

The natural mode of acquiring property.

Of the art of acquisition then there is one kind ^b which 13 is natural and is a part of the management of a household ^b. Either we must suppose the necessaries of life to exist previously, or the art of household management must provide a store of them for the common use of the family or state. They are the elements of true wealth; 14 for the amount of property which is needed for a good life is not unlimited, although Solon in one of his poems says that

‘No bound to riches has been fixed for man ^c.’

^a Cp. c. 7. § 5, and vii. 14. § 21.

^b Or, with Bernays, ‘which by nature is a part of the management of a household.’

^c Bergk, Poet. Lyr. Solon, iv. 12. v. 71.

But there is a boundary fixed, just as there is in the I. 8.
 15 arts; for the instruments of any art are never unlimited,
 either in number or size, and wealth may be defined as
 a number of instruments to be used in a household or
 in a state. And so we see that there is a natural
 art of acquisition which is practised by managers of
 households and by statesmen, and what is the reason
 of this.

There is another variety of the art of acquisition which 9.
 is commonly and rightly called the art of making money, The non-natural mode, or money-making.
 1257 a. and has in fact suggested the notion that wealth and
 property have no limit. Being nearly connected with
 the preceding, it is often identified with it. But though
 they are not very different, neither are they the same.
 The kind already described is given by nature, the other
 is gained by experience and art.

2 Let us begin our discussion of the question with the
 following considerations:—

Of everything which we possess there are two uses: Value in use and value in exchange.
 both belong to the thing as such, but not in the same
 manner, for one is the proper, and the other the im-
 proper or secondary use of it. For example, a shoe is
 used for wear, and is used for exchange; both are uses of
 3 the shoe. He who gives a shoe in exchange for money
 or food to him who wants one, does indeed use the shoe
 as a shoe, but this is not its proper or primary purpose,
 for a shoe is not made to be an object of barter. The
 4 same may be said of all possessions, for the art of ex-
 change extends to all of them, and it arises at first in a
 natural manner from the circumstance that some have
 too little, others too much. Hence we may infer that
 retail trade is not a natural part of the art of money-
 making; had it been so, men would have ceased to ex-
 5 change when they had enough. And in the first com-
 munity, which is the family, this art is obviously of no
 use, but only begins to be useful when the society in-
 creases. For the members of the family originally had
 all things in common; in a more divided state of society

I. 9. they ^astill shared in many things, but they were different things^a which they had to give in exchange for what they wanted, a kind of barter which is still practised among barbarous nations who exchange with one another the necessaries of life and nothing more; giving and receiving wine, for example, in exchange for corn and the like. This sort of barter is not part of the money-making art and is not contrary to nature, but is needed for the satisfaction of men's natural wants. The other or more complex form of exchange grew out of the simpler. When the inhabitants of one country became more dependent on those of another, and they imported what they needed, and exported the surplus, money necessarily came into use. For the various necessaries of life are not easily carried about, and hence men agreed to employ in their dealings with each other something which was intrinsically useful and easily applicable to the purposes of life, for example, iron, silver, and the like. Of this the value was at first measured by size and weight, but in process of time they put a stamp upon it, to save the trouble of weighing and to mark the value.

Invention
of money

and of coin.

Retail
trade.

When the use of coin had once been discovered, out of the barter of necessary articles arose the other art of money-making, namely, retail trade; which was at first probably a simple matter, but became more complicated as soon as men learned by experience whence and by what exchanges the greatest profit might be made. Originating in the use of coin, the art of money-making is generally thought to be chiefly concerned with it, and to be the art which produces wealth and money; having to consider how they may be accumulated. Indeed, wealth is assumed by many to be only a quantity of coin, because the art of money-making and retail trade are concerned with coin. Others maintain that coined money is a mere sham, a thing not natural,

Two views
about
money.

