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BOOK I
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Every art and every inquiry, and similarly every action and pursuit,

is thought to aim at some good; and for this reason the good has rightly

been declared to be that at which all things aim. But a certain difference

is found among ends; some are activities, others are products apart

from the activities that produce them. Where there are ends apart

from the actions, it is the nature of the products to be better than

the activities. Now, as there are many actions, arts, and sciences,

their ends also are many; the end of the medical art is health, that

of shipbuilding a vessel, that of strategy victory, that of economics

wealth. But where such arts fall under a single capacity- as bridle-making

and the other arts concerned with the equipment of horses fall under

the art of riding, and this and every military action under strategy,

in the same way other arts fall under yet others- in all of these

the ends of the master arts are to be preferred to all the subordinate

ends; for it is for the sake of the former that the latter are pursued.

It makes no difference whether the activities themselves are the ends

of the actions, or something else apart from the activities, as in

the case of the sciences just mentioned.
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If, then, there is some end of the things we do, which we desire for

its own sake (everything else being desired for the sake of this),

and if we do not choose everything for the sake of something else

(for at that rate the process would go on to infinity, so that our

desire would be empty and vain), clearly this must be the good and

the chief good. Will not the knowledge of it, then, have a great influence

on life? Shall we not, like archers who have a mark to aim at, be

more likely to hit upon what is right? If so, we must try, in outline

at least, to determine what it is, and of which of the sciences or

capacities it is the object. It would seem to belong to the most authoritative

art and that which is most truly the master art. And politics appears

to be of this nature; for it is this that ordains which of the sciences

should be studied in a state, and which each class of citizens should

learn and up to what point they should learn them; and we see even

the most highly esteemed of capacities to fall under this, e.g. strategy,

economics, rhetoric; now, since politics uses the rest of the sciences,

and since, again, it legislates as to what we are to do and what we

are to abstain from, the end of this science must include those of

the others, so that this end must be the good for man. For even if

the end is the same for a single man and for a state, that of the

state seems at all events something greater and more complete whether

to attain or to preserve; though it is worth while to attain the end

merely for one man, it is finer and more godlike to attain it for

a nation or for city-states. These, then, are the ends at which our

inquiry aims, since it is political science, in one sense of that

term.
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Our discussion will be adequate if it has as much clearness as the

subject-matter admits of, for precision is not to be sought for alike

in all discussions, any more than in all the products of the crafts.

Now fine and just actions, which political science investigates, admit

of much variety and fluctuation of opinion, so that they may be thought

to exist only by convention, and not by nature. And goods also give

rise to a similar fluctuation because they bring harm to many people;

for before now men have been undone by reason of their wealth, and

others by reason of their courage. We must be content, then, in speaking

of such subjects and with such premisses to indicate the truth roughly

and in outline, and in speaking about things which are only for the

most part true and with premisses of the same kind to reach conclusions

that are no better. In the same spirit, therefore, should each type

of statement be received; for it is the mark of an educated man to

look for precision in each class of things just so far as the nature

of the subject admits; it is evidently equally foolish to accept probable

reasoning from a mathematician and to demand from a rhetorician scientific

proofs.

Now each man judges well the things he knows, and of these he is a

good judge. And so the man who has been educated in a subject is a

good judge of that subject, and the man who has received an all-round

education is a good judge in general. Hence a young man is not a proper

hearer of lectures on political science; for he is inexperienced in

the actions that occur in life, but its discussions start from these

and are about these; and, further, since he tends to follow his passions,

his study will be vain and unprofitable, because the end aimed at

is not knowledge but action. And it makes no difference whether he

is young in years or youthful in character; the defect does not depend

on time, but on his living, and pursuing each successive object, as

passion directs. For to such persons, as to the incontinent, knowledge

brings no profit; but to those who desire and act in accordance with

a rational principle knowledge about such matters will be of great

benefit.

These remarks about the student, the sort of treatment to be expected,

and the purpose of the inquiry, may be taken as our preface.
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Let us resume our inquiry and state, in view of the fact that all

knowledge and every pursuit aims at some good, what it is that we

say political science aims at and what is the highest of all goods

achievable by action. Verbally there is very general agreement; for

both the general run of men and people of superior refinement say

that it is happiness, and identify living well and doing well with

being happy; but with regard to what happiness is they differ, and

the many do not give the same account as the wise. For the former

think it is some plain and obvious thing, like pleasure, wealth, or

honour; they differ, however, from one another- and often even the

same man identifies it with different things, with health when he

is ill, with wealth when he is poor; but, conscious of their ignorance,

they admire those who proclaim some great ideal that is above their

comprehension. Now some thought that apart from these many goods there

is another which is self-subsistent and causes the goodness of all

these as well. To examine all the opinions that have been held were

perhaps somewhat fruitless; enough to examine those that are most

prevalent or that seem to be arguable.

Let us not fail to notice, however, that there is a difference between

arguments from and those to the first principles. For Plato, too,

was right in raising this question and asking, as he used to do, 'are

we on the way from or to the first principles?' There is a difference,

as there is in a race-course between the course from the judges to

the turning-point and the way back. For, while we must begin with

what is known, things are objects of knowledge in two senses- some

to us, some without qualification. Presumably, then, we must begin

with things known to us. Hence any one who is to listen intelligently

to lectures about what is noble and just, and generally, about the

subjects of political science must have been brought up in good habits.

For the fact is the starting-point, and if this is sufficiently plain

to him, he will not at the start need the reason as well; and the

man who has been well brought up has or can easily get startingpoints.

And as for him who neither has nor can get them, let him hear the

words of Hesiod:

Far best is he who knows all things himself;

Good, he that hearkens when men counsel right;

But he who neither knows, nor lays to heart

Another's wisdom, is a useless wight.
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Let us, however, resume our discussion from the point at which we

digressed. To judge from the lives that men lead, most men, and men

of the most vulgar type, seem (not without some ground) to identify

the good, or happiness, with pleasure; which is the reason why they

love the life of enjoyment. For there are, we may say, three prominent

types of life- that just mentioned, the political, and thirdly the

contemplative life. Now the mass of mankind are evidently quite slavish

in their tastes, preferring a life suitable to beasts, but they get

some ground for their view from the fact that many of those in high

places share the tastes of Sardanapallus. A consideration of the prominent

types of life shows that people of superior refinement and of active

disposition identify happiness with honour; for this is, roughly speaking,

the end of the political life. But it seems too superficial to be

what we are looking for, since it is thought to depend on those who

bestow honour rather than on him who receives it, but the good we

divine to be something proper to a man and not easily taken from him.

Further, men seem to pursue honour in order that they may be assured

of their goodness; at least it is by men of practical wisdom that

they seek to be honoured, and among those who know them, and on the

ground of their virtue; clearly, then, according to them, at any rate,

virtue is better. And perhaps one might even suppose this to be, rather

than honour, the end of the political life. But even this appears

somewhat incomplete; for possession of virtue seems actually compatible

with being asleep, or with lifelong inactivity, and, further, with

the greatest sufferings and misfortunes; but a man who was living

so no one would call happy, unless he were maintaining a thesis at

all costs. But enough of this; for the subject has been sufficiently

treated even in the current discussions. Third comes the contemplative

life, which we shall consider later.

The life of money-making is one undertaken under compulsion, and wealth

is evidently not the good we are seeking; for it is merely useful

and for the sake of something else. And so one might rather take the

aforenamed objects to be ends; for they are loved for themselves.

But it is evident that not even these are ends; yet many arguments

have been thrown away in support of them. Let us leave this subject,

then.
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We had perhaps better consider the universal good and discuss thoroughly

what is meant by it, although such an inquiry is made an uphill one

by the fact that the Forms have been introduced by friends of our

own. Yet it would perhaps be thought to be better, indeed to be our

duty, for the sake of maintaining the truth even to destroy what touches

us closely, especially as we are philosophers or lovers of wisdom;

for, while both are dear, piety requires us to honour truth above

our friends.

The men who introduced this doctrine did not posit Ideas of classes

within which they recognized priority and posteriority (which is the

reason why they did not maintain the existence of an Idea embracing

all numbers); but the term 'good' is used both in the category of

substance and in that of quality and in that of relation, and that

which is per se, i.e. substance, is prior in nature to the relative

(for the latter is like an off shoot and accident of being); so that

there could not be a common Idea set over all these goods. Further,

since 'good' has as many senses as 'being' (for it is predicated both

in the category of substance, as of God and of reason, and in quality,

i.e. of the virtues, and in quantity, i.e. of that which is moderate,

and in relation, i.e. of the useful, and in time, i.e. of the right

opportunity, and in place, i.e. of the right locality and the like),

clearly it cannot be something universally present in all cases and

single; for then it could not have been predicated in all the categories

but in one only. Further, since of the things answering to one Idea

there is one science, there would have been one science of all the

goods; but as it is there are many sciences even of the things that

fall under one category, e.g. of opportunity, for opportunity in war

is studied by strategics and in disease by medicine, and the moderate

in food is studied by medicine and in exercise by the science of gymnastics.

And one might ask the question, what in the world they mean by 'a

thing itself', is (as is the case) in 'man himself' and in a particular

man the account of man is one and the same. For in so far as they

are man, they will in no respect differ; and if this is so, neither

will 'good itself' and particular goods, in so far as they are good.

But again it will not be good any the more for being eternal, since

that which lasts long is no whiter than that which perishes in a day.

The Pythagoreans seem to give a more plausible account of the good,

when they place the one in the column of goods; and it is they that

Speusippus seems to have followed.

But let us discuss these matters elsewhere; an objection to what we

have said, however, may be discerned in the fact that the Platonists

have not been speaking about all goods, and that the goods that are

pursued and loved for themselves are called good by reference to a

single Form, while those which tend to produce or to preserve these

somehow or to prevent their contraries are called so by reference

to these, and in a secondary sense. Clearly, then, goods must be spoken

of in two ways, and some must be good in themselves, the others by

reason of these. Let us separate, then, things good in themselves

from things useful, and consider whether the former are called good

by reference to a single Idea. What sort of goods would one call good

in themselves? Is it those that are pursued even when isolated from

others, such as intelligence, sight, and certain pleasures and honours?

Certainly, if we pursue these also for the sake of something else,

yet one would place them among things good in themselves. Or is nothing

other than the Idea of good good in itself? In that case the Form

will be empty. But if the things we have named are also things good

in themselves, the account of the good will have to appear as something

identical in them all, as that of whiteness is identical in snow and

in white lead. But of honour, wisdom, and pleasure, just in respect

of their goodness, the accounts are distinct and diverse. The good,

therefore, is not some common element answering to one Idea.

But what then do we mean by the good? It is surely not like the things

that only chance to have the same name. Are goods one, then, by being

derived from one good or by all contributing to one good, or are they

rather one by analogy? Certainly as sight is in the body, so is reason

in the soul, and so on in other cases. But perhaps these subjects

had better be dismissed for the present; for perfect precision about

them would be more appropriate to another branch of philosophy. And

similarly with regard to the Idea; even if there is some one good

which is universally predicable of goods or is capable of separate

and independent existence, clearly it could not be achieved or attained

by man; but we are now seeking something attainable. Perhaps, however,

some one might think it worth while to recognize this with a view

to the goods that are attainable and achievable; for having this as

a sort of pattern we shall know better the goods that are good for

us, and if we know them shall attain them. This argument has some

plausibility, but seems to clash with the procedure of the sciences;

for all of these, though they aim at some good and seek to supply

the deficiency of it, leave on one side the knowledge of the good.

Yet that all the exponents of the arts should be ignorant of, and

should not even seek, so great an aid is not probable. It is hard,

too, to see how a weaver or a carpenter will be benefited in regard

to his own craft by knowing this 'good itself', or how the man who

has viewed the Idea itself will be a better doctor or general thereby.

For a doctor seems not even to study health in this way, but the health

of man, or perhaps rather the health of a particular man; it is individuals

that he is healing. But enough of these topics.
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Let us again return to the good we are seeking, and ask what it can

be. It seems different in different actions and arts; it is different

in medicine, in strategy, and in the other arts likewise. What then

is the good of each? Surely that for whose sake everything else is

done. In medicine this is health, in strategy victory, in architecture

a house, in any other sphere something else, and in every action and

pursuit the end; for it is for the sake of this that all men do whatever

else they do. Therefore, if there is an end for all that we do, this

will be the good achievable by action, and if there are more than

one, these will be the goods achievable by action.

So the argument has by a different course reached the same point;

but we must try to state this even more clearly. Since there are evidently

more than one end, and we choose some of these (e.g. wealth, flutes,

and in general instruments) for the sake of something else, clearly

not all ends are final ends; but the chief good is evidently something

final. Therefore, if there is only one final end, this will be what

we are seeking, and if there are more than one, the most final of

these will be what we are seeking. Now we call that which is in itself

worthy of pursuit more final than that which is worthy of pursuit

for the sake of something else, and that which is never desirable

for the sake of something else more final than the things that are

desirable both in themselves and for the sake of that other thing,

and therefore we call final without qualification that which is always

desirable in itself and never for the sake of something else.

Now such a thing happiness, above all else, is held to be; for this

we choose always for self and never for the sake of something else,

but honour, pleasure, reason, and every virtue we choose indeed for

themselves (for if nothing resulted from them we should still choose

each of them), but we choose them also for the sake of happiness,

judging that by means of them we shall be happy. Happiness, on the

other hand, no one chooses for the sake of these, nor, in general,

for anything other than itself.

From the point of view of self-sufficiency the same result seems to

follow; for the final good is thought to be self-sufficient. Now by

self-sufficient we do not mean that which is sufficient for a man

by himself, for one who lives a solitary life, but also for parents,

children, wife, and in general for his friends and fellow citizens,

since man is born for citizenship. But some limit must be set to this;

for if we extend our requirement to ancestors and descendants and

friends' friends we are in for an infinite series. Let us examine

this question, however, on another occasion; the self-sufficient we

now define as that which when isolated makes life desirable and lacking

in nothing; and such we think happiness to be; and further we think

it most desirable of all things, without being counted as one good

thing among others- if it were so counted it would clearly be made

more desirable by the addition of even the least of goods; for that

which is added becomes an excess of goods, and of goods the greater

is always more desirable. Happiness, then, is something final and

self-sufficient, and is the end of action.

Presumably, however, to say that happiness is the chief good seems

a platitude, and a clearer account of what it is still desired. This

might perhaps be given, if we could first ascertain the function of

man. For just as for a flute-player, a sculptor, or an artist, and,

in general, for all things that have a function or activity, the good

and the 'well' is thought to reside in the function, so would it seem

to be for man, if he has a function. Have the carpenter, then, and

the tanner certain functions or activities, and has man none? Is he

born without a function? Or as eye, hand, foot, and in general each

of the parts evidently has a function, may one lay it down that man

similarly has a function apart from all these? What then can this

be? Life seems to be common even to plants, but we are seeking what

is peculiar to man. Let us exclude, therefore, the life of nutrition

and growth. Next there would be a life of perception, but it also

seems to be common even to the horse, the ox, and every animal. There

remains, then, an active life of the element that has a rational principle;

of this, one part has such a principle in the sense of being obedient

to one, the other in the sense of possessing one and exercising thought.

And, as 'life of the rational element' also has two meanings, we must

state that life in the sense of activity is what we mean; for this

seems to be the more proper sense of the term. Now if the function

of man is an activity of soul which follows or implies a rational

principle, and if we say 'so-and-so-and 'a good so-and-so' have a

function which is the same in kind, e.g. a lyre, and a good lyre-player,

and so without qualification in all cases, eminence in respect of

goodness being idded to the name of the function (for the function

of a lyre-player is to play the lyre, and that of a good lyre-player

is to do so well): if this is the case, and we state the function

of man to be a certain kind of life, and this to be an activity or

actions of the soul implying a rational principle, and the function

of a good man to be the good and noble performance of these, and if

any action is well performed when it is performed in accordance with

the appropriate excellence: if this is the case, human good turns

out to be activity of soul in accordance with virtue, and if there

are more than one virtue, in accordance with the best and most complete.

But we must add 'in a complete life.' For one swallow does not make

a summer, nor does one day; and so too one day, or a short time, does

not make a man blessed and happy.

Let this serve as an outline of the good; for we must presumably first

sketch it roughly, and then later fill in the details. But it would

seem that any one is capable of carrying on and articulating what

has once been well outlined, and that time is a good discoverer or

partner in such a work; to which facts the advances of the arts are

due; for any one can add what is lacking. And we must also remember

what has been said before, and not look for precision in all things

alike, but in each class of things such precision as accords with

the subject-matter, and so much as is appropriate to the inquiry.

For a carpenter and a geometer investigate the right angle in different

ways; the former does so in so far as the right angle is useful for

his work, while the latter inquires what it is or what sort of thing

it is; for he is a spectator of the truth. We must act in the same

way, then, in all other matters as well, that our main task may not

be subordinated to minor questions. Nor must we demand the cause in

all matters alike; it is enough in some cases that the fact be well

established, as in the case of the first principles; the fact is the

primary thing or first principle. Now of first principles we see some

by induction, some by perception, some by a certain habituation, and

others too in other ways. But each set of principles we must try to

investigate in the natural way, and we must take pains to state them

definitely, since they have a great influence on what follows. For

the beginning is thought to be more than half of the whole, and many

of the questions we ask are cleared up by it.
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We must consider it, however, in the light not only of our conclusion

and our premisses, but also of what is commonly said about it; for

with a true view all the data harmonize, but with a false one the

facts soon clash. Now goods have been divided into three classes,

and some are described as external, others as relating to soul or

to body; we call those that relate to soul most properly and truly

goods, and psychical actions and activities we class as relating to

soul. Therefore our account must be sound, at least according to this

view, which is an old one and agreed on by philosophers. It is correct

also in that we identify the end with certain actions and activities;

for thus it falls among goods of the soul and not among external goods.

Another belief which harmonizes with our account is that the happy

man lives well and does well; for we have practically defined happiness

as a sort of good life and good action. The characteristics that are

looked for in happiness seem also, all of them, to belong to what

we have defined happiness as being. For some identify happiness with

virtue, some with practical wisdom, others with a kind of philosophic

wisdom, others with these, or one of these, accompanied by pleasure

or not without pleasure; while others include also external prosperity.

Now some of these views have been held by many men and men of old,

others by a few eminent persons; and it is not probable that either

of these should be entirely mistaken, but rather that they should

be right in at least some one respect or even in most respects.

