SECOND EDITION

ARISTOTLE'S POLITICS

Translated and with an Introduction, Notes, and Glossary by Carnes Lord

CHAPTER 3

[1253b] (1) Since it is evident out of what parts the city is constituted, it is necessary first to speak of household management; for every city is composed of households. The parts of household management correspond to the parts out of which the household itself is constituted. Now the complete household is made up of slaves and free persons. Since everything is to be sought for first in its smallest elements, and the first and smallest parts of the household are master, slave, husband, wife, father, and children, three things must be investigated to determine what each is and what sort of thing it ought to be. (2) These are mastery, marital rule (there is no term for the union of man and woman), and thirdly procreative rule[20] (this too has not been assigned a term of its own). (3) So much, then, for the three we spoke of. There is a certain part of it, however, which some hold to be the same as household management, and others its greatest part; how the matter really stands has to be studied. I am speaking of what is called the art of getting goods.

Let us speak first about master and slave, so that we may see at the same time what relates to necessary needs and whether we cannot acquire something in the way of knowledge about these things that is better than current conceptions. (4) For some hold that mastery is a kind of science, and that managing the household, mastery, and political and kingly rule are the same, as we said at the beginning. Others hold that exercising

mastery is against nature; for [as they believe] it is by law that one person is slave and another free, there being no difference by nature, and hence it is not just, since it rests on force.

CHAPTER 4

(1) Now property is a part of the household, and the art of acquiring it a part of household management (for without the necessary things it is impossible either to live or to live well); and just as the specialized arts must of necessity have their proper instruments if their function is to be performed, so too must the household manager. (2) Now of instruments some are inanimate and others animate—the pilot's rudder, for example, is an inanimate instrument, but his lookout an animate one; for the subordinate is a kind of instrument whatever the art. A possession too, then, is an instrument for the purposes of life, and one's property is the aggregate of such instruments; and the slave is a possession of the animate sort.[21] Every subordinate, moreover, is an instrument that wields many instruments, (3) for if each of the instruments were able to perform its function on command or by anticipation, as they assert those of Daedalus did, or the tripods of Hephaestus (which the poet says "of their own accord came to the gods' gathering"),[22] so that shuttles would weave themselves and picks play the lyre, master craftsmen [1254a] would no longer have a need for subordinates, or masters for slaves. (4) Now the instruments mentioned are productive instruments, but a possession is an instrument of action. For from the shuttle comes something apart from the use of it, while from clothing or a bed the use alone. Further, since production and action differ in kind and both require instruments, these must of necessity reflect the same difference. (5) Life is action, not production; the slave is therefore a subordinate in matters concerning action.

A possession is spoken of in the same way as a part. A part is not only part of something else, but belongs wholly to something else; similarly with a possession. Accordingly, while the master is only master of the slave and does not belong to him, the slave is not only slave to the master but belongs wholly to him.

(6) What the nature of the slave is and what his capacity, then, is clear from these things. For one who does not belong to himself by nature but is another's, though a human being, is by nature a slave; a human being is

another's who, though a human being, is a possession; and a possession is an instrument of action and separate from its owner.

CHAPTER 5

(1) Whether anyone is of this sort by nature or not, and whether it is better and just for anyone to be a slave or not, but rather all slavery is against nature, must be investigated next. It is not difficult either to discern the answer by reasoning or to learn it from what actually happens. (2) Ruling and being ruled belong among not only necessary but also advantageous things. And immediately from birth certain things diverge, some toward being ruled, others toward ruling. There are many kinds of things both ruling and ruled, and the rule is always better over ruled things that are better, for example over a human being rather than a beast; (3) for the work performed by the better is better, and wherever something rules and something is ruled there is a certain work belonging to these together. For whatever is constituted out of a number of things—whether continuous or discrete—and becomes a single common thing always displays a ruling and a ruled element; (4) this is something that animate things derive from all of nature, for even in things that do not partake in life there is a sort of rule, for example in a harmony.[23] But these matters perhaps belong to a more external sort of investigation.[24] But an animal is the first thing constituted out of soul and body, of which the former is the ruling element by nature, the other the ruled. (5) It is in things whose condition is according to nature that one ought particularly to investigate what is by nature, not in things that are defective. Thus the human being to be studied is one whose state is best both in body and in soul—in him [1254b] this is clear; for in the case of the depraved, or those in a depraved condition, the body is often held to rule the soul on account of their being in a condition that is bad and unnatural.