^a Or, more simply, 'shared in many more things.'

but conventional only, which would have no value or use I. 9.
for any of the purposes of daily life if another commodity were substituted by the users. And, indeed, he who is rich in coin may often be in want of necessary food. But how can that be wealth of which a man may have a great abundance and yet perish with hunger, like Midas in the fable, whose insatiable prayer turned everything that was set before him into gold?

- 12 Men seek after a better notion of wealth and of the art of making money than the mere acquisition of coin, and they are right. For natural wealth and the natural art of money-making are a different thing; in their true form they are part of the management of a household; whereas retail trade is the art of producing wealth, not in every way, but by exchange. And it seems to be concerned with coin; for coin is the beginning of ex-
13 change and the measure or limit of it. And there is no bound to the wealth which springs from this art of money-making^a. As in the art of medicine there is no limit to the pursuit of health, and as in the other arts there is no limit to the pursuit of their several ends, for they aim at accomplishing their ends to the uttermost; (but of the means there is a limit, for the end is always the limit), so, too, in this art of money-making there is no limit of the end, which is wealth of the spurious kind,
14 and the acquisition of money. But the art of household management has a limit; the unlimited acquisition of money is not its business. And, therefore, in one point of view, all wealth must have a limit; nevertheless, as a matter of fact, we find the opposite to be the case; for all money-makers increase their hoard of coin without limit. The source of the confusion is the near connexion between
15 the two kinds of money-making; in either, the instrument [i. e. wealth] is the same, although the use is different, and so they pass into one another; for each is a use of the same property^b, but with a difference: accumulation is the end in the one case, but there is a further end in the

Distinction between natural wealth and the mere acquisition of coin.

In the arts the means are limited by the end, the end is unlimited: so in money-making, but not in household management.

^a Cp. c. 8. § 14.

^b Reading *κρήσεως χρήσις*.

I. 9.
Error of
those who
make
wealth an
end.

other. Hence some persons are led to believe that making money is the object of household management, and the whole idea of their lives is that they ought either to increase their money without limit, or at any rate not to lose it. The origin of this disposition in men is that they¹⁶ are intent upon living only, and not upon living well ;^{1258a.} and, as their desires are unlimited, they also desire that the means of gratifying them should be without limit. Even those who aim at a good life seek the means of obtaining bodily pleasures ; and, since the enjoyment of these appears to depend on property, they are absorbed in making money : and so there arises the second species of money-making. For, as their enjoyment is in excess,¹⁷ they seek an art which produces the excess of enjoyment ; and, if they are not able to supply their pleasures by the art of money-making, they try other arts, using in turn every faculty in a manner contrary to nature. The quality of courage, for example, is not intended to make money, but to inspire confidence ; neither is this the aim of the general's or of the physician's art ; but the one aims at victory and the other at health. Nevertheless, some men turn every quality or art into¹⁸ a means of making money ; this they conceive to be the end, and to the promotion of the end all things must contribute.

Thus, then, we have considered the art of money-making, which is unnecessary, and why men want it ; and also the necessary art of money-making, which we have seen to be different from the other, and to be a natural part of the art of managing a household, concerned with the provision of food, not, however, like the former kind, unlimited, but having a limit.

10. And we have found the answer to our original question *, Whether the art of money-making is the business of the manager of a household and of the statesman or not their business?—viz. that it is an art which is presupposed by them. For political science does not make

* Cp. c. 8. § 1.

men, but takes them from nature and uses them; and nature provides them with food from the element of earth, air, or sea. At this stage begins the duty of the manager of a household, who has to order the things which nature supplies;—he may be compared to the weaver who has not to make but to use wool, and to know what sort of wool is good and serviceable or bad and unserviceable. Were this otherwise, it would be difficult to see why the art of money-making is a part of the management of a household and the art of medicine not; for surely the members of a household must have health just as they must have life or any other necessary.

I. 10.
Relation of money-making to the art of household management.

And as from one point of view the master of the house and the ruler of the state have to consider about health, from another point of view not they but the physician; so in one way the art of household management, in another way the subordinate art, has to consider about money. But, strictly speaking, as I have already said, the means of life must be provided beforehand by nature; for the business of nature is to furnish food to that which is born, and the food of the offspring always remains over in the parent*. Wherefore the art of making money out of fruits and animals is always natural.