With those who identify happiness with virtue or some one virtue our

account is in harmony; for to virtue belongs virtuous activity. But

it makes, perhaps, no small difference whether we place the chief

good in possession or in use, in state of mind or in activity. For

the state of mind may exist without producing any good result, as

in a man who is asleep or in some other way quite inactive, but the

activity cannot; for one who has the activity will of necessity be

acting, and acting well. And as in the Olympic Games it is not the

most beautiful and the strongest that are crowned but those who compete

(for it is some of these that are victorious), so those who act win,

and rightly win, the noble and good things in life.

Their life is also in itself pleasant. For pleasure is a state of

soul, and to each man that which he is said to be a lover of is pleasant;

e.g. not only is a horse pleasant to the lover of horses, and a spectacle

to the lover of sights, but also in the same way just acts are pleasant

to the lover of justice and in general virtuous acts to the lover

of virtue. Now for most men their pleasures are in conflict with one

another because these are not by nature pleasant, but the lovers of

what is noble find pleasant the things that are by nature pleasant;

and virtuous actions are such, so that these are pleasant for such

men as well as in their own nature. Their life, therefore, has no

further need of pleasure as a sort of adventitious charm, but has

its pleasure in itself. For, besides what we have said, the man who

does not rejoice in noble actions is not even good; since no one would

call a man just who did not enjoy acting justly, nor any man liberal

who did not enjoy liberal actions; and similarly in all other cases.

If this is so, virtuous actions must be in themselves pleasant. But

they are also good and noble, and have each of these attributes in

the highest degree, since the good man judges well about these attributes;

his judgement is such as we have described. Happiness then is the

best, noblest, and most pleasant thing in the world, and these attributes

are not severed as in the inscription at Delos-

Most noble is that which is justest, and best is health;

But pleasantest is it to win what we love.

For all these properties belong to the best activities; and these,

or one- the best- of these, we identify with happiness.

Yet evidently, as we said, it needs the external goods as well; for

it is impossible, or not easy, to do noble acts without the proper

equipment. In many actions we use friends and riches and political

power as instruments; and there are some things the lack of which

takes the lustre from happiness, as good birth, goodly children, beauty;

for the man who is very ugly in appearance or ill-born or solitary

and childless is not very likely to be happy, and perhaps a man would

be still less likely if he had thoroughly bad children or friends

or had lost good children or friends by death. As we said, then, happiness

seems to need this sort of prosperity in addition; for which reason

some identify happiness with good fortune, though others identify

it with virtue.
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For this reason also the question is asked, whether happiness is to

be acquired by learning or by habituation or some other sort of training,

or comes in virtue of some divine providence or again by chance. Now

if there is any gift of the gods to men, it is reasonable that happiness

should be god-given, and most surely god-given of all human things

inasmuch as it is the best. But this question would perhaps be more

appropriate to another inquiry; happiness seems, however, even if

it is not god-sent but comes as a result of virtue and some process

of learning or training, to be among the most godlike things; for

that which is the prize and end of virtue seems to be the best thing

in the world, and something godlike and blessed.

It will also on this view be very generally shared; for all who are

not maimed as regards their potentiality for virtue may win it by

a certain kind of study and care. But if it is better to be happy

thus than by chance, it is reasonable that the facts should be so,

since everything that depends on the action of nature is by nature

as good as it can be, and similarly everything that depends on art

or any rational cause, and especially if it depends on the best of

all causes. To entrust to chance what is greatest and most noble would

be a very defective arrangement.

The answer to the question we are asking is plain also from the definition

of happiness; for it has been said to be a virtuous activity of soul,

of a certain kind. Of the remaining goods, some must necessarily pre-exist

as conditions of happiness, and others are naturally co-operative

and useful as instruments. And this will be found to agree with what

we said at the outset; for we stated the end of political science

to be the best end, and political science spends most of its pains

on making the citizens to be of a certain character, viz. good and

capable of noble acts.

It is natural, then, that we call neither ox nor horse nor any other

of the animals happy; for none of them is capable of sharing in such

activity. For this reason also a boy is not happy; for he is not yet

capable of such acts, owing to his age; and boys who are called happy

are being congratulated by reason of the hopes we have for them. For

there is required, as we said, not only complete virtue but also a

complete life, since many changes occur in life, and all manner of

chances, and the most prosperous may fall into great misfortunes in

old age, as is told of Priam in the Trojan Cycle; and one who has

experienced such chances and has ended wretchedly no one calls happy.
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Must no one at all, then, be called happy while he lives; must we,

as Solon says, see the end? Even if we are to lay down this doctrine,

is it also the case that a man is happy when he is dead? Or is not

this quite absurd, especially for us who say that happiness is an

activity? But if we do not call the dead man happy, and if Solon does

not mean this, but that one can then safely call a man blessed as

being at last beyond evils and misfortunes, this also affords matter

for discussion; for both evil and good are thought to exist for a

dead man, as much as for one who is alive but not aware of them; e.g.

honours and dishonours and the good or bad fortunes of children and

in general of descendants. And this also presents a problem; for though

a man has lived happily up to old age and has had a death worthy of

his life, many reverses may befall his descendants- some of them may

be good and attain the life they deserve, while with others the opposite

may be the case; and clearly too the degrees of relationship between

them and their ancestors may vary indefinitely. It would be odd, then,

if the dead man were to share in these changes and become at one time

happy, at another wretched; while it would also be odd if the fortunes

of the descendants did not for some time have some effect on the happiness

of their ancestors.

But we must return to our first difficulty; for perhaps by a consideration

of it our present problem might be solved. Now if we must see the

end and only then call a man happy, not as being happy but as having

been so before, surely this is a paradox, that when he is happy the

attribute that belongs to him is not to be truly predicated of him

because we do not wish to call living men happy, on account of the

changes that may befall them, and because we have assumed happiness

to be something permanent and by no means easily changed, while a

single man may suffer many turns of fortune's wheel. For clearly if

we were to keep pace with his fortunes, we should often call the same

man happy and again wretched, making the happy man out to be chameleon

and insecurely based. Or is this keeping pace with his fortunes quite

wrong? Success or failure in life does not depend on these, but human

life, as we said, needs these as mere additions, while virtuous activities

or their opposites are what constitute happiness or the reverse.

The question we have now discussed confirms our definition. For no

function of man has so much permanence as virtuous activities (these

are thought to be more durable even than knowledge of the sciences),

and of these themselves the most valuable are more durable because

those who are happy spend their life most readily and most continuously

in these; for this seems to be the reason why we do not forget them.

The attribute in question, then, will belong to the happy man, and

he will be happy throughout his life; for always, or by preference

to everything else, he will be engaged in virtuous action and contemplation,

and he will bear the chances of life most nobly and altogether decorously,

if he is 'truly good' and 'foursquare beyond reproach'.

Now many events happen by chance, and events differing in importance;

small pieces of good fortune or of its opposite clearly do not weigh

down the scales of life one way or the other, but a multitude of great

events if they turn out well will make life happier (for not only

are they themselves such as to add beauty to life, but the way a man

deals with them may be noble and good), while if they turn out ill

they crush and maim happiness; for they both bring pain with them

and hinder many activities. Yet even in these nobility shines through,

when a man bears with resignation many great misfortunes, not through

insensibility to pain but through nobility and greatness of soul.

If activities are, as we said, what gives life its character, no happy

man can become miserable; for he will never do the acts that are hateful

and mean. For the man who is truly good and wise, we think, bears

all the chances life becomingly and always makes the best of circumstances,

as a good general makes the best military use of the army at his command

and a good shoemaker makes the best shoes out of the hides that are

given him; and so with all other craftsmen. And if this is the case,

the happy man can never become miserable; though he will not reach

blessedness, if he meet with fortunes like those of Priam.

Nor, again, is he many-coloured and changeable; for neither will he

be moved from his happy state easily or by any ordinary misadventures,

but only by many great ones, nor, if he has had many great misadventures,

will he recover his happiness in a short time, but if at all, only

in a long and complete one in which he has attained many splendid

successes.

When then should we not say that he is happy who is active in accordance

with complete virtue and is sufficiently equipped with external goods,

not for some chance period but throughout a complete life? Or must

we add 'and who is destined to live thus and die as befits his life'?

Certainly the future is obscure to us, while happiness, we claim,

is an end and something in every way final. If so, we shall call happy

those among living men in whom these conditions are, and are to be,

fulfilled- but happy men. So much for these questions.

11

That the fortunes of descendants and of all a man's friends should

not affect his happiness at all seems a very unfriendly doctrine,

and one opposed to the opinions men hold; but since the events that

happen are numerous and admit of all sorts of difference, and some

come more near to us and others less so, it seems a long- nay, an

infinite- task to discuss each in detail; a general outline will perhaps

suffice. If, then, as some of a man's own misadventures have a certain

weight and influence on life while others are, as it were, lighter,

so too there are differences among the misadventures of our friends

taken as a whole, and it makes a difference whether the various suffering

befall the living or the dead (much more even than whether lawless

and terrible deeds are presupposed in a tragedy or done on the stage),

this difference also must be taken into account; or rather, perhaps,

the fact that doubt is felt whether the dead share in any good or

evil. For it seems, from these considerations, that even if anything

whether good or evil penetrates to them, it must be something weak

and negligible, either in itself or for them, or if not, at least

it must be such in degree and kind as not to make happy those who

are not happy nor to take away their blessedness from those who are.

The good or bad fortunes of friends, then, seem to have some effects

on the dead, but effects of such a kind and degree as neither to make

the happy unhappy nor to produce any other change of the kind.
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These questions having been definitely answered, let us consider whether

happiness is among the things that are praised or rather among the

things that are prized; for clearly it is not to be placed among potentialities.

Everything that is praised seems to be praised because it is of a

certain kind and is related somehow to something else; for we praise

the just or brave man and in general both the good man and virtue

itself because of the actions and functions involved, and we praise

the strong man, the good runner, and so on, because he is of a certain

kind and is related in a certain way to something good and important.

This is clear also from the praises of the gods; for it seems absurd

that the gods should be referred to our standard, but this is done

because praise involves a reference, to something else. But if if

praise is for things such as we have described, clearly what applies

to the best things is not praise, but something greater and better,

as is indeed obvious; for what we do to the gods and the most godlike

of men is to call them blessed and happy. And so too with good things;

no one praises happiness as he does justice, but rather calls it blessed,

as being something more divine and better.

Eudoxus also seems to have been right in his method of advocating

the supremacy of pleasure; he thought that the fact that, though a

good, it is not praised indicated it to be better than the things

that are praised, and that this is what God and the good are; for

by reference to these all other things are judged. Praise is appropriate

to virtue, for as a result of virtue men tend to do noble deeds, but

encomia are bestowed on acts, whether of the body or of the soul.

But perhaps nicety in these matters is more proper to those who have

made a study of encomia; to us it is clear from what has been said

that happiness is among the things that are prized and perfect. It

seems to be so also from the fact that it is a first principle; for

it is for the sake of this that we all do all that we do, and the

first principle and cause of goods is, we claim, something prized

and divine.
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Since happiness is an activity of soul in accordance with perfect

virtue, we must consider the nature of virtue; for perhaps we shall

thus see better the nature of happiness. The true student of politics,

too, is thought to have studied virtue above all things; for he wishes

to make his fellow citizens good and obedient to the laws. As an example

of this we have the lawgivers of the Cretans and the Spartans, and

any others of the kind that there may have been. And if this inquiry

belongs to political science, clearly the pursuit of it will be in

accordance with our original plan. But clearly the virtue we must

study is human virtue; for the good we were seeking was human good

and the happiness human happiness. By human virtue we mean not that

of the body but that of the soul; and happiness also we call an activity

of soul. But if this is so, clearly the student of politics must know

somehow the facts about soul, as the man who is to heal the eyes or

the body as a whole must know about the eyes or the body; and all

the more since politics is more prized and better than medicine; but

even among doctors the best educated spend much labour on acquiring

knowledge of the body. The student of politics, then, must study the

soul, and must study it with these objects in view, and do so just

to the extent which is sufficient for the questions we are discussing;

for further precision is perhaps something more laborious than our

purposes require.

Some things are said about it, adequately enough, even in the discussions

outside our school, and we must use these; e.g. that one element in

the soul is irrational and one has a rational principle. Whether these

are separated as the parts of the body or of anything divisible are,

or are distinct by definition but by nature inseparable, like convex

and concave in the circumference of a circle, does not affect the

present question.

Of the irrational element one division seems to be widely distributed,

and vegetative in its nature, I mean that which causes nutrition and

growth; for it is this kind of power of the soul that one must assign

to all nurslings and to embryos, and this same power to fullgrown

creatures; this is more reasonable than to assign some different power

to them. Now the excellence of this seems to be common to all species

and not specifically human; for this part or faculty seems to function

most in sleep, while goodness and badness are least manifest in sleep

(whence comes the saying that the happy are not better off than the

wretched for half their lives; and this happens naturally enough,

since sleep is an inactivity of the soul in that respect in which

it is called good or bad), unless perhaps to a small extent some of

the movements actually penetrate to the soul, and in this respect

the dreams of good men are better than those of ordinary people. Enough

of this subject, however; let us leave the nutritive faculty alone,

since it has by its nature no share in human excellence.

There seems to be also another irrational element in the soul-one

which in a sense, however, shares in a rational principle. For we

praise the rational principle of the continent man and of the incontinent,

and the part of their soul that has such a principle, since it urges

them aright and towards the best objects; but there is found in them

also another element naturally opposed to the rational principle,

which fights against and resists that principle. For exactly as paralysed

limbs when we intend to move them to the right turn on the contrary

to the left, so is it with the soul; the impulses of incontinent people

move in contrary directions. But while in the body we see that which

moves astray, in the soul we do not. No doubt, however, we must none

the less suppose that in the soul too there is something contrary

to the rational principle, resisting and opposing it. In what sense

it is distinct from the other elements does not concern us. Now even

this seems to have a share in a rational principle, as we said; at

any rate in the continent man it obeys the rational principle and

presumably in the temperate and brave man it is still more obedient;

for in him it speaks, on all matters, with the same voice as the rational

principle.

Therefore the irrational element also appears to be two-fold. For

the vegetative element in no way shares in a rational principle, but

the appetitive and in general the desiring element in a sense shares

in it, in so far as it listens to and obeys it; this is the sense

in which we speak of 'taking account' of one's father or one's friends,

not that in which we speak of 'accounting for a mathematical property.

That the irrational element is in some sense persuaded by a rational

principle is indicated also by the giving of advice and by all reproof

and exhortation. And if this element also must be said to have a rational

principle, that which has a rational principle (as well as that which

has not) will be twofold, one subdivision having it in the strict

sense and in itself, and the other having a tendency to obey as one

does one's father.

Virtue too is distinguished into kinds in accordance with this difference;

for we say that some of the virtues are intellectual and others moral,

philosophic wisdom and understanding and practical wisdom being intellectual,

liberality and temperance moral. For in speaking about a man's character

we do not say that he is wise or has understanding but that he is

good-tempered or temperate; yet we praise the wise man also with respect

to his state of mind; and of states of mind we call those which merit

praise virtues.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK II
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Virtue, then, being of two kinds, intellectual and moral, intellectual

virtue in the main owes both its birth and its growth to teaching

(for which reason it requires experience and time), while moral virtue

comes about as a result of habit, whence also its name (ethike) is

one that is formed by a slight variation from the word ethos (habit).

From this it is also plain that none of the moral virtues arises in

us by nature; for nothing that exists by nature can form a habit contrary

to its nature. For instance the stone which by nature moves downwards

cannot be habituated to move upwards, not even if one tries to train

it by throwing it up ten thousand times; nor can fire be habituated

to move downwards, nor can anything else that by nature behaves in

one way be trained to behave in another. Neither by nature, then,

nor contrary to nature do the virtues arise in us; rather we are adapted

by nature to receive them, and are made perfect by habit.

Again, of all the things that come to us by nature we first acquire

the potentiality and later exhibit the activity (this is plain in

the case of the senses; for it was not by often seeing or often hearing

that we got these senses, but on the contrary we had them before we

used them, and did not come to have them by using them); but the virtues

we get by first exercising them, as also happens in the case of the

arts as well. For the things we have to learn before we can do them,

we learn by doing them, e.g. men become builders by building and lyreplayers

by playing the lyre; so too we become just by doing just acts, temperate

by doing temperate acts, brave by doing brave acts.

This is confirmed by what happens in states; for legislators make

the citizens good by forming habits in them, and this is the wish

of every legislator, and those who do not effect it miss their mark,

and it is in this that a good constitution differs from a bad one.

Again, it is from the same causes and by the same means that every

virtue is both produced and destroyed, and similarly every art; for

it is from playing the lyre that both good and bad lyre-players are

produced. And the corresponding statement is true of builders and

of all the rest; men will be good or bad builders as a result of building

well or badly. For if this were not so, there would have been no need

of a teacher, but all men would have been born good or bad at their

craft. This, then, is the case with the virtues also; by doing the

acts that we do in our transactions with other men we become just

or unjust, and by doing the acts that we do in the presence of danger,

and being habituated to feel fear or confidence, we become brave or

cowardly. The same is true of appetites and feelings of anger; some

men become temperate and good-tempered, others self-indulgent and

irascible, by behaving in one way or the other in the appropriate

circumstances. Thus, in one word, states of character arise out of

like activities. This is why the activities we exhibit must be of

a certain kind; it is because the states of character correspond to

the differences between these. It makes no small difference, then,

whether we form habits of one kind or of another from our very youth;

it makes a very great difference, or rather all the difference.
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Since, then, the present inquiry does not aim at theoretical knowledge

like the others (for we are inquiring not in order to know what virtue

is, but in order to become good, since otherwise our inquiry would

have been of no use), we must examine the nature of actions, namely

how we ought to do them; for these determine also the nature of the

states of character that are produced, as we have said. Now, that

we must act according to the right rule is a common principle and

must be assumed-it will be discussed later, i.e. both what the right

rule is, and how it is related to the other virtues. But this must

be agreed upon beforehand, that the whole account of matters of conduct

must be given in outline and not precisely, as we said at the very

beginning that the accounts we demand must be in accordance with the

subject-matter; matters concerned with conduct and questions of what

is good for us have no fixity, any more than matters of health. The

general account being of this nature, the account of particular cases

is yet more lacking in exactness; for they do not fall under any art

or precept but the agents themselves must in each case consider what

is appropriate to the occasion, as happens also in the art of medicine

or of navigation.