(6) It is then in an animal, as we were saying, that one can first discern both the sort of rule of a master and political rule. For the soul rules the body with the rule of a master, while intellect rules appetite with political and kingly rule; and this makes it evident that it is according to nature and advantageous for the body to be ruled by the soul, and the passionate part of the soul by intellect and the part having reason, while it is harmful to both if the relation is equal or reversed. (7) The same holds with respect to

man and the other animals: tame animals have a better nature than wild ones, and it is better for all of them to be ruled by man, since in this way their preservation is ensured. Further, the relation of male to female is by nature a relation of superior to inferior and ruler to ruled. The same must of necessity hold in the case of human beings generally.

(8) Accordingly, those who are as different from other men as the soul from the body or man from beast—and they are in this state if their work is the use of the body, and if this is the best that can come from them—are slaves by nature. For them it is better to be ruled in accordance with this sort of rule, if such is the case for the other things mentioned. (9) For he is a slave by nature who is capable of belonging to another—which is also why he belongs to another—and who participates in reason only to the extent of perceiving it, but does not have it. (The other animals, not perceiving reason, obey their passions.[25]) Moreover, the need for them differs only slightly: bodily assistance in the necessary things is forthcoming from both, from slaves and from tame animals alike.

(10) Nature indeed wishes to make the bodies of free persons and slaves different as well as their souls—those of the latter strong with a view to necessary needs, those of the former straight and useless for such tasks, but useful with a view to a political way of life (which is itself divided between the needs of war and those of peace); yet the opposite often results, some having the bodies of free persons while others have the souls. It is evident, at any rate, that if they were to be born as different only[26] in body as the images of the gods, everyone would assert that those not so favored merited being their slaves. (11) But if this is true in the case of the body, it is much more justifiable to make this distinction in the case of the soul; yet it is not as easy to see [1255a] the beauty of the soul as it is that of the body. That some persons are free and others slaves by nature, therefore, and that for these slavery is both advantageous and just, is evident.

CHAPTER 6

(1) That those who assert the opposite are in a certain manner correct, however, is not difficult to see. Slavery and the slave are spoken of in a double sense. There is also a sort of slave or enslaved person according to convention,[27] the convention being a certain agreement under which

things conquered in war are said to belong to the conquerors. (2) This [plea of] justice is challenged by many of those conversant with the laws —as they would challenge an orator—on a motion of illegality,[28] on the grounds that it is a terrible thing if what yields to force is to be enslaved and ruled by what is able to apply force and is superior in power. And there are some of the wise as well who hold this opinion, though some hold the other. (3) The cause of this dispute—and what makes the arguments converge—is that virtue, once it obtains the necessary resources, is in a certain manner particularly able to apply force, and what is dominant is always preeminent in some good, so it is held that there is no force without virtue, and that the dispute concerns only [the plea of] justice; (4) for on this account the ones hold that good will is [the measure of] what is just, while the others hold that this very thing, the rule of the superior, is just. At any rate, if these arguments are set on one side, the other arguments—which assume that what is better in virtue ought not to rule or be master—have neither strength nor persuasiveness.[29] (5) Those who regard the slavery that results from war as just adhere wholly, as they suppose, to a sort of justice (for law is just in a certain sense); yet at the same time they deny [implicitly that it is in fact always just]. For the beginnings of wars are not always just, and no one would assert that someone not meriting enslavement ought ever to be a slave. Otherwise, the result will be that those held to be the best born will become slaves and the offspring of slaves if they happen to be captured and sold. (6) Accordingly, they do not want to speak of these as slaves, but rather barbarians. When they say this, however, they are in search of nothing other than the slave by nature of which we spoke at the beginning; for they must necessarily assert that there are some persons who are everywhere slaves, and others who are so nowhere. (7) It is the same way with good birth as well; for they consider themselves well born not only among their own but everywhere, but barbarians only at home—the assumption being that there is something well born and free simply, and something not simply [but relatively], as Theodectes's Helen says:

> As offshoot of divine roots on either side
> Who would dare call me serving-maid?[30]

(8) When they speak in this way, it is by nothing other than virtue or vice that they define what is slave and what is free, who is well born and who is

ill [1255b] born. For they claim that from the good should come someone good, just as a human being comes from a human being and a beast from beasts. But while nature wishes to do this, it is often unable to. (9) That there is some reason in the dispute, therefore, and that it is not [simply] the case that the ones are slaves by nature and the others free, is clear; and also that such a distinction does exist for some, where it is advantageous as well as just for the one to be enslaved and the other to be master; and that the one ought to be ruled and the other to rule, and to rule by the sort of rule that is natural for them, which is mastery, (10) while bad rule is disadvantageous for both. For the same thing is advantageous for the part and the whole and for body and soul, and the slave is a sort of part of the master—a part of his body, as it were, animate yet separate. There is thus a certain advantage—and even a friendship of slave and master for one another—for those slaves who merit being such by nature; but for those who do not merit it in this way but who are slaves according to convention and by force, the opposite is the case.[31]

CHAPTER 7

(1) It is evident from these things as well that mastery and political rule are not the same thing and that all the sorts of rule are not the same as one another, as some assert. For the one sort is over those free by nature, the other over slaves; and household management is monarchy (for every household is run by one alone), while political rule is over free and equal persons. (2) Now the master is so called not according to a science he possesses but through being a certain sort, and similarly with the slave and the free person. Still, there could be a science of mastery and one of slavery. The science of slavery would be the sort of thing provided through the education offered by the fellow in Syracuse—for someone there used to receive pay for teaching slave boys their regular serving chores; (3) and there might be additional learning in such matters, for example in cookery and other service of this type. For certain works are more honored or more necessary than others, and as the proverb has it, "slave before slave, master before master."[32] (4) All things of this sort, then, are sciences of slavery; but the science of mastery is expertise in using slaves, since the master is what he is not in the acquiring of slaves but in the use of them. This science has nothing great or dignified about it: the master must know

how to command the things that the slave must know how to do. (5) Hence for those to whom it is open not to be bothered with such things, a steward assumes this prerogative, while they themselves engage in politics or philosophy. Expertise in acquiring slaves is different from both of these—that is, the just sort of acquiring, which is like a certain kind of war or hunting. Concerning slave and master, then, let the discussion stand thus.

CHAPTER 8

[1256a] (1) But let us examine generally, in accordance with our normal sort of approach, possessions as such and the art of getting goods,[33] since the slave too turned out to be a part of one's possessions. In the first place, then, one might raise the question whether the art of getting goods is the same as household management, a part of it, or subordinate to it; and if subordinate, whether it is so in the way the art of making shuttles is to the art of weaving, or in the way the art of casting bronze is to the art of sculpture. For these are not subordinate in the same way, but the one provides instruments, the other the matter. (2) (By the matter I mean the substance out of which some work is performed—for example, wool for the weaver or bronze for the sculptor.) Now it is clear that household management is not the same as the art of getting goods, for it belongs to the latter to supply and the former to use. For what is the expertise that uses the things in the house if not expertise in household management? But whether getting goods is a part of it or different in kind is a matter of dispute. (3) For if it belongs to the expert at getting goods to discern how to get goods and property, and if property and wealth encompass many parts, one must consider in the first place whether expertise in farming is part of expertise in getting goods[34] or different in kind, and whether this is the case for the concern with sustenance generally and the possessions connected with it. (4) There are indeed many kinds of sustenance, and therefore many ways of life both of animals and of human beings. For it is impossible to live without sustenance, so that the differences in sustenance have made the ways of life of animals differ. (5) For of beasts some live in herds and others scattered—whichever is advantageous for their sustenance, on account of some of them being carnivores, some herbivores, and some omnivores; so that it is with a view to their convenience and their predilections in these matters that nature has