Of the two sorts of money-making one, as I have just said, is a part of household management, the other is retail trade: the former necessary and honourable, the latter a kind of exchange which is justly censured; for it

Retail trade.

is unnatural, and a mode by which men gain from one another. The most hated sort, and with the greatest reason, is usury, which makes a gain out of money itself, and not from the natural use of it. For money was intended to be used in exchange, but not to increase at interest. And this term usury [*τόκος*], which means the birth of money from money, is applied to the breeding of money because the offspring resembles the parent. Wherefore of all modes of making money this is the most unnatural.

Usury the breeding of money from money.

* Cp. c. 8. § 10.

I. 11.
Practical
classifica-
tion of
money-
making.

(1) The
natural
kind.

(2) Ex-
change.

(3) The
inter-
mediate
kind.

Enough has been said about the theory of money-making; we will now proceed to the practical part. *The discussion of such matters is not unworthy of philosophy, but to be engaged in them practically is illiberal and irksome*. The useful parts of money-making are, first, the knowledge of live-stock,—which are most profitable, and where, and how,—as, for example, what sort of horses or sheep or oxen or any other animals are most likely to give a return. A man ought to know which of these pay better than others, and which pay best in particular places, for some do better in one place and some in another. Secondly, husbandry, which may be either tillage or planting, and the keeping of bees and of fish, or fowl, or of any animals which may be useful to man. These are the divisions of the true or proper art of money-making and come first. Of the other, which consists in exchange, the first and most important division is commerce (of which there are three kinds—commerce by sea, commerce by land, selling in shops—these again differing as they are safer or more profitable), the second is usury, the third, service for hire—of this, one kind is employed in the mechanical arts, the other in unskilled and bodily labour. There is still a third sort of money-making intermediate between this and the first or natural mode which is partly natural, but is also concerned with exchange of the fruits and other products of the earth. Some of these latter, although they bear no fruit, are nevertheless profitable; for example, wood and minerals. The art of mining, by which minerals are obtained, has many branches, for there are various kinds of things dug out of the earth. Of the several divisions of money-making I now speak generally; a minute consideration of them might be useful in practice, but it would be tiresome to dwell upon them at greater length now.

Those occupations are most truly arts in which there

* Or, 'We are free to speculate about them, but in practice we are limited by circumstances.' (Bernays.)

is the least element of chance; they are the meanest I. 11.
 in which the body is most deteriorated, the most
 servile in which there is the greatest use of the body,
 and the most illiberal in which there is the least need
 of excellence.

- 7 Works have been written upon these subjects by Works on economic subjects.
 various persons; for example, by Chares the Parian, and
 Apollodorus the Lemnian, who have treated of Tillage
 1259a. and Planting, while others have treated of other branches;
 any one who cares for such matters may refer to their
 writings. It would be well also to collect the scattered
 stories of the ways in which individuals have succeeded in
 8 amassing a fortune; for all this is useful to persons who
 value the art of making money. There is the anecdote Story about Thales. How a philosopher once made a fortune.
 of Thales the Milesian and his financial device, which
 involves a principle of universal application, but is attri-
 buted to him on account of his reputation for wisdom.
- 9 He was reproached for his poverty, which was supposed
 to show that philosophy was of no use. According to
 the story, he knew by his skill in the stars while it was
 yet winter that there would be a great harvest of olives
 in the coming year; so, having a little money, he gave
 deposits for the use of all the olive-presses in Chios and
 Miletus, which he hired at a low price because no one
 bid against him. When the harvest-time came, and many
 wanted them all at once and of a sudden, he let them
 out at any rate which he pleased, and made a quantity
 of money. Thus he showed the world that philosophers
 can easily be rich if they like, but that their ambition
 10 is of another sort. He is supposed to have given a
 striking proof of his wisdom, but, as I was saying, his
 device for getting money is of universal application, and
 is nothing but the creation of a monopoly. It is an art Monopoly.
 often practised by cities when they are in want of money;
 they make a monopoly of provisions.
- 11 There was a man of Sicily, who, having money de- Story about a man of Sicily.
 posited with him, bought up all the iron from the iron
 mines; afterwards, when the merchants from their various