But though our present account is of this nature we must give what

help we can. First, then, let us consider this, that it is the nature

of such things to be destroyed by defect and excess, as we see in

the case of strength and of health (for to gain light on things imperceptible

we must use the evidence of sensible things); both excessive and defective

exercise destroys the strength, and similarly drink or food which

is above or below a certain amount destroys the health, while that

which is proportionate both produces and increases and preserves it.

So too is it, then, in the case of temperance and courage and the

other virtues. For the man who flies from and fears everything and

does not stand his ground against anything becomes a coward, and the

man who fears nothing at all but goes to meet every danger becomes

rash; and similarly the man who indulges in every pleasure and abstains

from none becomes self-indulgent, while the man who shuns every pleasure,

as boors do, becomes in a way insensible; temperance and courage,

then, are destroyed by excess and defect, and preserved by the mean.

But not only are the sources and causes of their origination and growth

the same as those of their destruction, but also the sphere of their

actualization will be the same; for this is also true of the things

which are more evident to sense, e.g. of strength; it is produced

by taking much food and undergoing much exertion, and it is the strong

man that will be most able to do these things. So too is it with the

virtues; by abstaining from pleasures we become temperate, and it

is when we have become so that we are most able to abstain from them;

and similarly too in the case of courage; for by being habituated

to despise things that are terrible and to stand our ground against

them we become brave, and it is when we have become so that we shall

be most able to stand our ground against them.
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We must take as a sign of states of character the pleasure or pain

that ensues on acts; for the man who abstains from bodily pleasures

and delights in this very fact is temperate, while the man who is

annoyed at it is self-indulgent, and he who stands his ground against

things that are terrible and delights in this or at least is not pained

is brave, while the man who is pained is a coward. For moral excellence

is concerned with pleasures and pains; it is on account of the pleasure

that we do bad things, and on account of the pain that we abstain

from noble ones. Hence we ought to have been brought up in a particular

way from our very youth, as Plato says, so as both to delight in and

to be pained by the things that we ought; for this is the right education.

Again, if the virtues are concerned with actions and passions, and

every passion and every action is accompanied by pleasure and pain,

for this reason also virtue will be concerned with pleasures and pains.

This is indicated also by the fact that punishment is inflicted by

these means; for it is a kind of cure, and it is the nature of cures

to be effected by contraries.

Again, as we said but lately, every state of soul has a nature relative

to and concerned with the kind of things by which it tends to be made

worse or better; but it is by reason of pleasures and pains that men

become bad, by pursuing and avoiding these- either the pleasures and

pains they ought not or when they ought not or as they ought not,

or by going wrong in one of the other similar ways that may be distinguished.

Hence men even define the virtues as certain states of impassivity

and rest; not well, however, because they speak absolutely, and do

not say 'as one ought' and 'as one ought not' and 'when one ought

or ought not', and the other things that may be added. We assume,

then, that this kind of excellence tends to do what is best with regard

to pleasures and pains, and vice does the contrary.

The following facts also may show us that virtue and vice are concerned

with these same things. There being three objects of choice and three

of avoidance, the noble, the advantageous, the pleasant, and their

contraries, the base, the injurious, the painful, about all of these

the good man tends to go right and the bad man to go wrong, and especially

about pleasure; for this is common to the animals, and also it accompanies

all objects of choice; for even the noble and the advantageous appear

pleasant.

Again, it has grown up with us all from our infancy; this is why it

is difficult to rub off this passion, engrained as it is in our life.

And we measure even our actions, some of us more and others less,

by the rule of pleasure and pain. For this reason, then, our whole

inquiry must be about these; for to feel delight and pain rightly

or wrongly has no small effect on our actions.

Again, it is harder to fight with pleasure than with anger, to use

Heraclitus' phrase', but both art and virtue are always concerned

with what is harder; for even the good is better when it is harder.

Therefore for this reason also the whole concern both of virtue and

of political science is with pleasures and pains; for the man who

uses these well will be good, he who uses them badly bad.

That virtue, then, is concerned with pleasures and pains, and that

by the acts from which it arises it is both increased and, if they

are done differently, destroyed, and that the acts from which it arose

are those in which it actualizes itself- let this be taken as said.
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The question might be asked,; what we mean by saying that we must

become just by doing just acts, and temperate by doing temperate acts;

for if men do just and temperate acts, they are already just and temperate,

exactly as, if they do what is in accordance with the laws of grammar

and of music, they are grammarians and musicians.

Or is this not true even of the arts? It is possible to do something

that is in accordance with the laws of grammar, either by chance or

at the suggestion of another. A man will be a grammarian, then, only

when he has both done something grammatical and done it grammatically;

and this means doing it in accordance with the grammatical knowledge

in himself.

Again, the case of the arts and that of the virtues are not similar;

for the products of the arts have their goodness in themselves, so

that it is enough that they should have a certain character, but if

the acts that are in accordance with the virtues have themselves a

certain character it does not follow that they are done justly or

temperately. The agent also must be in a certain condition when he

does them; in the first place he must have knowledge, secondly he

must choose the acts, and choose them for their own sakes, and thirdly

his action must proceed from a firm and unchangeable character. These

are not reckoned in as conditions of the possession of the arts, except

the bare knowledge; but as a condition of the possession of the virtues

knowledge has little or no weight, while the other conditions count

not for a little but for everything, i.e. the very conditions which

result from often doing just and temperate acts.

Actions, then, are called just and temperate when they are such as

the just or the temperate man would do; but it is not the man who

does these that is just and temperate, but the man who also does them

as just and temperate men do them. It is well said, then, that it

is by doing just acts that the just man is produced, and by doing

temperate acts the temperate man; without doing these no one would

have even a prospect of becoming good.

But most people do not do these, but take refuge in theory and think

they are being philosophers and will become good in this way, behaving

somewhat like patients who listen attentively to their doctors, but

do none of the things they are ordered to do. As the latter will not

be made well in body by such a course of treatment, the former will

not be made well in soul by such a course of philosophy.
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Next we must consider what virtue is. Since things that are found

in the soul are of three kinds- passions, faculties, states of character,

virtue must be one of these. By passions I mean appetite, anger, fear,

confidence, envy, joy, friendly feeling, hatred, longing, emulation,

pity, and in general the feelings that are accompanied by pleasure

or pain; by faculties the things in virtue of which we are said to

be capable of feeling these, e.g. of becoming angry or being pained

or feeling pity; by states of character the things in virtue of which

we stand well or badly with reference to the passions, e.g. with reference

to anger we stand badly if we feel it violently or too weakly, and

well if we feel it moderately; and similarly with reference to the

other passions.

Now neither the virtues nor the vices are passions, because we are

not called good or bad on the ground of our passions, but are so called

on the ground of our virtues and our vices, and because we are neither

praised nor blamed for our passions (for the man who feels fear or

anger is not praised, nor is the man who simply feels anger blamed,

but the man who feels it in a certain way), but for our virtues and

our vices we are praised or blamed.

Again, we feel anger and fear without choice, but the virtues are

modes of choice or involve choice. Further, in respect of the passions

we are said to be moved, but in respect of the virtues and the vices

we are said not to be moved but to be disposed in a particular way.

For these reasons also they are not faculties; for we are neither

called good nor bad, nor praised nor blamed, for the simple capacity

of feeling the passions; again, we have the faculties by nature, but

we are not made good or bad by nature; we have spoken of this before.

If, then, the virtues are neither passions nor faculties, all that

remains is that they should be states of character.

Thus we have stated what virtue is in respect of its genus.
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We must, however, not only describe virtue as a state of character,

but also say what sort of state it is. We may remark, then, that every

virtue or excellence both brings into good condition the thing of

which it is the excellence and makes the work of that thing be done

well; e.g. the excellence of the eye makes both the eye and its work

good; for it is by the excellence of the eye that we see well. Similarly

the excellence of the horse makes a horse both good in itself and

good at running and at carrying its rider and at awaiting the attack

of the enemy. Therefore, if this is true in every case, the virtue

of man also will be the state of character which makes a man good

and which makes him do his own work well.

How this is to happen we have stated already, but it will be made

plain also by the following consideration of the specific nature of

virtue. In everything that is continuous and divisible it is possible

to take more, less, or an equal amount, and that either in terms of

the thing itself or relatively to us; and the equal is an intermediate

between excess and defect. By the intermediate in the object I mean

that which is equidistant from each of the extremes, which is one

and the same for all men; by the intermediate relatively to us that

which is neither too much nor too little- and this is not one, nor

the same for all. For instance, if ten is many and two is few, six

is the intermediate, taken in terms of the object; for it exceeds

and is exceeded by an equal amount; this is intermediate according

to arithmetical proportion. But the intermediate relatively to us

is not to be taken so; if ten pounds are too much for a particular

person to eat and two too little, it does not follow that the trainer

will order six pounds; for this also is perhaps too much for the person

who is to take it, or too little- too little for Milo, too much for

the beginner in athletic exercises. The same is true of running and

wrestling. Thus a master of any art avoids excess and defect, but

seeks the intermediate and chooses this- the intermediate not in the

object but relatively to us.

If it is thus, then, that every art does its work well- by looking

to the intermediate and judgling its works by this standard (so that

we often say of good works of art that it is not possible either to

take away or to add anything, implying that excess and defect destroy

the goodness of works of art, while the mean preserves it; and good

artists, as we say, look to this in their work), and if, further,

virtue is more exact and better than any art, as nature also is, then

virtue must have the quality of aiming at the intermediate. I mean

moral virtue; for it is this that is concerned with passions and actions,

and in these there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. For instance,

both fear and confidence and appetite and anger and pity and in general

pleasure and pain may be felt both too much and too little, and in

both cases not well; but to feel them at the right times, with reference

to the right objects, towards the right people, with the right motive,

and in the right way, is what is both intermediate and best, and this

is characteristic of virtue. Similarly with regard to actions also

there is excess, defect, and the intermediate. Now virtue is concerned

with passions and actions, in which excess is a form of failure, and

so is defect, while the intermediate is praised and is a form of success;

and being praised and being successful are both characteristics of

virtue. Therefore virtue is a kind of mean, since, as we have seen,

it aims at what is intermediate.

Again, it is possible to fail in many ways (for evil belongs to the

class of the unlimited, as the Pythagoreans conjectured, and good

to that of the limited), while to succeed is possible only in one

way (for which reason also one is easy and the other difficult- to

miss the mark easy, to hit it difficult); for these reasons also,

then, excess and defect are characteristic of vice, and the mean of

virtue;

For men are good in but one way, but bad in many.

Virtue, then, is a state of character concerned with choice, lying

in a mean, i.e. the mean relative to us, this being determined by

a rational principle, and by that principle by which the man of practical

wisdom would determine it. Now it is a mean between two vices, that

which depends on excess and that which depends on defect; and again

it is a mean because the vices respectively fall short of or exceed

what is right in both passions and actions, while virtue both finds

and chooses that which is intermediate. Hence in respect of its substance

and the definition which states its essence virtue is a mean, with

regard to what is best and right an extreme.

But not every action nor every passion admits of a mean; for some

have names that already imply badness, e.g. spite, shamelessness,

envy, and in the case of actions adultery, theft, murder; for all

of these and suchlike things imply by their names that they are themselves

bad, and not the excesses or deficiencies of them. It is not possible,

then, ever to be right with regard to them; one must always be wrong.

Nor does goodness or badness with regard to such things depend on

committing adultery with the right woman, at the right time, and in

the right way, but simply to do any of them is to go wrong. It would

be equally absurd, then, to expect that in unjust, cowardly, and voluptuous

action there should be a mean, an excess, and a deficiency; for at

that rate there would be a mean of excess and of deficiency, an excess

of excess, and a deficiency of deficiency. But as there is no excess

and deficiency of temperance and courage because what is intermediate

is in a sense an extreme, so too of the actions we have mentioned

there is no mean nor any excess and deficiency, but however they are

done they are wrong; for in general there is neither a mean of excess

and deficiency, nor excess and deficiency of a mean.
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We must, however, not only make this general statement, but also apply

it to the individual facts. For among statements about conduct those

which are general apply more widely, but those which are particular

are more genuine, since conduct has to do with individual cases, and

our statements must harmonize with the facts in these cases. We may

take these cases from our table. With regard to feelings of fear and

confidence courage is the mean; of the people who exceed, he who exceeds

in fearlessness has no name (many of the states have no name), while

the man who exceeds in confidence is rash, and he who exceeds in fear

and falls short in confidence is a coward. With regard to pleasures

and pains- not all of them, and not so much with regard to the pains-

the mean is temperance, the excess self-indulgence. Persons deficient

with regard to the pleasures are not often found; hence such persons

also have received no name. But let us call them 'insensible'.

With regard to giving and taking of money the mean is liberality,

the excess and the defect prodigality and meanness. In these actions

people exceed and fall short in contrary ways; the prodigal exceeds

in spending and falls short in taking, while the mean man exceeds

in taking and falls short in spending. (At present we are giving a

mere outline or summary, and are satisfied with this; later these

states will be more exactly determined.) With regard to money there

are also other dispositions- a mean, magnificence (for the magnificent

man differs from the liberal man; the former deals with large sums,

the latter with small ones), an excess, tastelessness and vulgarity,

and a deficiency, niggardliness; these differ from the states opposed

to liberality, and the mode of their difference will be stated later.

With regard to honour and dishonour the mean is proper pride, the

excess is known as a sort of 'empty vanity', and the deficiency is

undue humility; and as we said liberality was related to magnificence,

differing from it by dealing with small sums, so there is a state

similarly related to proper pride, being concerned with small honours

while that is concerned with great. For it is possible to desire honour

as one ought, and more than one ought, and less, and the man who exceeds

in his desires is called ambitious, the man who falls short unambitious,

while the intermediate person has no name. The dispositions also are

nameless, except that that of the ambitious man is called ambition.

Hence the people who are at the extremes lay claim to the middle place;

and we ourselves sometimes call the intermediate person ambitious

and sometimes unambitious, and sometimes praise the ambitious man

and sometimes the unambitious. The reason of our doing this will be

stated in what follows; but now let us speak of the remaining states

according to the method which has been indicated.

With regard to anger also there is an excess, a deficiency, and a

mean. Although they can scarcely be said to have names, yet since

we call the intermediate person good-tempered let us call the mean

good temper; of the persons at the extremes let the one who exceeds

be called irascible, and his vice irascibility, and the man who falls

short an inirascible sort of person, and the deficiency inirascibility.

There are also three other means, which have a certain likeness to

one another, but differ from one another: for they are all concerned

with intercourse in words and actions, but differ in that one is concerned

with truth in this sphere, the other two with pleasantness; and of

this one kind is exhibited in giving amusement, the other in all the

circumstances of life. We must therefore speak of these too, that

we may the better see that in all things the mean is praise-worthy,

and the extremes neither praiseworthy nor right, but worthy of blame.

Now most of these states also have no names, but we must try, as in

the other cases, to invent names ourselves so that we may be clear

and easy to follow. With regard to truth, then, the intermediate is

a truthful sort of person and the mean may be called truthfulness,

while the pretence which exaggerates is boastfulness and the person

characterized by it a boaster, and that which understates is mock

modesty and the person characterized by it mock-modest. With regard

to pleasantness in the giving of amusement the intermediate person

is ready-witted and the disposition ready wit, the excess is buffoonery

and the person characterized by it a buffoon, while the man who falls

short is a sort of boor and his state is boorishness. With regard

to the remaining kind of pleasantness, that which is exhibited in

life in general, the man who is pleasant in the right way is friendly

and the mean is friendliness, while the man who exceeds is an obsequious

person if he has no end in view, a flatterer if he is aiming at his

own advantage, and the man who falls short and is unpleasant in all

circumstances is a quarrelsome and surly sort of person.

There are also means in the passions and concerned with the passions;

since shame is not a virtue, and yet praise is extended to the modest

man. For even in these matters one man is said to be intermediate,

and another to exceed, as for instance the bashful man who is ashamed

of everything; while he who falls short or is not ashamed of anything

at all is shameless, and the intermediate person is modest. Righteous

indignation is a mean between envy and spite, and these states are

concerned with the pain and pleasure that are felt at the fortunes

of our neighbours; the man who is characterized by righteous indignation

is pained at undeserved good fortune, the envious man, going beyond

him, is pained at all good fortune, and the spiteful man falls so

far short of being pained that he even rejoices. But these states

there will be an opportunity of describing elsewhere; with regard

to justice, since it has not one simple meaning, we shall, after describing

the other states, distinguish its two kinds and say how each of them

is a mean; and similarly we shall treat also of the rational virtues.
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There are three kinds of disposition, then, two of them vices, involving

excess and deficiency respectively, and one a virtue, viz. the mean,

and all are in a sense opposed to all; for the extreme states are

contrary both to the intermediate state and to each other, and the

intermediate to the extremes; as the equal is greater relatively to

the less, less relatively to the greater, so the middle states are

excessive relatively to the deficiencies, deficient relatively to

the excesses, both in passions and in actions. For the brave man appears

rash relatively to the coward, and cowardly relatively to the rash

man; and similarly the temperate man appears self-indulgent relatively

to the insensible man, insensible relatively to the self-indulgent,

and the liberal man prodigal relatively to the mean man, mean relatively

to the prodigal. Hence also the people at the extremes push the intermediate

man each over to the other, and the brave man is called rash by the

coward, cowardly by the rash man, and correspondingly in the other

cases.

These states being thus opposed to one another, the greatest contrariety

is that of the extremes to each other, rather than to the intermediate;

for these are further from each other than from the intermediate,

as the great is further from the small and the small from the great

than both are from the equal. Again, to the intermediate some extremes

show a certain likeness, as that of rashness to courage and that of

prodigality to liberality; but the extremes show the greatest unlikeness

to each other; now contraries are defined as the things that are furthest

from each other, so that things that are further apart are more contrary.

To the mean in some cases the deficiency, in some the excess is more

opposed; e.g. it is not rashness, which is an excess, but cowardice,

which is a deficiency, that is more opposed to courage, and not insensibility,

which is a deficiency, but self-indulgence, which is an excess, that

is more opposed to temperance. This happens from two reasons, one

being drawn from the thing itself; for because one extreme is nearer

and liker to the intermediate, we oppose not this but rather its contrary

to the intermediate. E.g. since rashness is thought liker and nearer

to courage, and cowardice more unlike, we oppose rather the latter

to courage; for things that are further from the intermediate are

thought more contrary to it. This, then, is one cause, drawn from

the thing itself; another is drawn from ourselves; for the things

to which we ourselves more naturally tend seem more contrary to the

intermediate. For instance, we ourselves tend more naturally to pleasures,

and hence are more easily carried away towards self-indulgence than

towards propriety. We describe as contrary to the mean, then, rather

the directions in which we more often go to great lengths; and therefore

self-indulgence, which is an excess, is the more contrary to temperance.
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That moral virtue is a mean, then, and in what sense it is so, and

that it is a mean between two vices, the one involving excess, the

other deficiency, and that it is such because its character is to

aim at what is intermediate in passions and in actions, has been sufficiently

stated. Hence also it is no easy task to be good. For in everything

it is no easy task to find the middle, e.g. to find the middle of

a circle is not for every one but for him who knows; so, too, any

one can get angry- that is easy- or give or spend money; but to do

this to the right person, to the right extent, at the right time,

with the right motive, and in the right way, that is not for every

one, nor is it easy; wherefore goodness is both rare and laudable

and noble.