determined their ways of life. And because the same thing is not pleasant to each kind of animal according to nature but different things to different kinds, among the carnivores and the herbivores themselves their ways of life differ from one another. (6) The same is the case for human beings as well; for there are great differences in their ways of life. The idlest are nomads: they derive sustenance from tame animals without labor and amid leisure, though as it is necessary for their herds to move about on account of their pastures, they are compelled to follow along with them, as if they were farming a living farm. (7) Others live from hunting, and different sorts from different sorts of hunting. Some, for example, live from brigandage;[35] others from fishing, if they dwell near lakes, marshes, rivers, or a sea that is suitable; others from birds or wild beasts. But the type of human being that is most numerous lives from the land and from cultivated crops.

(8) The ways of life are, then, about this many, or at least those which involve self-generated work and do not supply sustenance through exchange [1256b] and commerce: the way of life of the nomad, the farmer, the brigand, the fisher, and the hunter. There are also some who live pleasantly by combining several of these in order to compensate for the shortcomings of one way of life, where it happens to be lacking in sufficiency. For example, some combine the nomad's with the brigand's, some the farmer's with the hunter's, and similarly with others as well—they pass their time in the manner that need [together with pleasure] compels them to.[36] (9) Now property of this sort is evidently given by nature itself to all animals, both immediately from birth and when they have reached completion. (10) For at birth from the very beginning some animals provide at the same time as much sustenance as is adequate until the offspring can supply itself—for example, those that give birth to larvae or eggs; while those that give birth to live offspring have sustenance for these in themselves for a certain period—the natural substance called milk. (11) It is clear in a similar way, therefore, that for grown things as well one must suppose both that plants exist for the sake of animals and that the other animals exist for the sake of human beings—the tame animals, both for use and sustenance, and most if not all of the wild animals, for sustenance and other assistance, in order that clothing and other instruments may be got from them.[37] (12) If, then, nature makes

nothing that is incomplete or purposeless, nature must necessarily have made all of these for the sake of human beings.

Hence the art of war will also be in some sense a natural form of the acquisitive art; for one part of it is expertise in hunting, which should be used with a view both to beasts and to those human beings who are naturally suited to be ruled but unwilling—this sort of war being by nature just. (13) One kind of the acquisitive art, then, is by nature a part of household management, and must either be available or be supplied by the latter so as to be available—the art of acquiring those goods a store of which is both necessary for life and useful for the community of a city or household.[38] (14) At any rate, it would seem to be these things that make up genuine wealth. For sufficiency[39] in possessions of this sort with a view to a good life is not limitless, as Solon asserts it to be in his poem: "of wealth no boundary lies revealed to men."[40] (15) There is such a boundary, just as in the other arts; for there is no art that has an instrument that is without limit either in number or in size, and wealth is the aggregate of instruments belonging to household managers and political rulers. That there is a natural art of acquisition for household managers and political rulers, then, and the cause of this, is clear.

CHAPTER 9

(1) But there is another type of acquisitive art that they particularly call—and justifiably so—the art of getting goods, on account of which there is [1257a] held to be no limit to wealth and property. This is considered by many to be one and the same as the sort mentioned because of the resemblance between them; and while it is not the same as the one spoken of, it is not far from it either. The one is by nature, while the other is not by nature but arises rather through a certain experience and art.