I. 11. markets came to buy, he was the only seller, and without much increasing the price he gained 200 per cent. Which when Dionysius heard, he told him that he might ¹² take away his money, but that he must not remain at Syracuse, for he thought that the man had discovered a way of making money which was injurious to his own interests. He had the same idea ^a as Thales; they both contrived to create a monopoly for themselves. And ¹³ statesmen ought to know these things; for a state is often as much in want of money and of such devices for obtaining it as a household, or even more so; hence some public men devote themselves entirely to finance.

Monopoly applied to finance.

I 2.

Different kinds of rule within the household :
(1) rule of master over slaves ;
(2) of father over children ;
(3) of husband over wife.

Of household management we have seen ^b that there are three parts—one is the rule of a master over slaves, which has been discussed already ^c, another of a father, and the third of a husband. A husband and father rules over wife and children, both free, but the rule differs, the rule over his children being a royal, over his wife a ^{1259b} constitutional rule. For although there may be exceptions to the order of nature, the male is by nature fitter for command than the female, just as the elder and full-grown is superior to the younger and more immature. But in most constitutional states the citizens ^a rule and are ruled by turns, for the idea of a constitutional state implies that the natures of the citizens are equal, and do not differ at all ^d. Nevertheless, when one rules and the other is ruled we endeavour to create a difference of outward forms and names and titles of respect, which may be illustrated by the saying of Amasis about his foot-pan ^e. The relation of the male ³ to the female is of this kind, but there the inequality is permanent. The rule of a father over his children is royal, for he receives both love and the respect due to age, exercising a kind of royal power. And therefore Homer has appropriately called Zeus 'father of Gods and men,' because he is the king of them all. For a king

^a Reading *εὐρημα* with Bernays. ^b Cp. c. 3. § 1. ^c Cp. c. 3-7.

^d Cp. ii. 2. § 6; iii. 17. § 4. ^e Herod. ii. 172, and note on this passage.

is the natural superior of his subjects, but he should be of the same kin or kind with them, and such is the relation of elder and younger, of father and son. I. 12.

Thus it is clear that household management attends more to men than to the acquisition of inanimate things, and to human excellence more than to the excellence of property which we call wealth, and to the virtue of freemen more than to the virtue of slaves. A question may indeed be raised, whether there is any excellence at all in a slave beyond merely instrumental and ministerial qualities—whether he can have the virtues of temperance, courage, justice, and the like; or whether slaves possess only bodily and ministerial qualities. And, whichever way we answer the question, a difficulty arises; for, if they have virtue, in what will they differ from freemen? I 13.

On the other hand, since they are men and share in reason, it seems absurd to say that they have no virtue. A similar question may be raised about women and children, whether they too have virtues: ought a woman to be temperate and brave and just, and is a child to be called temperate, and intemperate, or not? Has a slave virtue?

So in general we may ask about the natural ruler, and the natural subject, whether they have the same or different virtues. For a noble nature is equally required in both, but if so, why should one of them always rule, and the other always be ruled? Nor can we say that this is a question of degree, for the difference between ruler and subject is a difference of kind, and therefore not of degree; yet how strange is the supposition that the one ought, and that the other ought not, to have virtue! The virtues of ruler and subject different.

For if the ruler is intemperate and unjust, how can he rule well? if the subject, how can he obey well? If he be licentious and cowardly, he will certainly not do his duty. It is evident, therefore, that both of them must have a share of virtue, but varying according to their various natures. And this is at once indicated by the soul, in which one part naturally rules, and the other is subject, and the virtue of the ruler we maintain Psychological parallel.