Hence he who aims at the intermediate must first depart from what

is the more contrary to it, as Calypso advises-

Hold the ship out beyond that surf and spray.

For of the extremes one is more erroneous, one less so; therefore,

since to hit the mean is hard in the extreme, we must as a second

best, as people say, take the least of the evils; and this will be

done best in the way we describe. But we must consider the things

towards which we ourselves also are easily carried away; for some

of us tend to one thing, some to another; and this will be recognizable

from the pleasure and the pain we feel. We must drag ourselves away

to the contrary extreme; for we shall get into the intermediate state

by drawing well away from error, as people do in straightening sticks

that are bent.

Now in everything the pleasant or pleasure is most to be guarded against;

for we do not judge it impartially. We ought, then, to feel towards

pleasure as the elders of the people felt towards Helen, and in all

circumstances repeat their saying; for if we dismiss pleasure thus

we are less likely to go astray. It is by doing this, then, (to sum

the matter up) that we shall best be able to hit the mean.

But this is no doubt difficult, and especially in individual cases;

for or is not easy to determine both how and with whom and on what

provocation and how long one should be angry; for we too sometimes

praise those who fall short and call them good-tempered, but sometimes

we praise those who get angry and call them manly. The man, however,

who deviates little from goodness is not blamed, whether he do so

in the direction of the more or of the less, but only the man who

deviates more widely; for he does not fail to be noticed. But up to

what point and to what extent a man must deviate before he becomes

blameworthy it is not easy to determine by reasoning, any more than

anything else that is perceived by the senses; such things depend

on particular facts, and the decision rests with perception. So much,

then, is plain, that the intermediate state is in all things to be

praised, but that we must incline sometimes towards the excess, sometimes

towards the deficiency; for so shall we most easily hit the mean and

what is right.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK III

1

Since virtue is concerned with passions and actions, and on voluntary

passions and actions praise and blame are bestowed, on those that

are involuntary pardon, and sometimes also pity, to distinguish the

voluntary and the involuntary is presumably necessary for those who

are studying the nature of virtue, and useful also for legislators

with a view to the assigning both of honours and of punishments. Those

things, then, are thought-involuntary, which take place under compulsion

or owing to ignorance; and that is compulsory of which the moving

principle is outside, being a principle in which nothing is contributed

by the person who is acting or is feeling the passion, e.g. if he

were to be carried somewhere by a wind, or by men who had him in their

power.

But with regard to the things that are done from fear of greater evils

or for some noble object (e.g. if a tyrant were to order one to do

something base, having one's parents and children in his power, and

if one did the action they were to be saved, but otherwise would be

put to death), it may be debated whether such actions are involuntary

or voluntary. Something of the sort happens also with regard to the

throwing of goods overboard in a storm; for in the abstract no one

throws goods away voluntarily, but on condition of its securing the

safety of himself and his crew any sensible man does so. Such actions,

then, are mixed, but are more like voluntary actions; for they are

worthy of choice at the time when they are done, and the end of an

action is relative to the occasion. Both the terms, then, 'voluntary'

and 'involuntary', must be used with reference to the moment of action.

Now the man acts voluntarily; for the principle that moves the instrumental

parts of the body in such actions is in him, and the things of which

the moving principle is in a man himself are in his power to do or

not to do. Such actions, therefore, are voluntary, but in the abstract

perhaps involuntary; for no one would choose any such act in itself.

For such actions men are sometimes even praised, when they endure

something base or painful in return for great and noble objects gained;

in the opposite case they are blamed, since to endure the greatest

indignities for no noble end or for a trifling end is the mark of

an inferior person. On some actions praise indeed is not bestowed,

but pardon is, when one does what he ought not under pressure which

overstrains human nature and which no one could withstand. But some

acts, perhaps, we cannot be forced to do, but ought rather to face

death after the most fearful sufferings; for the things that 'forced'

Euripides Alcmaeon to slay his mother seem absurd. It is difficult

sometimes to determine what should be chosen at what cost, and what

should be endured in return for what gain, and yet more difficult

to abide by our decisions; for as a rule what is expected is painful,

and what we are forced to do is base, whence praise and blame are

bestowed on those who have been compelled or have not.

What sort of acts, then, should be called compulsory? We answer that

without qualification actions are so when the cause is in the external

circumstances and the agent contributes nothing. But the things that

in themselves are involuntary, but now and in return for these gains

are worthy of choice, and whose moving principle is in the agent,

are in themselves involuntary, but now and in return for these gains

voluntary. They are more like voluntary acts; for actions are in the

class of particulars, and the particular acts here are voluntary.

What sort of things are to be chosen, and in return for what, it is

not easy to state; for there are many differences in the particular

cases.

But if some one were to say that pleasant and noble objects have a

compelling power, forcing us from without, all acts would be for him

compulsory; for it is for these objects that all men do everything

they do. And those who act under compulsion and unwillingly act with

pain, but those who do acts for their pleasantness and nobility do

them with pleasure; it is absurd to make external circumstances responsible,

and not oneself, as being easily caught by such attractions, and to

make oneself responsible for noble acts but the pleasant objects responsible

for base acts. The compulsory, then, seems to be that whose moving

principle is outside, the person compelled contributing nothing.

Everything that is done by reason of ignorance is not voluntary; it

is only what produces pain and repentance that is involuntary. For

the man who has done something owing to ignorance, and feels not the

least vexation at his action, has not acted voluntarily, since he

did not know what he was doing, nor yet involuntarily, since he is

not pained. Of people, then, who act by reason of ignorance he who

repents is thought an involuntary agent, and the man who does not

repent may, since he is different, be called a not voluntary agent;

for, since he differs from the other, it is better that he should

have a name of his own.

Acting by reason of ignorance seems also to be different from acting

in ignorance; for the man who is drunk or in a rage is thought to

act as a result not of ignorance but of one of the causes mentioned,

yet not knowingly but in ignorance.

Now every wicked man is ignorant of what he ought to do and what he

ought to abstain from, and it is by reason of error of this kind that

men become unjust and in general bad; but the term 'involuntary' tends

to be used not if a man is ignorant of what is to his advantage- for

it is not mistaken purpose that causes involuntary action (it leads

rather to wickedness), nor ignorance of the universal (for that men

are blamed), but ignorance of particulars, i.e. of the circumstances

of the action and the objects with which it is concerned. For it is

on these that both pity and pardon depend, since the person who is

ignorant of any of these acts involuntarily.

Perhaps it is just as well, therefore, to determine their nature and

number. A man may be ignorant, then, of who he is, what he is doing,

what or whom he is acting on, and sometimes also what (e.g. what instrument)

he is doing it with, and to what end (e.g. he may think his act will

conduce to some one's safety), and how he is doing it (e.g. whether

gently or violently). Now of all of these no one could be ignorant

unless he were mad, and evidently also he could not be ignorant of

the agent; for how could he not know himself? But of what he is doing

a man might be ignorant, as for instance people say 'it slipped out

of their mouths as they were speaking', or 'they did not know it was

a secret', as Aeschylus said of the mysteries, or a man might say

he 'let it go off when he merely wanted to show its working', as the

man did with the catapult. Again, one might think one's son was an

enemy, as Merope did, or that a pointed spear had a button on it,

or that a stone was pumicestone; or one might give a man a draught

to save him, and really kill him; or one might want to touch a man,

as people do in sparring, and really wound him. The ignorance may

relate, then, to any of these things, i.e. of the circumstances of

the action, and the man who was ignorant of any of these is thought

to have acted involuntarily, and especially if he was ignorant on

the most important points; and these are thought to be the circumstances

of the action and its end. Further, the doing of an act that is called

involuntary in virtue of ignorance of this sort must be painful and

involve repentance.

Since that which is done under compulsion or by reason of ignorance

is involuntary, the voluntary would seem to be that of which the moving

principle is in the agent himself, he being aware of the particular

circumstances of the action. Presumably acts done by reason of anger

or appetite are not rightly called involuntary. For in the first place,

on that showing none of the other animals will act voluntarily, nor

will children; and secondly, is it meant that we do not do voluntarily

any of the acts that are due to appetite or anger, or that we do the

noble acts voluntarily and the base acts involuntarily? Is not this

absurd, when one and the same thing is the cause? But it would surely

be odd to describe as involuntary the things one ought to desire;

and we ought both to be angry at certain things and to have an appetite

for certain things, e.g. for health and for learning. Also what is

involuntary is thought to be painful, but what is in accordance with

appetite is thought to be pleasant. Again, what is the difference

in respect of involuntariness between errors committed upon calculation

and those committed in anger? Both are to be avoided, but the irrational

passions are thought not less human than reason is, and therefore

also the actions which proceed from anger or appetite are the man's

actions. It would be odd, then, to treat them as involuntary.
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Both the voluntary and the involuntary having been delimited, we must

next discuss choice; for it is thought to be most closely bound up

with virtue and to discriminate characters better than actions do.

Choice, then, seems to be voluntary, but not the same thing as the

voluntary; the latter extends more widely. For both children and the

lower animals share in voluntary action, but not in choice, and acts

done on the spur of the moment we describe as voluntary, but not as

chosen.

Those who say it is appetite or anger or wish or a kind of opinion

do not seem to be right. For choice is not common to irrational creatures

as well, but appetite and anger are. Again, the incontinent man acts

with appetite, but not with choice; while the continent man on the

contrary acts with choice, but not with appetite. Again, appetite

is contrary to choice, but not appetite to appetite. Again, appetite

relates to the pleasant and the painful, choice neither to the painful

nor to the pleasant.

Still less is it anger; for acts due to anger are thought to be less

than any others objects of choice.

But neither is it wish, though it seems near to it; for choice cannot

relate to impossibles, and if any one said he chose them he would

be thought silly; but there may be a wish even for impossibles, e.g.

for immortality. And wish may relate to things that could in no way

be brought about by one's own efforts, e.g. that a particular actor

or athlete should win in a competition; but no one chooses such things,

but only the things that he thinks could be brought about by his own

efforts. Again, wish relates rather to the end, choice to the means;

for instance, we wish to be healthy, but we choose the acts which

will make us healthy, and we wish to be happy and say we do, but we

cannot well say we choose to be so; for, in general, choice seems

to relate to the things that are in our own power.

For this reason, too, it cannot be opinion; for opinion is thought

to relate to all kinds of things, no less to eternal things and impossible

things than to things in our own power; and it is distinguished by

its falsity or truth, not by its badness or goodness, while choice

is distinguished rather by these.

Now with opinion in general perhaps no one even says it is identical.

But it is not identical even with any kind of opinion; for by choosing

what is good or bad we are men of a certain character, which we are

not by holding certain opinions. And we choose to get or avoid something

good or bad, but we have opinions about what a thing is or whom it

is good for or how it is good for him; we can hardly be said to opine

to get or avoid anything. And choice is praised for being related

to the right object rather than for being rightly related to it, opinion

for being truly related to its object. And we choose what we best

know to be good, but we opine what we do not quite know; and it is

not the same people that are thought to make the best choices and

to have the best opinions, but some are thought to have fairly good

opinions, but by reason of vice to choose what they should not. If

opinion precedes choice or accompanies it, that makes no difference;

for it is not this that we are considering, but whether it is identical

with some kind of opinion.

What, then, or what kind of thing is it, since it is none of the things

we have mentioned? It seems to be voluntary, but not all that is voluntary

to be an object of choice. Is it, then, what has been decided on by

previous deliberation? At any rate choice involves a rational principle

and thought. Even the name seems to suggest that it is what is chosen

before other things.
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Do we deliberate about everything, and is everything a possible subject

of deliberation, or is deliberation impossible about some things?

We ought presumably to call not what a fool or a madman would deliberate

about, but what a sensible man would deliberate about, a subject of

deliberation. Now about eternal things no one deliberates, e.g. about

the material universe or the incommensurability of the diagonal and

the side of a square. But no more do we deliberate about the things

that involve movement but always happen in the same way, whether of

necessity or by nature or from any other cause, e.g. the solstices

and the risings of the stars; nor about things that happen now in

one way, now in another, e.g. droughts and rains; nor about chance

events, like the finding of treasure. But we do not deliberate even

about all human affairs; for instance, no Spartan deliberates about

the best constitution for the Scythians. For none of these things

can be brought about by our own efforts.

We deliberate about things that are in our power and can be done;

and these are in fact what is left. For nature, necessity, and chance

are thought to be causes, and also reason and everything that depends

on man. Now every class of men deliberates about the things that can

be done by their own efforts. And in the case of exact and self-contained

sciences there is no deliberation, e.g. about the letters of the alphabet

(for we have no doubt how they should be written); but the things

that are brought about by our own efforts, but not always in the same

way, are the things about which we deliberate, e.g. questions of medical

treatment or of money-making. And we do so more in the case of the

art of navigation than in that of gymnastics, inasmuch as it has been

less exactly worked out, and again about other things in the same

ratio, and more also in the case of the arts than in that of the sciences;

for we have more doubt about the former. Deliberation is concerned

with things that happen in a certain way for the most part, but in

which the event is obscure, and with things in which it is indeterminate.

We call in others to aid us in deliberation on important questions,

distrusting ourselves as not being equal to deciding.

We deliberate not about ends but about means. For a doctor does not

deliberate whether he shall heal, nor an orator whether he shall persuade,

nor a statesman whether he shall produce law and order, nor does any

one else deliberate about his end. They assume the end and consider

how and by what means it is to be attained; and if it seems to be

produced by several means they consider by which it is most easily

and best produced, while if it is achieved by one only they consider

how it will be achieved by this and by what means this will be achieved,

till they come to the first cause, which in the order of discovery

is last. For the person who deliberates seems to investigate and analyse

in the way described as though he were analysing a geometrical construction

(not all investigation appears to be deliberation- for instance mathematical

investigations- but all deliberation is investigation), and what is

last in the order of analysis seems to be first in the order of becoming.

And if we come on an impossibility, we give up the search, e.g. if

we need money and this cannot be got; but if a thing appears possible

we try to do it. By 'possible' things I mean things that might be

brought about by our own efforts; and these in a sense include things

that can be brought about by the efforts of our friends, since the

moving principle is in ourselves. The subject of investigation is

sometimes the instruments, sometimes the use of them; and similarly

in the other cases- sometimes the means, sometimes the mode of using

it or the means of bringing it about. It seems, then, as has been

said, that man is a moving principle of actions; now deliberation

is about the things to be done by the agent himself, and actions are

for the sake of things other than themselves. For the end cannot be

a subject of deliberation, but only the means; nor indeed can the

particular facts be a subject of it, as whether this is bread or has

been baked as it should; for these are matters of perception. If we

are to be always deliberating, we shall have to go on to infinity.

The same thing is deliberated upon and is chosen, except that the

object of choice is already determinate, since it is that which has

been decided upon as a result of deliberation that is the object of

choice. For every one ceases to inquire how he is to act when he has

brought the moving principle back to himself and to the ruling part

of himself; for this is what chooses. This is plain also from the

ancient constitutions, which Homer represented; for the kings announced

their choices to the people. The object of choice being one of the

things in our own power which is desired after deliberation, choice

will be deliberate desire of things in our own power; for when we

have decided as a result of deliberation, we desire in accordance

with our deliberation.

We may take it, then, that we have described choice in outline, and

stated the nature of its objects and the fact that it is concerned

with means.
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That wish is for the end has already been stated; some think it is

for the good, others for the apparent good. Now those who say that

the good is the object of wish must admit in consequence that that

which the man who does not choose aright wishes for is not an object

of wish (for if it is to be so, it must also be good; but it was,

if it so happened, bad); while those who say the apparent good is

the object of wish must admit that there is no natural object of wish,

but only what seems good to each man. Now different things appear

good to different people, and, if it so happens, even contrary things.

If these consequences are unpleasing, are we to say that absolutely

and in truth the good is the object of wish, but for each person the

apparent good; that that which is in truth an object of wish is an

object of wish to the good man, while any chance thing may be so the

bad man, as in the case of bodies also the things that are in truth

wholesome are wholesome for bodies which are in good condition, while

for those that are diseased other things are wholesome- or bitter

or sweet or hot or heavy, and so on; since the good man judges each

class of things rightly, and in each the truth appears to him? For

each state of character has its own ideas of the noble and the pleasant,

and perhaps the good man differs from others most by seeing the truth

in each class of things, being as it were the norm and measure of

them. In most things the error seems to be due to pleasure; for it

appears a good when it is not. We therefore choose the pleasant as

a good, and avoid pain as an evil.
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The end, then, being what we wish for, the means what we deliberate

about and choose, actions concerning means must be according to choice

and voluntary. Now the exercise of the virtues is concerned with means.

Therefore virtue also is in our own power, and so too vice. For where

it is in our power to act it is also in our power not to act, and

vice versa; so that, if to act, where this is noble, is in our power,

not to act, which will be base, will also be in our power, and if

not to act, where this is noble, is in our power, to act, which will

be base, will also be in our power. Now if it is in our power to do

noble or base acts, and likewise in our power not to do them, and

this was what being good or bad meant, then it is in our power to

be virtuous or vicious.

The saying that 'no one is voluntarily wicked nor involuntarily happy'

seems to be partly false and partly true; for no one is involuntarily

happy, but wickedness is voluntary. Or else we shall have to dispute

what has just been said, at any rate, and deny that man is a moving

principle or begetter of his actions as of children. But if these

facts are evident and we cannot refer actions to moving principles

other than those in ourselves, the acts whose moving principles are

in us must themselves also be in our power and voluntary.