(2) Concerning this, let us take the following as our beginning. Every possession has a double use. Both of these uses belong to it as such, but not in the same way, the one being proper and the other not proper to the thing. In the case of shoes, for example, one can wear them or one can trade them.[41] Both of these are uses of shoes; (3) for the one exchanging shoes with someone who needs them in return for money or sustenance uses shoes as shoes, but not in respect of their proper use; for they did not come to be for the sake of exchange. The same is the case concerning

other possessions as well. (4) For trading can be applied to all things; it arises in the first place from something that is according to nature—the fact that human beings have either more or fewer things than what is required. Thus it is also clear that commerce is not by nature part of the art of making money;[42] for it was necessary to make an exchange in order to obtain what they required. (5) In the first community, then—that is, the household—it is evident that exchange has no function, but only when the community has already become more numerous. For those in the household shared all of the same things, while persons separated into different households needed many other things as well, and it was necessary to make transfers of these things according to their needs, as many barbarian nations still do, through barter.[43] (6) For they exchange useful things for one another and nothing besides—giving, for example, wine and accepting grain, and similarly for other such things. This sort of trading is not contrary to nature, nor is it any form of money-making, for it existed in order to support natural sufficiency. (7) However, the latter arose from it reasonably enough. For as the assistance of foreigners became greater in importing what they were in need of and exporting what was in surplus, the use of money was necessarily devised. (8) For the things necessary by nature are not in each case easily portable; hence with a view to exchanges they made a compact with one another to give and accept something which was itself one of the useful things and could be used flexibly to suit the needs of life, such as iron and silver and whatever else might be of this sort. At first this was something with its value determined simply by size and weight, but eventually they impressed a mark on it in order to be relieved of having to measure it, the mark being put on as an indication of the amount. [1257b] (9) Once a supply of money came into being as a result of such necessary exchange, then, the other kind of goods-getting arose—that is, commerce. At first this probably existed in a simple fashion, while later through experience it became more a matter of art—the art of discerning what and how to trade in order to make the greatest profit. (10) It is on this account that the art of goods-getting is held to be particularly connected with money, and to have as its function the ability to discern what will provide a given amount of it; for it is held to be productive of wealth and goods. Indeed, they often define wealth as a given amount of money, since this is what money-making or commerce is connected with. (11) At other times, however, money seems

to be something nonsensical and to exist altogether by convention,[44] and in no way by nature, because when changed by its users it is worth nothing and is not useful with a view to any of the necessary things; and it will often happen that one who is wealthy in money will go in want of necessary sustenance. Yet it would be absurd if wealth were something one could have in abundance and die of starvation—like the Midas of the fable, when everything set before him turned into gold on account of the greediness of his prayer.[45] (12) Hence they seek another definition of wealth and the getting of goods, and correctly so. For the getting of goods and the wealth that is according to nature is something different: this is the art of household management, while the other is commerce, which is productive of wealth not in every way but through trafficking in goods, and is held to be connected with money, since money is the medium and goal of exchange. (13) And the wealth deriving from this sort of getting of goods is indeed without limit. For just as the art of medicine has no limit with respect to being healthy, or any of the other arts with respect to its end (for this is what they particularly wish to accomplish), while there is a limit with respect to what exists for the sake of the end (since the end is a limit in the case of all of them), so with this sort of goods-getting there is no limit with respect to the end, and the end is wealth of this sort and property in money. (14) But of household management as distinguished from money-making there is a limit; for that is not the function of household management. Thus in one way it appears necessary that there be a limit to all wealth; yet if we look at what actually occurs we see that the opposite happens—all who engage in money-making increase their money without limit. (15) The cause of this is the nearness to one another of these [forms of goods-getting]. For they converge in the matter of use, the same thing being used in the case of either sort of goods-getting. For the same property is being used,[46] though not in the same respect, but in the one case the end is increase, in the other something else. So some hold that this is the function of household management, and they proceed on the supposition that they should either preserve or increase without limit their holdings of money. (16) The cause of this condition is that they are serious about living, [1258a] but not about living well; and since that desire of theirs is without limit, they also desire what is productive of unlimited things. Even those who also aim at living well seek what conduces to bodily gratifications, and since this too appears to be available in and

through property, their pursuits are wholly connected with making money, and this is why the other form of the art of getting goods has arisen. (17) For as gratification consists in excess, they seek the sort of art that produces the excess characteristic of gratification; and if they are unable to supply it through getting goods, they attempt this in some other fashion, using each sort of capacity in a way not according to nature. For it belongs to courage to produce not goods but confidence; nor does this belong to the military or medical arts, but it belongs to the former to produce victory, to the latter, health. (18) But all of these they make forms of money-making, as if this were the end and everything else had to march toward it.