I. 13. to be different from that of the subject ;—the one being the virtue of the rational, and the other of the irrational part. Now, it is obvious that the same principle applies generally, and therefore almost all things rule and are ruled according to nature. But the kind of rule differs ; 7 —the freeman rules over the slave after another manner from that in which the male rules over the female, or the man over the child ; although the parts of the soul are present in all of them, they are present in different degrees. For the slave has no deliberative faculty at all ; the woman has, but it is ^awithout authority^a, and the child has, but it is immature. So it must necessarily be 8 with the moral virtues also ; all may be supposed to partake of them, but only in such manner and degree as is required by each for the fulfilment of his duty.

Different degrees of virtue.

Hence the ruler ought to have moral virtue in perfection, for his duty is entirely that of a master artificer, and the master artificer is reason ; the subjects, on the other hand, require only that measure of virtue which is proper to each of them. Clearly, then, moral virtue belongs to 9 all of them ; but the temperance of a man and of a woman, or the courage and justice of a man and of a woman, are not, as Socrates maintained ^b, the same ; the courage of a man is shown in commanding, of a woman in obeying. And this holds of all other virtues, as 10 will be more clearly seen if we look at them in detail, for those who say generally that virtue consists in a good disposition of the soul, or in doing rightly, or the like, only deceive themselves. Far better than such definitions is their mode of speaking, who, like Gorgias ^b, enumerate the virtues. All classes must be deemed to 11 have their special attributes ; as the poet says of women,

Plato criticised.

‘ Silence is a woman’s glory ^c ;’

but this is not equally the glory of man. The child is imperfect, and therefore obviously his virtue is not relative

^a Or, with Bernays, ‘inconclusive.’ ^b Plato Meno, 71–73.

^c Soph. Aj. 293.

to himself alone, but to the perfect man and to his I. 14.
 12 teacher^a, and in like manner the virtue of the slave is
 relative to a master. Now we determined that a slave
 is useful for the wants of life, and therefore he will obvi-
 ously require only so much virtue as will prevent him
 from failing in his duty through cowardice and intem-
 perance. Some one will ask whether, if what we are
 saying is true, virtue will not be required also in the
 artisans, for they often fail in their work through mis-
 13 conduct? But is there not a great difference in the two
 cases? For the slave shares in his master's life; the
 artisan is less closely connected with him, and only
 attains excellence in proportion as he becomes a slave,
 [i. e. is under the direction of a master]. The meaner
 1260b. sort of mechanic has a special and separate slavery; and
 whereas the slave exists by nature, not so the shoemaker
 14 or other artisan: It is manifest, then, that the master
 ought to be the source of excellence in the slave; but
 not merely because he possesses the art which trains
 him in his duties^b. Wherefore they are mistaken who
 forbid us to converse with slaves and say that we should
 employ command only^c, for slaves stand even more in
 need of admonition than children. Mechanic
and slave.

15 The relations of husband and wife, parent and child, Virtues in
the family
relations.
 their several virtues, what in their intercourse with one
 another is good, and what is evil, and how we may
 pursue the good and escape the evil, will have to be dis-
 cussed when we speak of the different forms of govern-
 ment. For, inasmuch as every family is a part of a state,
 and these relationships are the parts of a family, the
 virtue of the part must have regard to the virtue of the
 whole. And therefore women and children must be
 trained by education with an eye to the state^d, if the
 virtues of either of them are supposed to make any
 difference in the virtues of the state. And they must
 16 make a difference: for the children grow up to be

^a 'His father who guides him' (Bernays).

^b Cp. c. 7. § 4.

^c Plato Laws, vi. 777.

^d Cp. v. 9. § 11-15; viii. 1. § 1.

I. 14. citizens, and half the free persons in a state are women^a.

Of these matters, enough has been said; of what remains, let us speak at another time. Regarding, then, our present enquiry as complete, we will make a new beginning. And, first, let us examine the various theories of a perfect state.

^a Plato *Laws*, vi. 781 B.