Witness seems to be borne to this both by individuals in their private

capacity and by legislators themselves; for these punish and take

vengeance on those who do wicked acts (unless they have acted under

compulsion or as a result of ignorance for which they are not themselves

responsible), while they honour those who do noble acts, as though

they meant to encourage the latter and deter the former. But no one

is encouraged to do the things that are neither in our power nor voluntary;

it is assumed that there is no gain in being persuaded not to be hot

or in pain or hungry or the like, since we shall experience these

feelings none the less. Indeed, we punish a man for his very ignorance,

if he is thought responsible for the ignorance, as when penalties

are doubled in the case of drunkenness; for the moving principle is

in the man himself, since he had the power of not getting drunk and

his getting drunk was the cause of his ignorance. And we punish those

who are ignorant of anything in the laws that they ought to know and

that is not difficult, and so too in the case of anything else that

they are thought to be ignorant of through carelessness; we assume

that it is in their power not to be ignorant, since they have the

power of taking care.

But perhaps a man is the kind of man not to take care. Still they

are themselves by their slack lives responsible for becoming men of

that kind, and men make themselves responsible for being unjust or

self-indulgent, in the one case by cheating and in the other by spending

their time in drinking bouts and the like; for it is activities exercised

on particular objects that make the corresponding character. This

is plain from the case of people training for any contest or action;

they practise the activity the whole time. Now not to know that it

is from the exercise of activities on particular objects that states

of character are produced is the mark of a thoroughly senseless person.

Again, it is irrational to suppose that a man who acts unjustly does

not wish to be unjust or a man who acts self-indulgently to be self-indulgent.

But if without being ignorant a man does the things which will make

him unjust, he will be unjust voluntarily. Yet it does not follow

that if he wishes he will cease to be unjust and will be just. For

neither does the man who is ill become well on those terms. We may

suppose a case in which he is ill voluntarily, through living incontinently

and disobeying his doctors. In that case it was then open to him not

to be ill, but not now, when he has thrown away his chance, just as

when you have let a stone go it is too late to recover it; but yet

it was in your power to throw it, since the moving principle was in

you. So, too, to the unjust and to the self-indulgent man it was open

at the beginning not to become men of this kind, and so they are unjust

and selfindulgent voluntarily; but now that they have become so it

is not possible for them not to be so.

But not only are the vices of the soul voluntary, but those of the

body also for some men, whom we accordingly blame; while no one blames

those who are ugly by nature, we blame those who are so owing to want

of exercise and care. So it is, too, with respect to weakness and

infirmity; no one would reproach a man blind from birth or by disease

or from a blow, but rather pity him, while every one would blame a

man who was blind from drunkenness or some other form of self-indulgence.

Of vices of the body, then, those in our own power are blamed, those

not in our power are not. And if this be so, in the other cases also

the vices that are blamed must be in our own power.

Now some one may say that all men desire the apparent good, but have

no control over the appearance, but the end appears to each man in

a form answering to his character. We reply that if each man is somehow

responsible for his state of mind, he will also be himself somehow

responsible for the appearance; but if not, no one is responsible

for his own evildoing, but every one does evil acts through ignorance

of the end, thinking that by these he will get what is best, and the

aiming at the end is not self-chosen but one must be born with an

eye, as it were, by which to judge rightly and choose what is truly

good, and he is well endowed by nature who is well endowed with this.

For it is what is greatest and most noble, and what we cannot get

or learn from another, but must have just such as it was when given

us at birth, and to be well and nobly endowed with this will be perfect

and true excellence of natural endowment. If this is true, then, how

will virtue be more voluntary than vice? To both men alike, the good

and the bad, the end appears and is fixed by nature or however it

may be, and it is by referring everything else to this that men do

whatever they do.

Whether, then, it is not by nature that the end appears to each man

such as it does appear, but something also depends on him, or the

end is natural but because the good man adopts the means voluntarily

virtue is voluntary, vice also will be none the less voluntary; for

in the case of the bad man there is equally present that which depends

on himself in his actions even if not in his end. If, then, as is

asserted, the virtues are voluntary (for we are ourselves somehow

partly responsible for our states of character, and it is by being

persons of a certain kind that we assume the end to be so and so),

the vices also will be voluntary; for the same is true of them.

With regard to the virtues in general we have stated their genus in

outline, viz. that they are means and that they are states of character,

and that they tend, and by their own nature, to the doing of the acts

by which they are produced, and that they are in our power and voluntary,

and act as the right rule prescribes. But actions and states of character

are not voluntary in the same way; for we are masters of our actions

from the beginning right to the end, if we know the particular facts,

but though we control the beginning of our states of character the

gradual progress is not obvious any more than it is in illnesses;

because it was in our power, however, to act in this way or not in

this way, therefore the states are voluntary.

Let us take up the several virtues, however, and say which they are

and what sort of things they are concerned with and how they are concerned

with them; at the same time it will become plain how many they are.

And first let us speak of courage.
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That it is a mean with regard to feelings of fear and confidence has

already been made evident; and plainly the things we fear are terrible

things, and these are, to speak without qualification, evils; for

which reason people even define fear as expectation of evil. Now we

fear all evils, e.g. disgrace, poverty, disease, friendlessness, death,

but the brave man is not thought to be concerned with all; for to

fear some things is even right and noble, and it is base not to fear

them- e.g. disgrace; he who fears this is good and modest, and he

who does not is shameless. He is, however, by some people called brave,

by a transference of the word to a new meaning; for he has in him

something which is like the brave man, since the brave man also is

a fearless person. Poverty and disease we perhaps ought not to fear,

nor in general the things that do not proceed from vice and are not

due to a man himself. But not even the man who is fearless of these

is brave. Yet we apply the word to him also in virtue of a similarity;

for some who in the dangers of war are cowards are liberal and are

confident in face of the loss of money. Nor is a man a coward if he

fears insult to his wife and children or envy or anything of the kind;

nor brave if he is confident when he is about to be flogged. With

what sort of terrible things, then, is the brave man concerned? Surely

with the greatest; for no one is more likely than he to stand his

ground against what is awe-inspiring. Now death is the most terrible

of all things; for it is the end, and nothing is thought to be any

longer either good or bad for the dead. But the brave man would not

seem to be concerned even with death in all circumstances, e.g. at

sea or in disease. In what circumstances, then? Surely in the noblest.

Now such deaths are those in battle; for these take place in the greatest

and noblest danger. And these are correspondingly honoured in city-states

and at the courts of monarchs. Properly, then, he will be called brave

who is fearless in face of a noble death, and of all emergencies that

involve death; and the emergencies of war are in the highest degree

of this kind. Yet at sea also, and in disease, the brave man is fearless,

but not in the same way as the seaman; for he has given up hope of

safety, and is disliking the thought of death in this shape, while

they are hopeful because of their experience. At the same time, we

show courage in situations where there is the opportunity of showing

prowess or where death is noble; but in these forms of death neither

of these conditions is fulfilled.
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What is terrible is not the same for all men; but we say there are

things terrible even beyond human strength. These, then, are terrible

to every one- at least to every sensible man; but the terrible things

that are not beyond human strength differ in magnitude and degree,

and so too do the things that inspire confidence. Now the brave man

is as dauntless as man may be. Therefore, while he will fear even

the things that are not beyond human strength, he will face them as

he ought and as the rule directs, for honour's sake; for this is the

end of virtue. But it is possible to fear these more, or less, and

again to fear things that are not terrible as if they were. Of the

faults that are committed one consists in fearing what one should

not, another in fearing as we should not, another in fearing when

we should not, and so on; and so too with respect to the things that

inspire confidence. The man, then, who faces and who fears the right

things and from the right motive, in the right way and from the right

time, and who feels confidence under the corresponding conditions,

is brave; for the brave man feels and acts according to the merits

of the case and in whatever way the rule directs. Now the end of every

activity is conformity to the corresponding state of character. This

is true, therefore, of the brave man as well as of others. But courage

is noble. Therefore the end also is noble; for each thing is defined

by its end. Therefore it is for a noble end that the brave man endures

and acts as courage directs.

Of those who go to excess he who exceeds in fearlessness has no name

(we have said previously that many states of character have no names),

but he would be a sort of madman or insensible person if he feared

nothing, neither earthquakes nor the waves, as they say the Celts

do not; while the man who exceeds in confidence about what really

is terrible is rash. The rash man, however, is also thought to be

boastful and only a pretender to courage; at all events, as the brave

man is with regard to what is terrible, so the rash man wishes to

appear; and so he imitates him in situations where he can. Hence also

most of them are a mixture of rashness and cowardice; for, while in

these situations they display confidence, they do not hold their ground

against what is really terrible. The man who exceeds in fear is a

coward; for he fears both what he ought not and as he ought not, and

all the similar characterizations attach to him. He is lacking also

in confidence; but he is more conspicuous for his excess of fear in

painful situations. The coward, then, is a despairing sort of person;

for he fears everything. The brave man, on the other hand, has the

opposite disposition; for confidence is the mark of a hopeful disposition.

The coward, the rash man, and the brave man, then, are concerned with

the same objects but are differently disposed towards them; for the

first two exceed and fall short, while the third holds the middle,

which is the right, position; and rash men are precipitate, and wish

for dangers beforehand but draw back when they are in them, while

brave men are keen in the moment of action, but quiet beforehand.

As we have said, then, courage is a mean with respect to things that

inspire confidence or fear, in the circumstances that have been stated;

and it chooses or endures things because it is noble to do so, or

because it is base not to do so. But to die to escape from poverty

or love or anything painful is not the mark of a brave man, but rather

of a coward; for it is softness to fly from what is troublesome, and

such a man endures death not because it is noble but to fly from evil.
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Courage, then, is something of this sort, but the name is also applied

to five other kinds.

First comes the courage of the citizen-soldier; for this is most like

true courage. Citizen-soldiers seem to face dangers because of the

penalties imposed by the laws and the reproaches they would otherwise

incur, and because of the honours they win by such action; and therefore

those peoples seem to be bravest among whom cowards are held in dishonour

and brave men in honour. This is the kind of courage that Homer depicts,

e.g. in Diomede and in Hector:

First will Polydamas be to heap reproach on me then; and

For Hector one day 'mid the Trojans shall utter his vaulting

harangue:

Afraid was Tydeides, and fled from my face.

This kind of courage is most like to that which we described earlier,

because it is due to virtue; for it is due to shame and to desire

of a noble object (i.e. honour) and avoidance of disgrace, which is

ignoble. One might rank in the same class even those who are compelled

by their rulers; but they are inferior, inasmuch as they do what they

do not from shame but from fear, and to avoid not what is disgraceful

but what is painful; for their masters compel them, as Hector does:

But if I shall spy any dastard that cowers far from the fight,

Vainly will such an one hope to escape from the dogs.

And those who give them their posts, and beat them if they retreat,

do the same, and so do those who draw them up with trenches or something

of the sort behind them; all of these apply compulsion. But one ought

to be brave not under compulsion but because it is noble to be so.

(2) Experience with regard to particular facts is also thought to

be courage; this is indeed the reason why Socrates thought courage

was knowledge. Other people exhibit this quality in other dangers,

and professional soldiers exhibit it in the dangers of war; for there

seem to be many empty alarms in war, of which these have had the most

comprehensive experience; therefore they seem brave, because the others

do not know the nature of the facts. Again, their experience makes

them most capable in attack and in defence, since they can use their

arms and have the kind that are likely to be best both for attack

and for defence; therefore they fight like armed men against unarmed

or like trained athletes against amateurs; for in such contests too

it is not the bravest men that fight best, but those who are strongest

and have their bodies in the best condition. Professional soldiers

turn cowards, however, when the danger puts too great a strain on

them and they are inferior in numbers and equipment; for they are

the first to fly, while citizen-forces die at their posts, as in fact

happened at the temple of Hermes. For to the latter flight is disgraceful

and death is preferable to safety on those terms; while the former

from the very beginning faced the danger on the assumption that they

were stronger, and when they know the facts they fly, fearing death

more than disgrace; but the brave man is not that sort of person.

(3) Passion also is sometimes reckoned as courage; those who act from

passion, like wild beasts rushing at those who have wounded them,

are thought to be brave, because brave men also are passionate; for

passion above all things is eager to rush on danger, and hence Homer's

'put strength into his passion' and 'aroused their spirit and passion

and 'hard he breathed panting' and 'his blood boiled'. For all such

expressions seem to indicate the stirring and onset of passion. Now

brave men act for honour's sake, but passion aids them; while wild

beasts act under the influence of pain; for they attack because they

have been wounded or because they are afraid, since if they are in

a forest they do not come near one. Thus they are not brave because,

driven by pain and passion, they rush on danger without foreseeing

any of the perils, since at that rate even asses would be brave when

they are hungry; for blows will not drive them from their food; and

lust also makes adulterers do many daring things. (Those creatures

are not brave, then, which are driven on to danger by pain or passion.)

The 'courage' that is due to passion seems to be the most natural,

and to be courage if choice and motive be added.

Men, then, as well as beasts, suffer pain when they are angry, and

are pleased when they exact their revenge; those who fight for these

reasons, however, are pugnacious but not brave; for they do not act

for honour's sake nor as the rule directs, but from strength of feeling;

they have, however, something akin to courage.

(4) Nor are sanguine people brave; for they are confident in danger

only because they have conquered often and against many foes. Yet

they closely resemble brave men, because both are confident; but brave

men are confident for the reasons stated earlier, while these are

so because they think they are the strongest and can suffer nothing.

(Drunken men also behave in this way; they become sanguine). When

their adventures do not succeed, however, they run away; but it was

the mark of a brave man to face things that are, and seem, terrible

for a man, because it is noble to do so and disgraceful not to do

so. Hence also it is thought the mark of a braver man to be fearless

and undisturbed in sudden alarms than to be so in those that are foreseen;

for it must have proceeded more from a state of character, because

less from preparation; acts that are foreseen may be chosen by calculation

and rule, but sudden actions must be in accordance with one's state

of character.

(5) People who are ignorant of the danger also appear brave, and they

are not far removed from those of a sanguine temper, but are inferior

inasmuch as they have no self-reliance while these have. Hence also

the sanguine hold their ground for a time; but those who have been

deceived about the facts fly if they know or suspect that these are

different from what they supposed, as happened to the Argives when

they fell in with the Spartans and took them for Sicyonians.

We have, then, described the character both of brave men and of those

who are thought to be brave.
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Though courage is concerned with feelings of confidence and of fear,

it is not concerned with both alike, but more with the things that

inspire fear; for he who is undisturbed in face of these and bears

himself as he should towards these is more truly brave than the man

who does so towards the things that inspire confidence. It is for

facing what is painful, then, as has been said, that men are called

brave. Hence also courage involves pain, and is justly praised; for

it is harder to face what is painful than to abstain from what is

pleasant.

Yet the end which courage sets before it would seem to be pleasant,

but to be concealed by the attending circumstances, as happens also

in athletic contests; for the end at which boxers aim is pleasant-

the crown and the honours- but the blows they take are distressing

to flesh and blood, and painful, and so is their whole exertion; and

because the blows and the exertions are many the end, which is but

small, appears to have nothing pleasant in it. And so, if the case

of courage is similar, death and wounds will be painful to the brave

man and against his will, but he will face them because it is noble

to do so or because it is base not to do so. And the more he is possessed

of virtue in its entirety and the happier he is, the more he will

be pained at the thought of death; for life is best worth living for

such a man, and he is knowingly losing the greatest goods, and this

is painful. But he is none the less brave, and perhaps all the more

so, because he chooses noble deeds of war at that cost. It is not

the case, then, with all the virtues that the exercise of them is

pleasant, except in so far as it reaches its end. But it is quite

possible that the best soldiers may be not men of this sort but those

who are less brave but have no other good; for these are ready to

face danger, and they sell their life for trifling gains.

So much, then, for courage; it is not difficult to grasp its nature

in outline, at any rate, from what has been said.
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After courage let us speak of temperance; for these seem to be the

virtues of the irrational parts. We have said that temperance is a

mean with regard to pleasures (for it is less, and not in the same

way, concerned with pains); self-indulgence also is manifested in

the same sphere. Now, therefore, let us determine with what sort of

pleasures they are concerned. We may assume the distinction between

bodily pleasures and those of the soul, such as love of honour and

love of learning; for the lover of each of these delights in that

of which he is a lover, the body being in no way affected, but rather

the mind; but men who are concerned with such pleasures are called

neither temperate nor self-indulgent. Nor, again, are those who are

concerned with the other pleasures that are not bodily; for those

who are fond of hearing and telling stories and who spend their days

on anything that turns up are called gossips, but not self-indulgent,

nor are those who are pained at the loss of money or of friends.

Temperance must be concerned with bodily pleasures, but not all even

of these; for those who delight in objects of vision, such as colours

and shapes and painting, are called neither temperate nor self-indulgent;

yet it would seem possible to delight even in these either as one

should or to excess or to a deficient degree.

And so too is it with objects of hearing; no one calls those who delight

extravagantly in music or acting self-indulgent, nor those who do

so as they ought temperate.

Nor do we apply these names to those who delight in odour, unless

it be incidentally; we do not call those self-indulgent who delight

in the odour of apples or roses or incense, but rather those who delight

in the odour of unguents or of dainty dishes; for self-indulgent people

delight in these because these remind them of the objects of their

appetite. And one may see even other people, when they are hungry,

delighting in the smell of food; but to delight in this kind of thing

is the mark of the self-indulgent man; for these are objects of appetite

to him.

Nor is there in animals other than man any pleasure connected with

these senses, except incidentally. For dogs do not delight in the

scent of hares, but in the eating of them, but the scent told them

the hares were there; nor does the lion delight in the lowing of the

ox, but in eating it; but he perceived by the lowing that it was near,

and therefore appears to delight in the lowing; and similarly he does

not delight because he sees 'a stag or a wild goat', but because he

is going to make a meal of it. Temperance and self-indulgence, however,

are concerned with the kind of pleasures that the other animals share

in, which therefore appear slavish and brutish; these are touch and

taste. But even of taste they appear to make little or no use; for

the business of taste is the discriminating of flavours, which is

done by winetasters and people who season dishes; but they hardly

take pleasure in making these discriminations, or at least self-indulgent

people do not, but in the actual enjoyment, which in all cases comes

through touch, both in the case of food and in that of drink and in

that of sexual intercourse. This is why a certain gourmand prayed

that his throat might become longer than a crane's, implying that

it was the contact that he took pleasure in. Thus the sense with which

self-indulgence is connected is the most widely shared of the senses;

and self-indulgence would seem to be justly a matter of reproach,

because it attaches to us not as men but as animals. To delight in

such things, then, and to love them above all others, is brutish.