Concerning the unnecessary sort of getting goods, then, both as regards what it is and why we are in need of it, enough has been said; and also concerning the necessary sort—that it is different from the other, being household management according to nature (the sort connected with sustenance), and is not without limit like the other, but has a defining principle.

CHAPTER 10

(1) It is also clear what the answer is to the question raised at the beginning whether the art of getting goods belongs to the expert household manager or political ruler or not, but should rather be available to him. For just as political expertise does not create human beings but makes use of them after receiving them from nature, so also should nature provide land or sea or something else for sustenance, while it befits the household manager to have what comes from those things in the state it should be in. (2) For it does not belong to the art of weaving to make wool, but to make use of it, and to know what sort is usable and suitable or poor and unsuitable. Otherwise one might raise the question why the art of getting goods should be a part of household management but not the medical art, since those in the household ought to be healthy, just as they must live or do any other necessary thing. (3) But just as seeing about health does indeed belong to the household manager and the ruler in a sense, but in another sense not but rather to the doctor, so in the case of goods it belongs to the household manager in a sense, but in another sense not but rather to the subordinate art. This should be available above all, as was said before, by nature. For it is a work of nature to provide sustenance to

the newly born, everything deriving sustenance from what remains of that from which it is born. (4) The art of getting goods relative to crops and animals is thus natural for all. But since it is twofold, as we said, part of it being commerce and part the art of household management, the latter necessary [1258b] and praised, while the art of exchange is justly blamed since it is not according to nature but involves taking from others, usury is most reasonably hated, because one's possessions derive from money itself and not from that for which it was supplied. (5) For it came into being for the sake of exchange, but interest actually creates more of it. And it is from this that it gets its name: offspring are similar to those who give birth to them, and interest is money born of money.[47] So of the sorts of goods-getting this is the most contrary to nature.

CHAPTER 11

(1) Since we have discussed adequately what relates to knowledge, what relates to utility must be treated. All things of this sort have room for a free sort of study, but experience in them is a necessity. The useful parts of the art of getting goods are: to be experienced regarding livestock—what sorts are most profitable in which places and under what conditions (for example, what sort of horses or cattle or sheep ought to be kept, and similarly with the other animals, (2) for one needs to be experienced as regards those that are most profitable both compared with one another and in particular places, since different kinds thrive in different areas); next, regarding farming, both of grain and fruit; and finally, regarding beekeeping and the raising of other animals, whether fish or fowl, from which it is possible to derive benefit. (3) Of the art of getting goods in its most proper sense, then, these are the parts and primary elements. Of the art of exchange the greatest part is trade, of which there are three parts: provisioning the ship, transport, and marketing (these differ from each other by the fact that some are safer while others provide greater remuneration); the second is moneylending; and the third is wage labor, (4) of which one sort involves workers' arts,[48] while the other is performed by those who lack any art but are useful only for their bodies. There is a third kind of art of getting goods between this and the first, since it has some part both of the sort that is according to nature and of the art of exchange: this deals with things from the earth and unfruitful but

useful things that grow from the earth, and includes activities such as lumbering and every sort of mining (5) (this now encompasses many different types, as there are many kinds of things mined from the earth).

A general account has now been given of each of these things; a detailed and exact discussion would be useful in undertaking the works themselves, but to spend much time on such things is crude. (6) The most artful of these works are those which involve chance the least; the most vulgar, those in which the body is most damaged; the most slavish, those in which the body is most used; the most ignoble, those which are least in need of virtue.

(7) Since some have written on these matters—as Chares of Paros and [1259a] Apollodoros of Lemnos on farming both of grain and fruit, for example, and others on other things—they may be studied there by anyone concerned with them; but, in addition, what has been said in various places concerning the ways some have succeeded in getting goods should be collected.[49] (8) For all these things are useful for those who honor the art of getting goods. There is, for example, the scheme of Thales of Miletus.[50] This is a money-making[51] scheme that is attributed to him on account of his wisdom, yet it happens to be general in application. (9) For they say that when some on account of his poverty reproached him with the uselessness of philosophy, Thales, observing through his knowledge of astronomy that there would be a good harvest of olives, was able during the winter to raise a small sum of money to place in deposit on all the olive presses in both Miletus and Chios, which he could hire at a low rate because no one was competing with him; then, when the season came, and many of them were suddenly in demand at the same time, he hired them out on what terms he pleased and collected a great deal of money,[52] thus showing how easy it is for philosophers to become wealthy if they so wish, but it is not this they are serious about. (10) Thales, then, is said to have made a display of his wisdom in this manner, though, as we said, this piece of the art of money-making is universal, if someone is able to establish a monopoly for himself. Thus even some cities raise revenue in this way when they are short of money; they establish a monopoly on things being sold. (11) In Sicily, a man used some money[53] deposited with him to buy all the iron from the iron foundries, and when traders came from their trading places he alone had it to sell; and though he did not

greatly increase the price, he made a hundred talents' profit out of an original fifty. (12) When Dionysius heard of this, he ordered him to take his money[54] and leave Syracuse, on the grounds that he had discovered a way of raising revenue that was harmful to Dionysius's own affairs.[55] Yet the insight was the same as that of Thales, for both artfully arranged a monopoly for themselves. (13) It is useful for political rulers also to be familiar with these things. For many cities stand in need of money-making and revenues of this sort, just as households do, yet more so. Thus there are some even among those engaged in politics who are concerned only with these matters.[56]

CHAPTER 12

(1) Since there are three parts of the art of household management—mastery, which was spoken of earlier, paternal rule, and marital rule—[the latter two must now be taken up. These differ fundamentally from the former, since one ought][57] to rule a wife and children as free persons, though it is not [1259b] the same manner of rule in each case, the wife being ruled in political, the children in kingly fashion. For the male, unless constituted in some respect contrary to nature, is by nature more expert at leading than the female, and the elder and complete than the younger and incomplete. (2) In most political offices, it is true, there is an alternation of ruler and ruled, since they tend by their nature to be on an equal footing and to differ in nothing; all the same, when one rules and the other is ruled, the ruler seeks to establish differences in external appearance, forms of address, and prerogatives, as in the story Amasis told about his footpan.[58] The male always stands thus in relation to the female. (3) But rule over the children is kingly. For the begetter is ruler on the basis of both affection and age, which is the very mark of kingly rule. Homer thus spoke finely of Zeus when he addressed as "father of men and gods" the king of them all. For by nature the king should be different, but he should be of the same stock; and this is the case of the elder in relation to the younger and the begetter to the child.

CHAPTER 13

(1) It is evident, then, that household management gives more serious attention to human beings than to inanimate property, to the virtue of these