For even of the pleasures of touch the most liberal have been eliminated,

e.g. those produced in the gymnasium by rubbing and by the consequent

heat; for the contact characteristic of the self-indulgent man does

not affect the whole body but only certain parts.
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Of the appetites some seem to be common, others to be peculiar to

individuals and acquired; e.g. the appetite for food is natural, since

every one who is without it craves for food or drink, and sometimes

for both, and for love also (as Homer says) if he is young and lusty;

but not every one craves for this or that kind of nourishment or love,

nor for the same things. Hence such craving appears to be our very

own. Yet it has of course something natural about it; for different

things are pleasant to different kinds of people, and some things

are more pleasant to every one than chance objects. Now in the natural

appetites few go wrong, and only in one direction, that of excess;

for to eat or drink whatever offers itself till one is surfeited is

to exceed the natural amount, since natural appetite is the replenishment

of one's deficiency. Hence these people are called belly-gods, this

implying that they fill their belly beyond what is right. It is people

of entirely slavish character that become like this. But with regard

to the pleasures peculiar to individuals many people go wrong and

in many ways. For while the people who are 'fond of so and so' are

so called because they delight either in the wrong things, or more

than most people do, or in the wrong way, the self-indulgent exceed

in all three ways; they both delight in some things that they ought

not to delight in (since they are hateful), and if one ought to delight

in some of the things they delight in, they do so more than one ought

and than most men do.

Plainly, then, excess with regard to pleasures is self-indulgence

and is culpable; with regard to pains one is not, as in the case of

courage, called temperate for facing them or self-indulgent for not

doing so, but the selfindulgent man is so called because he is pained

more than he ought at not getting pleasant things (even his pain being

caused by pleasure), and the temperate man is so called because he

is not pained at the absence of what is pleasant and at his abstinence

from it.

The self-indulgent man, then, craves for all pleasant things or those

that are most pleasant, and is led by his appetite to choose these

at the cost of everything else; hence he is pained both when he fails

to get them and when he is merely craving for them (for appetite involves

pain); but it seems absurd to be pained for the sake of pleasure.

People who fall short with regard to pleasures and delight in them

less than they should are hardly found; for such insensibility is

not human. Even the other animals distinguish different kinds of food

and enjoy some and not others; and if there is any one who finds nothing

pleasant and nothing more attractive than anything else, he must be

something quite different from a man; this sort of person has not

received a name because he hardly occurs. The temperate man occupies

a middle position with regard to these objects. For he neither enjoys

the things that the self-indulgent man enjoys most-but rather dislikes

them-nor in general the things that he should not, nor anything of

this sort to excess, nor does he feel pain or craving when they are

absent, or does so only to a moderate degree, and not more than he

should, nor when he should not, and so on; but the things that, being

pleasant, make for health or for good condition, he will desire moderately

and as he should, and also other pleasant things if they are not hindrances

to these ends, or contrary to what is noble, or beyond his means.

For he who neglects these conditions loves such pleasures more than

they are worth, but the temperate man is not that sort of person,

but the sort of person that the right rule prescribes.
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Self-indulgence is more like a voluntary state than cowardice. For

the former is actuated by pleasure, the latter by pain, of which the

one is to be chosen and the other to be avoided; and pain upsets and

destroys the nature of the person who feels it, while pleasure does

nothing of the sort. Therefore self-indulgence is more voluntary.

Hence also it is more a matter of reproach; for it is easier to become

accustomed to its objects, since there are many things of this sort

in life, and the process of habituation to them is free from danger,

while with terrible objects the reverse is the case. But cowardice

would seem to be voluntary in a different degree from its particular

manifestations; for it is itself painless, but in these we are upset

by pain, so that we even throw down our arms and disgrace ourselves

in other ways; hence our acts are even thought to be done under compulsion.

For the self-indulgent man, on the other hand, the particular acts

are voluntary (for he does them with craving and desire), but the

whole state is less so; for no one craves to be self-indulgent.

The name self-indulgence is applied also to childish faults; for they

bear a certain resemblance to what we have been considering. Which

is called after which, makes no difference to our present purpose;

plainly, however, the later is called after the earlier. The transference

of the name seems not a bad one; for that which desires what is base

and which develops quickly ought to be kept in a chastened condition,

and these characteristics belong above all to appetite and to the

child, since children in fact live at the beck and call of appetite,

and it is in them that the desire for what is pleasant is strongest.

If, then, it is not going to be obedient and subject to the ruling

principle, it will go to great lengths; for in an irrational being

the desire for pleasure is insatiable even if it tries every source

of gratification, and the exercise of appetite increases its innate

force, and if appetites are strong and violent they even expel the

power of calculation. Hence they should be moderate and few, and should

in no way oppose the rational principle-and this is what we call an

obedient and chastened state-and as the child should live according

to the direction of his tutor, so the appetitive element should live

according to rational principle. Hence the appetitive element in a

temperate man should harmonize with the rational principle; for the

noble is the mark at which both aim, and the temperate man craves

for the things be ought, as he ought, as when he ought; and when he

ought; and this is what rational principle directs.

Here we conclude our account of temperance.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK IV

1

Let us speak next of liberality. It seems to be the mean with regard

to wealth; for the liberal man is praised not in respect of military

matters, nor of those in respect of which the temrate man is praised,

nor of judicial decisions, but with regard to the giving and taking

of wealth, and especially in respect of giving. Now by 'wealth' we

mean all the things whose value is measured by money. Further, prodigality

and meanness are excesses and defects with regard to wealth; and meanness

we always impute to those who care more than they ought for wealth,

but we sometimes apply the word 'prodigality' in a complex sense;

for we call those men prodigals who are incontinent and spend money

on self-indulgence. Hence also they are thought the poorest characters;

for they combine more vices than one. Therefore the application of

the word to them is not its proper use; for a 'prodigal' means a man

who has a single evil quality, that of wasting his substance; since

a prodigal is one who is being ruined by his own fault, and the wasting

of substance is thought to be a sort of ruining of oneself, life being

held to depend on possession of substance.

This, then, is the sense in which we take the word 'prodigality'.

Now the things that have a use may be used either well or badly; and

riches is a useful thing; and everything is used best by the man who

has the virtue concerned with it; riches, therefore, will be used

best by the man who has the virtue concerned with wealth; and this

is the liberal man. Now spending and giving seem to be the using of

wealth; taking and keeping rather the possession of it. Hence it is

more the mark of the liberal man to give to the right people than

to take from the right sources and not to take from the wrong. For

it is more characteristic of virtue to do good than to have good done

to one, and more characteristic to do what is noble than not to do

what is base; and it is not hard to see that giving implies doing

good and doing what is noble, and taking implies having good done

to one or not acting basely. And gratitude is felt towards him who

gives, not towards him who does not take, and praise also is bestowed

more on him. It is easier, also, not to take than to give; for men

are apter to give away their own too little than to take what is another's.

Givers, too, are called liberal; but those who do not take are not

praised for liberality but rather for justice; while those who take

are hardly praised at all. And the liberal are almost the most loved

of all virtuous characters, since they are useful; and this depends

on their giving.

Now virtuous actions are noble and done for the sake of the noble.

Therefore the liberal man, like other virtuous men, will give for

the sake of the noble, and rightly; for he will give to the right

people, the right amounts, and at the right time, with all the other

qualifications that accompany right giving; and that too with pleasure

or without pain; for that which is virtuous is pleasant or free from

pain-least of all will it be painful. But he who gives to the wrong

people or not for the sake of the noble but for some other cause,

will be called not liberal but by some other name. Nor is he liberal

who gives with pain; for he would prefer the wealth to the noble act,

and this is not characteristic of a liberal man. But no more will

the liberal man take from wrong sources; for such taking is not characteristic

of the man who sets no store by wealth. Nor will he be a ready asker;

for it is not characteristic of a man who confers benefits to accept

them lightly. But he will take from the right sources, e.g. from his

own possessions, not as something noble but as a necessity, that he

may have something to give. Nor will he neglect his own property,

since he wishes by means of this to help others. And he will refrain

from giving to anybody and everybody, that he may have something to

give to the right people, at the right time, and where it is noble

to do so. It is highly characteristic of a liberal man also to go

to excess in giving, so that he leaves too little for himself; for

it is the nature of a liberal man not to look to himself. The term

'liberality' is used relatively to a man's substance; for liberality

resides not in the multitude of the gifts but in the state of character

of the giver, and this is relative to the giver's substance. There

is therefore nothing to prevent the man who gives less from being

the more liberal man, if he has less to give those are thought to

be more liberal who have not made their wealth but inherited it; for

in the first place they have no experience of want, and secondly all

men are fonder of their own productions, as are parents and poets.

It is not easy for the liberal man to be rich, since he is not apt

either at taking or at keeping, but at giving away, and does not value

wealth for its own sake but as a means to giving. Hence comes the

charge that is brought against fortune, that those who deserve riches

most get it least. But it is not unreasonable that it should turn

out so; for he cannot have wealth, any more than anything else, if

he does not take pains to have it. Yet he will not give to the wrong

people nor at the wrong time, and so on; for he would no longer be

acting in accordance with liberality, and if he spent on these objects

he would have nothing to spend on the right objects. For, as has been

said, he is liberal who spends according to his substance and on the

right objects; and he who exceeds is prodigal. Hence we do not call

despots prodigal; for it is thought not easy for them to give and

spend beyond the amount of their possessions. Liberality, then, being

a mean with regard to giving and taking of wealth, the liberal man

will both give and spend the right amounts and on the right objects,

alike in small things and in great, and that with pleasure; he will

also take the right amounts and from the right sources. For, the virtue

being a mean with regard to both, he will do both as he ought; since

this sort of taking accompanies proper giving, and that which is not

of this sort is contrary to it, and accordingly the giving and taking

that accompany each other are present together in the same man, while

the contrary kinds evidently are not. But if he happens to spend in

a manner contrary to what is right and noble, he will be pained, but

moderately and as he ought; for it is the mark of virtue both to be

pleased and to be pained at the right objects and in the right way.

Further, the liberal man is easy to deal with in money matters; for

he can be got the better of, since he sets no store by money, and

is more annoyed if he has not spent something that he ought than pained

if he has spent something that he ought not, and does not agree with

the saying of Simonides.

The prodigal errs in these respects also; for he is neither pleased

nor pained at the right things or in the right way; this will be more

evident as we go on. We have said that prodigality and meanness are

excesses and deficiencies, and in two things, in giving and in taking;

for we include spending under giving. Now prodigality exceeds in giving

and not taking, while meanness falls short in giving, and exceeds

in taking, except in small things.

The characteristics of prodigality are not often combined; for it

is not easy to give to all if you take from none; private persons

soon exhaust their substance with giving, and it is to these that

the name of prodigals is applied- though a man of this sort would

seem to be in no small degree better than a mean man. For he is easily

cured both by age and by poverty, and thus he may move towards the

middle state. For he has the characteristics of the liberal man, since

he both gives and refrains from taking, though he does neither of

these in the right manner or well. Therefore if he were brought to

do so by habituation or in some other way, he would be liberal; for

he will then give to the right people, and will not take from the

wrong sources. This is why he is thought to have not a bad character;

it is not the mark of a wicked or ignoble man to go to excess in giving

and not taking, but only of a foolish one. The man who is prodigal

in this way is thought much better than the mean man both for the

aforesaid reasons and because he benefits many while the other benefits

no one, not even himself.

But most prodigal people, as has been said, also take from the wrong

sources, and are in this respect mean. They become apt to take because

they wish to spend and cannot do this easily; for their possessions

soon run short. Thus they are forced to provide means from some other

source. At the same time, because they care nothing for honour, they

take recklessly and from any source; for they have an appetite for

giving, and they do not mind how or from what source. Hence also their

giving is not liberal; for it is not noble, nor does it aim at nobility,

nor is it done in the right way; sometimes they make rich those who

should be poor, and will give nothing to people of respectable character,

and much to flatterers or those who provide them with some other pleasure.

Hence also most of them are self-indulgent; for they spend lightly

and waste money on their indulgences, and incline towards pleasures

because they do not live with a view to what is noble.

The prodigal man, then, turns into what we have described if he is

left untutored, but if he is treated with care he will arrive at the

intermediate and right state. But meanness is both incurable (for

old age and every disability is thought to make men mean) and more

innate in men than prodigality; for most men are fonder of getting

money than of giving. It also extends widely, and is multiform, since

there seem to be many kinds of meanness.

For it consists in two things, deficiency in giving and excess in

taking, and is not found complete in all men but is sometimes divided;

some men go to excess in taking, others fall short in giving. Those

who are called by such names as 'miserly', 'close', 'stingy', all

fall short in giving, but do not covet the possessions of others nor

wish to get them. In some this is due to a sort of honesty and avoidance

of what is disgraceful (for some seem, or at least profess, to hoard

their money for this reason, that they may not some day be forced

to do something disgraceful; to this class belong the cheeseparer

and every one of the sort; he is so called from his excess of unwillingness

to give anything); while others again keep their hands off the property

of others from fear, on the ground that it is not easy, if one takes

the property of others oneself, to avoid having one's own taken by

them; they are therefore content neither to take nor to give.

Others again exceed in respect of taking by taking anything and from

any source, e.g. those who ply sordid trades, pimps and all such people,

and those who lend small sums and at high rates. For all of these

take more than they ought and from wrong sources. What is common to

them is evidently sordid love of gain; they all put up with a bad

name for the sake of gain, and little gain at that. For those who

make great gains but from wrong sources, and not the right gains,

e.g. despots when they sack cities and spoil temples, we do not call

mean but rather wicked, impious, and unjust. But the gamester and

the footpad (and the highwayman) belong to the class of the mean,

since they have a sordid love of gain. For it is for gain that both

of them ply their craft and endure the disgrace of it, and the one

faces the greatest dangers for the sake of the booty, while the other

makes gain from his friends, to whom he ought to be giving. Both,

then, since they are willing to make gain from wrong sources, are

sordid lovers of gain; therefore all such forms of taking are mean.

And it is natural that meanness is described as the contrary of liberality;

for not only is it a greater evil than prodigality, but men err more

often in this direction than in the way of prodigality as we have

described it.

So much, then, for liberality and the opposed vices.
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It would seem proper to discuss magnificence next. For this also seems

to be a virtue concerned with wealth; but it does not like liberality

extend to all the actions that are concerned with wealth, but only

to those that involve expenditure; and in these it surpasses liberality

in scale. For, as the name itself suggests, it is a fitting expenditure

involving largeness of scale. But the scale is relative; for the expense

of equipping a trireme is not the same as that of heading a sacred

embassy. It is what is fitting, then, in relation to the agent, and

to the circumstances and the object. The man who in small or middling

things spends according to the merits of the case is not called magnificent

(e.g. the man who can say 'many a gift I gave the wanderer'), but

only the man who does so in great things. For the magnificent man

is liberal, but the liberal man is not necessarily magnificent. The

deficiency of this state of character is called niggardliness, the

excess vulgarity, lack of taste, and the like, which do not go to

excess in the amount spent on right objects, but by showy expenditure

in the wrong circumstances and the wrong manner; we shall speak of

these vices later.

The magnificent man is like an artist; for he can see what is fitting

and spend large sums tastefully. For, as we said at the begining,

a state of character is determined by its activities and by its objects.

Now the expenses of the magnificent man are large and fitting. Such,

therefore, are also his results; for thus there will be a great expenditure

and one that is fitting to its result. Therefore the result should

be worthy of the expense, and the expense should be worthy of the

result, or should even exceed it. And the magnificent man will spend

such sums for honour's sake; for this is common to the virtues. And

further he will do so gladly and lavishly; for nice calculation is

a niggardly thing. And he will consider how the result can be made

most beautiful and most becoming rather than for how much it can be

produced and how it can be produced most cheaply. It is necessary,

then, that the magnificent man be also liberal. For the liberal man

also will spend what he ought and as he ought; and it is in these

matters that the greatness implied in the name of the magnificent

man-his bigness, as it were-is manifested, since liberality is concerned

with these matters; and at an equal expense he will produce a more

magnificent work of art. For a possession and a work of art have not

the same excellence. The most valuable possession is that which is

worth most, e.g. gold, but the most valuable work of art is that which

is great and beautiful (for the contemplation of such a work inspires

admiration, and so does magnificence); and a work has an excellence-viz.

magnificence-which involves magnitude. Magnificence is an attribute

of expenditures of the kind which we call honourable, e.g. those connected

with the gods-votive offerings, buildings, and sacrifices-and similarly

with any form of religious worship, and all those that are proper

objects of public-spirited ambition, as when people think they ought

to equip a chorus or a trireme, or entertain the city, in a brilliant

way. But in all cases, as has been said, we have regard to the agent

as well and ask who he is and what means he has; for the expenditure

should be worthy of his means, and suit not only the result but also

the producer. Hence a poor man cannot be magnificent, since he has

not the means with which to spend large sums fittingly; and he who

tries is a fool, since he spends beyond what can be expected of him

and what is proper, but it is right expenditure that is virtuous.

But great expenditure is becoming to those who have suitable means

to start with, acquired by their own efforts or from ancestors or

connexions, and to people of high birth or reputation, and so on;

for all these things bring with them greatness and prestige. Primarily,

then, the magnificent man is of this sort, and magnificence is shown

in expenditures of this sort, as has been said; for these are the

greatest and most honourable. Of private occasions of expenditure

the most suitable are those that take place once for all, e.g. a wedding

or anything of the kind, or anything that interests the whole city

or the people of position in it, and also the receiving of foreign

guests and the sending of them on their way, and gifts and counter-gifts;

for the magnificent man spends not on himself but on public objects,

and gifts bear some resemblance to votive offerings. A magnificent

man will also furnish his house suitably to his wealth (for even a

house is a sort of public ornament), and will spend by preference

on those works that are lasting (for these are the most beautiful),

and on every class of things he will spend what is becoming; for the

same things are not suitable for gods and for men, nor in a temple

and in a tomb. And since each expenditure may be great of its kind,

and what is most magnificent absolutely is great expenditure on a

great object, but what is magnificent here is what is great in these

circumstances, and greatness in the work differs from greatness in

the expense (for the most beautiful ball or bottle is magnificent

as a gift to a child, but the price of it is small and mean),-therefore

it is characteristic of the magnificent man, whatever kind of result

he is producing, to produce it magnificently (for such a result is

not easily surpassed) and to make it worthy of the expenditure.

Such, then, is the magnificent man; the man who goes to excess and

is vulgar exceeds, as has been said, by spending beyond what is right.