rather than to that of property (which we call wealth), and to the virtue of free persons rather than to that of slaves. (2) First, then, one might raise a question concerning slaves: whether there is a certain virtue belonging to a slave beside the virtues of an instrument and a servant and more honorable than these, such as moderation and courage and justice and the other dispositions of this sort, or whether there is none beside the bodily services. (3) Questions arise either way, for if there is such a virtue, how will they differ from free persons? But if there is not, though they are human beings and share in reason, it is odd. Nearly the same question arises concerning woman and child, whether there are virtues belonging to these as well—whether the woman should be moderate and courageous and just, and whether a child is [capable of being] licentious and moderate or not. (4) And in general, then, this must be investigated concerning the ruled by nature and the ruler, whether virtue is the same or different. For if both should partake in gentlemanliness,[59] why should the one rule and the other be ruled once and for all? For it is not possible for them to differ by greater and less, since being ruled and ruling differ in kind, not by greater and less; (5) but that one should have such virtue and the other not would be surprising. For unless the ruler is moderate and just, how will he rule finely? And unless the ruled is, how will he be ruled finely? [1260a] For if he is licentious and cowardly he will perform none of his duties. It is evident, then, that both must of necessity partake in virtue, but that there are differences in their virtue, as there are in the virtue of those who are by nature ruled. (6) Consideration of the soul guides us straightway to this conclusion. For in this there is by nature a ruling and a ruled element, and we assert there is a different virtue of each—that is, of the element having reason and of the irrational element. It is clear, then, that the same thing holds in the other cases as well. Thus by nature most things are ruling and ruled. (7) For the free person rules the slave, the male the female, and the man the child in different ways. The parts of the soul are present in all, but they are present in a different way. The slave is wholly lacking the deliberative element; the female has it but it lacks authority;[60] the child has it but it is incomplete. (8) It is to be supposed that the same necessarily holds concerning the virtues of character: all must share in them, but not in the same way, but to each in relation to his own function. Hence the ruler must have complete virtue of character (for his function is in an absolute sense that of a master craftsman, and reason is a master

craftsman); while each of the others must have as much as falls to him. (9) It is thus evident that there is a virtue of character that belongs to all these mentioned, and that the moderation of a woman and a man is not the same, nor their courage or justice, as Socrates supposed, but that there is a ruling and a serving courage, and similarly with the other virtues. (10) This is clear further if we investigate the matter in more detail. For those who say in a general way that virtue is a good condition of the soul or acting correctly or something of this sort deceive themselves. Those who enumerate the virtues, like Gorgias, do much better than those who define it in this way.[61] (11) One should thus consider that matters stand with everyone as the poet said of woman: "to a woman silence is an ornament,"[62] though this is not the case for a man. Since the child is incomplete, it is clear that its virtue too is not its own as relating to itself, but as relating to its end and the person leading it. (12) The same is true of that of the slave in relation to a master. We laid it down that the slave is useful with respect to the necessary things, so that he clearly needs only a small amount of virtue—as much as will prevent him from falling short in his work through licentiousness or cowardice. One might raise the question whether, if what has just been said is true, artisans too will need virtue, since they often fall short in their work through licentiousness. (13) Or is the case very different? For the slave is a sharer in the master's life, while the other is more remote, and has virtue only so far as he [1260b] is also a slave. For the manufacturing artisan is under a special sort of slavery, and while the slave belongs among those persons or things that are by nature, no shoemaker does, nor any of the other artisans. (14) It is evident, therefore, that the master should be responsible for instilling this sort of virtue in the slave; he is not merely someone possessing an art of mastery that instructs the slave in his work. Those who deny reason to slaves and assert that commands only should be used with them do not argue finely: admonition is to be used with slaves more than with children. (15) But concerning these matters let our discussion stand thus. Concerning husband and wife and children and father and the sort of virtue that is connected with each of these, and what is and what is not fine in their relations with one another and how one should pursue what is well and avoid the bad, these things must necessarily be addressed in the discourses on the regimes.[63] For since the household as a whole is a part of the city, and these things of the household, and one should look at the

virtue of the part in relation to the virtue of the whole, both children and women must necessarily be educated looking to the regime, at least if it makes any difference with a view to the city's being excellent that both its children and its women are excellent. (16) But it necessarily makes a difference: women are a part amounting to a half of free persons, and from the children come those who are sharers in the regime. So since there has been discussion of these matters, and we must speak elsewhere of those remaining, let us leave off the present discourses as having reached an end and make another beginning to the argument. Let us investigate in the first instance the views that have been put forward about the best regime.