For on small objects of expenditure he spends much and displays a

tasteless showiness; e.g. he gives a club dinner on the scale of a

wedding banquet, and when he provides the chorus for a comedy he brings

them on to the stage in purple, as they do at Megara. And all such

things he will do not for honour's sake but to show off his wealth,

and because he thinks he is admired for these things, and where he

ought to spend much he spends little and where little, much. The niggardly

man on the other hand will fall short in everything, and after spending

the greatest sums will spoil the beauty of the result for a trifle,

and whatever he is doing he will hesitate and consider how he may

spend least, and lament even that, and think he is doing everything

on a bigger scale than he ought.

These states of character, then, are vices; yet they do not bring

disgrace because they are neither harmful to one's neighbour nor very

unseemly.
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Pride seems even from its name to be concerned with great things;

what sort of great things, is the first question we must try to answer.

It makes no difference whether we consider the state of character

or the man characterized by it. Now the man is thought to be proud

who thinks himself worthy of great things, being worthy of them; for

he who does so beyond his deserts is a fool, but no virtuous man is

foolish or silly. The proud man, then, is the man we have described.

For he who is worthy of little and thinks himself worthy of little

is temperate, but not proud; for pride implies greatness, as beauty

implies a goodsized body, and little people may be neat and well-proportioned

but cannot be beautiful. On the other hand, he who thinks himself

worthy of great things, being unworthy of them, is vain; though not

every one who thinks himself worthy of more than he really is worthy

of in vain. The man who thinks himself worthy of worthy of less than

he is really worthy of is unduly humble, whether his deserts be great

or moderate, or his deserts be small but his claims yet smaller. And

the man whose deserts are great would seem most unduly humble; for

what would he have done if they had been less? The proud man, then,

is an extreme in respect of the greatness of his claims, but a mean

in respect of the rightness of them; for he claims what is accordance

with his merits, while the others go to excess or fall short.

If, then, he deserves and claims great things, and above all the great

things, he will be concerned with one thing in particular. Desert

is relative to external goods; and the greatest of these, we should

say, is that which we render to the gods, and which people of position

most aim at, and which is the prize appointed for the noblest deeds;

and this is honour; that is surely the greatest of external goods.

Honours and dishonours, therefore, are the objects with respect to

which the proud man is as he should be. And even apart from argument

it is with honour that proud men appear to be concerned; for it is

honour that they chiefly claim, but in accordance with their deserts.

The unduly humble man falls short both in comparison with his own

merits and in comparison with the proud man's claims. The vain man

goes to excess in comparison with his own merits, but does not exceed

the proud man's claims.

Now the proud man, since he deserves most, must be good in the highest

degree; for the better man always deserves more, and the best man

most. Therefore the truly proud man must be good. And greatness in

every virtue would seem to be characteristic of a proud man. And it

would be most unbecoming for a proud man to fly from danger, swinging

his arms by his sides, or to wrong another; for to what end should

he do disgraceful acts, he to whom nothing is great? If we consider

him point by point we shall see the utter absurdity of a proud man

who is not good. Nor, again, would he be worthy of honour if he were

bad; for honour is the prize of virtue, and it is to the good that

it is rendered. Pride, then, seems to be a sort of crown of the virtues;

for it makes them greater, and it is not found without them. Therefore

it is hard to be truly proud; for it is impossible without nobility

and goodness of character. It is chiefly with honours and dishonours,

then, that the proud man is concerned; and at honours that are great

and conferred by good men he will be moderately Pleased, thinking

that he is coming by his own or even less than his own; for there

can be no honour that is worthy of perfect virtue, yet he will at

any rate accept it since they have nothing greater to bestow on him;

but honour from casual people and on trifling grounds he will utterly

despise, since it is not this that he deserves, and dishonour too,

since in his case it cannot be just. In the first place, then, as

has been said, the proud man is concerned with honours; yet he will

also bear himself with moderation towards wealth and power and all

good or evil fortune, whatever may befall him, and will be neither

over-joyed by good fortune nor over-pained by evil. For not even towards

honour does he bear himself as if it were a very great thing. Power

and wealth are desirable for the sake of honour (at least those who

have them wish to get honour by means of them); and for him to whom

even honour is a little thing the others must be so too. Hence proud

men are thought to be disdainful.

The goods of fortune also are thought to contribute towards pride.

For men who are well-born are thought worthy of honour, and so are

those who enjoy power or wealth; for they are in a superior position,

and everything that has a superiority in something good is held in

greater honour. Hence even such things make men prouder; for they

are honoured by some for having them; but in truth the good man alone

is to be honoured; he, however, who has both advantages is thought

the more worthy of honour. But those who without virtue have such

goods are neither justified in making great claims nor entitled to

the name of 'proud'; for these things imply perfect virtue. Disdainful

and insolent, however, even those who have such goods become. For

without virtue it is not easy to bear gracefully the goods of fortune;

and, being unable to bear them, and thinking themselves superior to

others, they despise others and themselves do what they please. They

imitate the proud man without being like him, and this they do where

they can; so they do not act virtuously, but they do despise others.

For the proud man despises justly (since he thinks truly), but the

many do so at random.

He does not run into trifling dangers, nor is he fond of danger, because

he honours few things; but he will face great dangers, and when he

is in danger he is unsparing of his life, knowing that there are conditions

on which life is not worth having. And he is the sort of man to confer

benefits, but he is ashamed of receiving them; for the one is the

mark of a superior, the other of an inferior. And he is apt to confer

greater benefits in return; for thus the original benefactor besides

being paid will incur a debt to him, and will be the gainer by the

transaction. They seem also to remember any service they have done,

but not those they have received (for he who receives a service is

inferior to him who has done it, but the proud man wishes to be superior),

and to hear of the former with pleasure, of the latter with displeasure;

this, it seems, is why Thetis did not mention to Zeus the services

she had done him, and why the Spartans did not recount their services

to the Athenians, but those they had received. It is a mark of the

proud man also to ask for nothing or scarcely anything, but to give

help readily, and to be dignified towards people who enjoy high position

and good fortune, but unassuming towards those of the middle class;

for it is a difficult and lofty thing to be superior to the former,

but easy to be so to the latter, and a lofty bearing over the former

is no mark of ill-breeding, but among humble people it is as vulgar

as a display of strength against the weak. Again, it is characteristic

of the proud man not to aim at the things commonly held in honour,

or the things in which others excel; to be sluggish and to hold back

except where great honour or a great work is at stake, and to be a

man of few deeds, but of great and notable ones. He must also be open

in his hate and in his love (for to conceal one's feelings, i.e. to

care less for truth than for what people will think, is a coward's

part), and must speak and act openly; for he is free of speech because

he is contemptuous, and he is given to telling the truth, except when

he speaks in irony to the vulgar. He must be unable to make his life

revolve round another, unless it be a friend; for this is slavish,

and for this reason all flatterers are servile and people lacking

in self-respect are flatterers. Nor is he given to admiration; for

nothing to him is great. Nor is he mindful of wrongs; for it is not

the part of a proud man to have a long memory, especially for wrongs,

but rather to overlook them. Nor is he a gossip; for he will speak

neither about himself nor about another, since he cares not to be

praised nor for others to be blamed; nor again is he given to praise;

and for the same reason he is not an evil-speaker, even about his

enemies, except from haughtiness. With regard to necessary or small

matters he is least of all me given to lamentation or the asking of

favours; for it is the part of one who takes such matters seriously

to behave so with respect to them. He is one who will possess beautiful

and profitless things rather than profitable and useful ones; for

this is more proper to a character that suffices to itself.

Further, a slow step is thought proper to the proud man, a deep voice,

and a level utterance; for the man who takes few things seriously

is not likely to be hurried, nor the man who thinks nothing great

to be excited, while a shrill voice and a rapid gait are the results

of hurry and excitement.

Such, then, is the proud man; the man who falls short of him is unduly

humble, and the man who goes beyond him is vain. Now even these are

not thought to be bad (for they are not malicious), but only mistaken.

For the unduly humble man, being worthy of good things, robs himself

of what he deserves, and to have something bad about him from the

fact that he does not think himself worthy of good things, and seems

also not to know himself; else he would have desired the things he

was worthy of, since these were good. Yet such people are not thought

to be fools, but rather unduly retiring. Such a reputation, however,

seems actually to make them worse; for each class of people aims at

what corresponds to its worth, and these people stand back even from

noble actions and undertakings, deeming themselves unworthy, and from

external goods no less. Vain people, on the other hand, are fools

and ignorant of themselves, and that manifestly; for, not being worthy

of them, they attempt honourable undertakings, and then are found

out; and tetadorn themselves with clothing and outward show and such

things, and wish their strokes of good fortune to be made public,

and speak about them as if they would be honoured for them. But undue

humility is more opposed to pride than vanity is; for it is both commoner

and worse.

Pride, then, is concerned with honour on the grand scale, as has been

said.
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There seems to be in the sphere of honour also, as was said in our

first remarks on the subject, a virtue which would appear to be related

to pride as liberality is to magnificence. For neither of these has

anything to do with the grand scale, but both dispose us as is right

with regard to middling and unimportant objects; as in getting and

giving of wealth there is a mean and an excess and defect, so too

honour may be desired more than is right, or less, or from the right

sources and in the right way. We blame both the ambitious man as am

at honour more than is right and from wrong sources, and the unambitious

man as not willing to be honoured even for noble reasons. But sometimes

we praise the ambitious man as being manly and a lover of what is

noble, and the unambitious man as being moderate and self-controlled,

as we said in our first treatment of the subject. Evidently, since

'fond of such and such an object' has more than one meaning, we do

not assign the term 'ambition' or 'love of honour' always to the same

thing, but when we praise the quality we think of the man who loves

honour more than most people, and when we blame it we think of him

who loves it more than is right. The mean being without a name, the

extremes seem to dispute for its place as though that were vacant

by default. But where there is excess and defect, there is also an

intermediate; now men desire honour both more than they should and

less; therefore it is possible also to do so as one should; at all

events this is the state of character that is praised, being an unnamed

mean in respect of honour. Relatively to ambition it seems to be unambitiousness,

and relatively to unambitiousness it seems to be ambition, while relatively

to both severally it seems in a sense to be both together. This appears

to be true of the other virtues also. But in this case the extremes

seem to be contradictories because the mean has not received a name.
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Good temper is a mean with respect to anger; the middle state being

unnamed, and the extremes almost without a name as well, we place

good temper in the middle position, though it inclines towards the

deficiency, which is without a name. The excess might called a sort

of 'irascibility'. For the passion is anger, while its causes are

many and diverse.

The man who is angry at the right things and with the right people,

and, further, as he ought, when he ought, and as long as he ought,

is praised. This will be the good-tempered man, then, since good temper

is praised. For the good-tempered man tends to be unperturbed and

not to be led by passion, but to be angry in the manner, at the things,

and for the length of time, that the rule dictates; but he is thought

to err rather in the direction of deficiency; for the good-tempered

man is not revengeful, but rather tends to make allowances.

The deficiency, whether it is a sort of 'inirascibility' or whatever

it is, is blamed. For those who are not angry at the things they should

be angry at are thought to be fools, and so are those who are not

angry in the right way, at the right time, or with the right persons;

for such a man is thought not to feel things nor to be pained by them,

and, since he does not get angry, he is thought unlikely to defend

himself; and to endure being insulted and put up with insult to one's

friends is slavish.

The excess can be manifested in all the points that have been named

(for one can be angry with the wrong persons, at the wrong things,

more than is right, too quickly, or too long); yet all are not found

in the same person. Indeed they could not; for evil destroys even

itself, and if it is complete becomes unbearable. Now hot-tempered

people get angry quickly and with the wrong persons and at the wrong

things and more than is right, but their anger ceases quickly-which

is the best point about them. This happens to them because they do

not restrain their anger but retaliate openly owing to their quickness

of temper, and then their anger ceases. By reason of excess choleric

people are quick-tempered and ready to be angry with everything and

on every occasion; whence their name. Sulky people are hard to appease,

and retain their anger long; for they repress their passion. But it

ceases when they retaliate; for revenge relieves them of their anger,

producing in them pleasure instead of pain. If this does not happen

they retain their burden; for owing to its not being obvious no one

even reasons with them, and to digest one's anger in oneself takes

time. Such people are most troublesome to themselves and to their

dearest friends. We call had-tempered those who are angry at the wrong

things, more than is right, and longer, and cannot be appeased until

they inflict vengeance or punishment.

To good temper we oppose the excess rather than the defect; for not

only is it commoner since revenge is the more human), but bad-tempered

people are worse to live with.

What we have said in our earlier treatment of the subject is plain

also from what we are now saying; viz. that it is not easy to define

how, with whom, at what, and how long one should be angry, and at

what point right action ceases and wrong begins. For the man who strays

a little from the path, either towards the more or towards the less,

is not blamed; since sometimes we praise those who exhibit the deficiency,

and call them good-tempered, and sometimes we call angry people manly,

as being capable of ruling. How far, therefore, and how a man must

stray before he becomes blameworthy, it is not easy to state in words;

for the decision depends on the particular facts and on perception.

But so much at least is plain, that the middle state is praiseworthy-

that in virtue of which we are angry with the right people, at the

right things, in the right way, and so on, while the excesses and

defects are blameworthy- slightly so if they are present in a low

degree, more if in a higher degree, and very much if in a high degree.

Evidently, then, we must cling to the middle state.- Enough of the

states relative to anger.
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In gatherings of men, in social life and the interchange of words

and deeds, some men are thought to be obsequious, viz. those who to

give pleasure praise everything and never oppose, but think it their

duty 'to give no pain to the people they meet'; while those who, on

the contrary, oppose everything and care not a whit about giving pain

are called churlish and contentious. That the states we have named

are culpable is plain enough, and that the middle state is laudable-

that in virtue of which a man will put up with, and will resent, the

right things and in the right way; but no name has been assigned to

it, though it most resembles friendship. For the man who corresponds

to this middle state is very much what, with affection added, we call

a good friend. But the state in question differs from friendship in

that it implies no passion or affection for one's associates; since

it is not by reason of loving or hating that such a man takes everything

in the right way, but by being a man of a certain kind. For he will

behave so alike towards those he knows and those he does not know,

towards intimates and those who are not so, except that in each of

these cases he will behave as is befitting; for it is not proper to

have the same care for intimates and for strangers, nor again is it

the same conditions that make it right to give pain to them. Now we

have said generally that he will associate with people in the right

way; but it is by reference to what is honourable and expedient that

he will aim at not giving pain or at contributing pleasure. For he

seems to be concerned with the pleasures and pains of social life;

and wherever it is not honourable, or is harmful, for him to contribute

pleasure, he will refuse, and will choose rather to give pain; also

if his acquiescence in another's action would bring disgrace, and

that in a high degree, or injury, on that other, while his opposition

brings a little pain, he will not acquiesce but will decline. He will

associate differently with people in high station and with ordinary

people, with closer and more distant acquaintances, and so too with

regard to all other differences, rendering to each class what is befitting,

and while for its own sake he chooses to contribute pleasure, and

avoids the giving of pain, he will be guided by the consequences,

if these are greater, i.e. honour and expediency. For the sake of

a great future pleasure, too, he will inflict small pains.

The man who attains the mean, then, is such as we have described,

but has not received a name; of those who contribute pleasure, the

man who aims at being pleasant with no ulterior object is obsequious,

but the man who does so in order that he may get some advantage in

the direction of money or the things that money buys is a flatterer;

while the man who quarrels with everything is, as has been said, churlish

and contentious. And the extremes seem to be contradictory to each

other because the mean is without a name.
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The mean opposed to boastfulness is found in almost the same sphere;

and this also is without a name. It will be no bad plan to describe

these states as well; for we shall both know the facts about character

better if we go through them in detail, and we shall be convinced

that the virtues are means if we see this to be so in all cases. In

the field of social life those who make the giving of pleasure or

pain their object in associating with others have been described;

let us now describe those who pursue truth or falsehood alike in words

and deeds and in the claims they put forward. The boastful man, then,

is thought to be apt to claim the things that bring glory, when he

has not got them, or to claim more of them than he has, and the mock-modest

man on the other hand to disclaim what he has or belittle it, while

the man who observes the mean is one who calls a thing by its own

name, being truthful both in life and in word, owning to what he has,

and neither more nor less. Now each of these courses may be adopted

either with or without an object. But each man speaks and acts and

lives in accordance with his character, if he is not acting for some

ulterior object. And falsehood is in itself mean and culpable, and

truth noble and worthy of praise. Thus the truthful man is another

case of a man who, being in the mean, is worthy of praise, and both

forms of untruthful man are culpable, and particularly the boastful

man.

Let us discuss them both, but first of all the truthful man. We are

not speaking of the man who keeps faith in his agreements, i.e. in

the things that pertain to justice or injustice (for this would belong

to another virtue), but the man who in the matters in which nothing

of this sort is at stake is true both in word and in life because

his character is such. But such a man would seem to be as a matter

of fact equitable. For the man who loves truth, and is truthful where

nothing is at stake, will still more be truthful where something is

at stake; he will avoid falsehood as something base, seeing that he

avoided it even for its own sake; and such a man is worthy of praise.

He inclines rather to understate the truth; for this seems in better

taste because exaggerations are wearisome.

He who claims more than he has with no ulterior object is a contemptible

sort of fellow (otherwise he would not have delighted in falsehood),

but seems futile rather than bad; but if he does it for an object,

he who does it for the sake of reputation or honour is (for a boaster)

not very much to be blamed, but he who does it for money, or the things

that lead to money, is an uglier character (it is not the capacity

that makes the boaster, but the purpose; for it is in virtue of his

state of character and by being a man of a certain kind that he is

boaster); as one man is a liar because he enjoys the lie itself, and

another because he desires reputation or gain. Now those who boast

for the sake of reputation claim such qualities as will praise or

congratulation, but those whose object is gain claim qualities which

are of value to one's neighbours and one's lack of which is not easily

detected, e.g. the powers of a seer, a sage, or a physician. For this

reason it is such things as these that most people claim and boast

about; for in them the above-mentioned qualities are found.

Mock-modest people, who understate things, seem more attractive in

character; for they are thought to speak not for gain but to avoid

parade; and here too it is qualities which bring reputation that they

disclaim, as Socrates used to do. Those who disclaim trifling and

obvious qualities are called humbugs and are more contemptible; and

sometimes this seems to be boastfulness, like the Spartan dress; for

both excess and great deficiency are boastful. But those who use understatement

with moderation and understate about matters that do not very much

force themselves on our notice seem attractive. And it is the boaster

that seems to be opposed to the truthful man; for he is the worse

character.
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Since life includes rest as well as activity, and in this is included

leisure and amusement, there seems here also to be a kind of intercourse

which is tasteful; there is such a thing as saying- and again listening

to- what one should and as one should. The kind of people one is speaking

or listening to will also make a difference. Evidently here also there

is both an excess and a deficiency as compared with the mean. Those

who carry humour to excess are thought to be vulgar buffoons, striving

after humour at all costs, and aiming rather at raising a laugh than

at saying what is becoming and at avoiding pain to the object of their

fun; while those who can neither make a joke themselves nor put up

with those who do are thought to be boorish and unpolished. But those

who joke in a tasteful way are called ready-witted, which implies

a sort of readiness to turn this way and that; for such sallies are

thought to be movements of the character, and as bodies are discriminated

by their movements, so too are characters. The ridiculous side of

things is not far to seek, however, and most people delight more than

they should in amusement and in jestinly. and so even buffoons are

called ready-witted because they are found attractive; but that they

differ from the ready-witted man, and to no small extent, is clear

from what has been said.

To the middle state belongs also tact; it is the mark of a tactful

man to say and listen to such things as befit a good and well-bred

man; for there are some things that it befits such a man to say and

to hear by way of jest, and the well-bred man's jesting differs from

that of a vulgar man, and the joking of an educated man from that

of an uneducated. One may see this even from the old and the new comedies;

to the authors of the former indecency of language was amusing, to

those of the latter innuendo is more so; and these differ in no small

degree in respect of propriety. Now should we define the man who jokes

well by his saying what is not unbecoming to a well-bred man, or by

his not giving pain, or even giving delight, to the hearer? Or is

the latter definition, at any rate, itself indefinite, since different

things are hateful or pleasant to different people? The kind of jokes

he will listen to will be the same; for the kind he can put up with

are also the kind he seems to make. There are, then, jokes he will

not make; for the jest is a sort of abuse, and there are things that

lawgivers forbid us to abuse; and they should, perhaps, have forbidden

us even to make a jest of such. The refined and well-bred man, therefore,

will be as we have described, being as it were a law to himself.

Such, then, is the man who observes the mean, whether he be called

tactful or ready-witted. The buffoon, on the other hand, is the slave

of his sense of humour, and spares neither himself nor others if he

can raise a laugh, and says things none of which a man of refinement

would say, and to some of which he would not even listen. The boor,

again, is useless for such social intercourse; for he contributes

nothing and finds fault with everything. But relaxation and amusement

are thought to be a necessary element in life.

The means in life that have been described, then, are three in number,

and are all concerned with an interchange of words and deeds of some

kind. They differ, however, in that one is concerned with truth; and

the other two with pleasantness. Of those concerned with pleasure,

one is displayed in jests, the other in the general social intercourse

of life.
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Shame should not be described as a virtue; for it is more like a feeling

than a state of character. It is defined, at any rate, as a kind of

fear of dishonour, and produces an effect similar to that produced

by fear of danger; for people who feel disgraced blush, and those

who fear death turn pale. Both, therefore, seem to be in a sense bodily

conditions, which is thought to be characteristic of feeling rather

than of a state of character.

The feeling is not becoming to every age, but only to youth. For we

think young people should be prone to the feeling of shame because

they live by feeling and therefore commit many errors, but are restrained

by shame; and we praise young people who are prone to this feeling,

but an older person no one would praise for being prone to the sense

of disgrace, since we think he should not do anything that need cause

this sense. For the sense of disgrace is not even characteristic of

a good man, since it is consequent on bad actions (for such actions

should not be done; and if some actions are disgraceful in very truth

and others only according to common opinion, this makes no difference;

for neither class of actions should be done, so that no disgrace should

be felt); and it is a mark of a bad man even to be such as to do any

disgraceful action. To be so constituted as to feel disgraced if one

does such an action, and for this reason to think oneself good, is

absurd; for it is for voluntary actions that shame is felt, and the

good man will never voluntarily do bad actions. But shame may be said

to be conditionally a good thing; if a good man does such actions,

he will feel disgraced; but the virtues are not subject to such a

qualification. And if shamelessness-not to be ashamed of doing base

actions-is bad, that does not make it good to be ashamed of doing

such actions. Continence too is not virtue, but a mixed sort of state;

this will be shown later. Now, however, let us discuss justice.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK V

1

With regards to justice and injustice we must (1) consider what kind

of actions they are concerned with, (2) what sort of mean justice

is, and (3) between what extremes the just act is intermediate. Our

investigation shall follow the same course as the preceding discussions.

We see that all men mean by justice that kind of state of character

which makes people disposed to do what is just and makes them act

justly and wish for what is just; and similarly by injustice that

state which makes them act unjustly and wish for what is unjust. Let

us too, then, lay this down as a general basis. For the same is not

true of the sciences and the faculties as of states of character.

A faculty or a science which is one and the same is held to relate

to contrary objects, but a state of character which is one of two

contraries does not produce the contrary results; e.g. as a result

of health we do not do what is the opposite of healthy, but only what

is healthy; for we say a man walks healthily, when he walks as a healthy

man would.

Now often one contrary state is recognized from its contrary, and

often states are recognized from the subjects that exhibit them; for

(A) if good condition is known, bad condition also becomes known,

and (B) good condition is known from the things that are in good condition,

and they from it. If good condition is firmness of flesh, it is necessary

both that bad condition should be flabbiness of flesh and that the

wholesome should be that which causes firmness in flesh. And it follows

for the most part that if one contrary is ambiguous the other also

will be ambiguous; e.g. if 'just' is so, that 'unjust' will be so

too.

Now 'justice' and 'injustice' seem to be ambiguous, but because their

different meanings approach near to one another the ambiguity escapes

notice and is not obvious as it is, comparatively, when the meanings

are far apart, e.g. (for here the difference in outward form is great)

as the ambiguity in the use of kleis for the collar-bone of an animal

and for that with which we lock a door. Let us take as a starting-point,

then, the various meanings of 'an unjust man'. Both the lawless man

and the grasping and unfair man are thought to be unjust, so that

evidently both the law-abiding and the fair man will be just. The

just, then, is the lawful and the fair, the unjust the unlawful and

the unfair.

Since the unjust man is grasping, he must be concerned with goods-not

all goods, but those with which prosperity and adversity have to do,

which taken absolutely are always good, but for a particular person

are not always good. Now men pray for and pursue these things; but

they should not, but should pray that the things that are good absolutely

may also be good for them, and should choose the things that are good

for them. The unjust man does not always choose the greater, but also

the less-in the case of things bad absolutely; but because the lesser

evil is itself thought to be in a sense good, and graspingness is

directed at the good, therefore he is thought to be grasping. And

he is unfair; for this contains and is common to both.

Since the lawless man was seen to be unjust and the law-abiding man

just, evidently all lawful acts are in a sense just acts; for the

acts laid down by the legislative art are lawful, and each of these,

we say, is just. Now the laws in their enactments on all subjects

aim at the common advantage either of all or of the best or of those

who hold power, or something of the sort; so that in one sense we

call those acts just that tend to produce and preserve happiness and

its components for the political society. And the law bids us do both

the acts of a brave man (e.g. not to desert our post nor take to flight

nor throw away our arms), and those of a temperate man (e.g. not to

commit adultery nor to gratify one's lust), and those of a good-tempered

man (e.g. not to strike another nor to speak evil), and similarly

with regard to the other virtues and forms of wickedness, commanding

some acts and forbidding others; and the rightly-framed law does this

rightly, and the hastily conceived one less well. This form of justice,

then, is complete virtue, but not absolutely, but in relation to our

neighbour. And therefore justice is often thought to be the greatest

of virtues, and 'neither evening nor morning star' is so wonderful;

and proverbially 'in justice is every virtue comprehended'. And it

is complete virtue in its fullest sense, because it is the actual

exercise of complete virtue. It is complete because he who possesses

it can exercise his virtue not only in himself but towards his neighbour

also; for many men can exercise virtue in their own affairs, but not

in their relations to their neighbour. This is why the saying of Bias

is thought to be true, that 'rule will show the man'; for a ruler

is necessarily in relation to other men and a member of a society.

For this same reason justice, alone of the virtues, is thought to

be 'another's good', because it is related to our neighbour; for it

does what is advantageous to another, either a ruler or a copartner.

Now the worst man is he who exercises his wickedness both towards

himself and towards his friends, and the best man is not he who exercises

his virtue towards himself but he who exercises it towards another;

for this is a difficult task. Justice in this sense, then, is not

part of virtue but virtue entire, nor is the contrary injustice a

part of vice but vice entire. What the difference is between virtue

and justice in this sense is plain from what we have said; they are

the same but their essence is not the same; what, as a relation to

one's neighbour, is justice is, as a certain kind of state without

qualification, virtue.
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But at all events what we are investigating is the justice which is

a part of virtue; for there is a justice of this kind, as we maintain.

Similarly it is with injustice in the particular sense that we are

concerned.

That there is such a thing is indicated by the fact that while the

man who exhibits in action the other forms of wickedness acts wrongly

indeed, but not graspingly (e.g. the man who throws away his shield

through cowardice or speaks harshly through bad temper or fails to

help a friend with money through meanness), when a man acts graspingly

he often exhibits none of these vices,-no, nor all together, but certainly

wickedness of some kind (for we blame him) and injustice. There is,

then, another kind of injustice which is a part of injustice in the

wide sense, and a use of the word 'unjust' which answers to a part

of what is unjust in the wide sense of 'contrary to the law'. Again

if one man commits adultery for the sake of gain and makes money by

it, while another does so at the bidding of appetite though he loses

money and is penalized for it, the latter would be held to be self-indulgent

rather than grasping, but the former is unjust, but not self-indulgent;

evidently, therefore, he is unjust by reason of his making gain by

his act. Again, all other unjust acts are ascribed invariably to some

particular kind of wickedness, e.g. adultery to self-indulgence, the

desertion of a comrade in battle to cowardice, physical violence to

anger; but if a man makes gain, his action is ascribed to no form

of wickedness but injustice. Evidently, therefore, there is apart

from injustice in the wide sense another, 'particular', injustice

which shares the name and nature of the first, because its definition

falls within the same genus; for the significance of both consists

in a relation to one's neighbour, but the one is concerned with honour

or money or safety-or that which includes all these, if we had a single

name for it-and its motive is the pleasure that arises from gain;

while the other is concerned with all the objects with which the good

man is concerned.

It is clear, then, that there is more than one kind of justice, and

that there is one which is distinct from virtue entire; we must try

to grasp its genus and differentia.

The unjust has been divided into the unlawful and the unfair, and

the just into the lawful and the fair. To the unlawful answers the

afore-mentioned sense of injustice. But since unfair and the unlawful

are not the same, but are different as a part is from its whole (for

all that is unfair is unlawful, but not all that is unlawful is unfair),

the unjust and injustice in the sense of the unfair are not the same

as but different from the former kind, as part from whole; for injustice

in this sense is a part of injustice in the wide sense, and similarly

justice in the one sense of justice in the other. Therefore we must

speak also about particular justice and particular and similarly about

the just and the unjust. The justice, then, which answers to the whole

of virtue, and the corresponding injustice, one being the exercise

of virtue as a whole, and the other that of vice as a whole, towards

one's neighbour, we may leave on one side. And how the meanings of

'just' and 'unjust' which answer to these are to be distinguished

is evident; for practically the majority of the acts commanded by

the law are those which are prescribed from the point of view of virtue

taken as a whole; for the law bids us practise every virtue and forbids

us to practise any vice. And the things that tend to produce virtue

taken as a whole are those of the acts prescribed by the law which

have been prescribed with a view to education for the common good.

But with regard to the education of the individual as such, which

makes him without qualification a good man, we must determine later

whether this is the function of the political art or of another; for

perhaps it is not the same to be a good man and a good citizen of

any state taken at random.

Of particular justice and that which is just in the corresponding

sense, (A) one kind is that which is manifested in distributions of

honour or money or the other things that fall to be divided among

those who have a share in the constitution (for in these it is possible

for one man to have a share either unequal or equal to that of another),

and (B) one is that which plays a rectifying part in transactions

between man and man. Of this there are two divisions; of transactions

(1) some are voluntary and (2) others involuntary- voluntary such

transactions as sale, purchase, loan for consumption, pledging, loan

for use, depositing, letting (they are called voluntary because the

origin of these transactions is voluntary), while of the involuntary

(a) some are clandestine, such as theft, adultery, poisoning, procuring,

enticement of slaves, assassination, false witness, and (b) others

are violent, such as assault, imprisonment, murder, robbery with violence,

mutilation, abuse, insult.
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(A) We have shown that both the unjust man and the unjust act are

unfair or unequal; now it is clear that there is also an intermediate

between the two unequals involved in either case. And this is the

equal; for in any kind of action in which there's a more and a less

there is also what is equal. If, then, the unjust is unequal, just

is equal, as all men suppose it to be, even apart from argument. And

since the equal is intermediate, the just will be an intermediate.

Now equality implies at least two things. The just, then, must be

both intermediate and equal and relative (i.e. for certain persons).

And since the equall intermediate it must be between certain things

(which are respectively greater and less); equal, it involves two

things; qua just, it is for certain people. The just, therefore, involves

at least four terms; for the persons for whom it is in fact just are

two, and the things in which it is manifested, the objects distributed,

are two. And the same equality will exist between the persons and

between the things concerned; for as the latter the things concerned-are

related, so are the former; if they are not equal, they will not have

what is equal, but this is the origin of quarrels and complaints-when

either equals have and are awarded unequal shares, or unequals equal

shares. Further, this is plain from the fact that awards should be

'according to merit'; for all men agree that what is just in distribution

must be according to merit in some sense, though they do not all specify

the same sort of merit, but democrats identify it with the status

of freeman, supporters of oligarchy with wealth (or with noble birth),

and supporters of aristocracy with excellence.

The just, then, is a species of the proportionate (proportion being

not a property only of the kind of number which consists of abstract

units, but of number in general). For proportion is equality of ratios,

and involves four terms at least (that discrete proportion involves

four terms is plain, but so does continuous proportion, for it uses

one term as two and mentions it twice; e.g. 'as the line A is to the

line B, so is the line B to the line C'; the line B, then, has been

mentioned twice, so that if the line B be assumed twice, the proportional

terms will be four); and the just, too, involves at least four terms,

and the ratio between one pair is the same as that between the other

pair; for there is a similar distinction between the persons and between

the things. As the term A, then, is to B, so will C be to D, and therefore,

alternando, as A is to C, B will be to D. Therefore also the whole

is in the same ratio to the whole; and this coupling the distribution

effects, and, if the terms are so combined, effects justly. The conjunction,

then, of the term A with C and of B with D is what is just in distribution,

and this species of the just is intermediate, and the unjust is what

violates the proportion; for the proportional is intermediate, and

the just is proportional. (Mathematicians call this kind of proportion

geometrical; for it is in geometrical proportion that it follows that

the whole is to the whole as either part is to the corresponding part.)

This proportion is not continuous; for we cannot get a single term

standing for a person and a thing.

This, then, is what the just is-the proportional; the unjust is what

violates the proportion. Hence one term becomes too great, the other

too small, as indeed happens in practice; for the man who acts unjustly

has too much, and the man who is unjustly treated too little, of what

is good. In the case of evil the reverse is true; for the lesser evil

is reckoned a good in comparison with the greater evil, since the

lesser evil is rather to be chosen than the greater, and what is worthy

of choice is good, and what is worthier of choice a greater good.

This, then, is one species of the just.
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(B) The remaining one is the rectificatory, which arises in connexion

with transactions both voluntary and involuntary. This form of the

just has a different specific character from the former. For the justice

which distributes common possessions is always in accordance with

the kind of proportion mentioned above (for in the case also in which

the distribution is made from the common funds of a partnership it

will be according to the same ratio which the funds put into the business

by the partners bear to one another); and the injustice opposed to

this kind of justice is that which violates the proportion. But the

justice in transactions between man and man is a sort of equality

indeed, and the injustice a sort of inequality; not according to that

kind of proportion, however, but according to arithmetical proportion.

For it makes no difference whether a good man has defrauded a bad

man or a bad man a good one, nor whether it is a good or a bad man

that has committed adultery; the law looks only to the distinctive

character of the injury, and treats the parties as equal, if one is

in the wrong and the other is being wronged, and if one inflicted

injury and the other has received it. Therefore, this kind of injustice

being an inequality, the judge tries to equalize it; for in the case

also in which one has received and the other has inflicted a wound,

or one has slain and the other been slain, the suffering and the action

have been unequally distributed; but the judge tries to equalize by

means of the penalty, taking away from the gain of the assailant.

For the term 'gain' is applied generally to such cases, even if it

be not a term appropriate to certain cases, e.g. to the person who

inflicts a woundand 'loss' to the sufferer; at all events when the

suffering has been estimated, the one is called loss and the other

gain. Therefore the equal is intermediate between the greater and

the less, but the gain and the loss are respectively greater and less

in contrary ways; more of the good and less of the evil are gain,

and the contrary is loss; intermediate between them is, as we saw,

equal, which we say is just; therefore corrective justice will be

the intermediate between loss and gain. This is why, when people dispute,

they take refuge in the judge; and to go to the judge is to go to

justice; for the nature of the judge is to be a sort of animate justice;

and they seek the judge as an intermediate, and in some states they

call judges mediators, on the assumption that if they get what is

intermediate they will get what is just. The just, then, is an intermediate,

since the judge is so. Now the judge restores equality; it is as though

there were a line divided into unequal parts, and he took away that

by which the greater segment exceeds the half, and added it to the

smaller segment. And when the whole has been equally divided, then

they say they have 'their own'-i.e. when they have got what is equal.

The equal is intermediate between the greater and the lesser line

according to arithmetical proportion. It is for this reason also that

it is called just (sikaion), because it is a division into two equal

parts (sicha), just as if one were to call it sichaion; and the judge

(sikastes) is one who bisects (sichastes). For when something is subtracted

from one of two equals and added to the other, the other is in excess

by these two; since if what was taken from the one had not been added

to the other, the latter would have been in excess by one only. It

therefore exceeds the intermediate by one, and the intermediate exceeds

by one that from which something was taken. By this, then, we shall

recognize both what we must subtract from that which has more, and

what we must add to that which has less; we must add to the latter

that by which the intermediate exceeds it, and subtract from the greatest

that by which it exceeds the intermediate. Let the lines AA', BB',

CC' be equal to one another; from the line AA' let the segment AE

have been subtracted, and to the line CC' let the segment Cd have

been added, so that the whole line DCC' exceeds the line EA' by the

segment CD and the segment CF; therefore it exceeds the line Bb' by

the segment CD. (See diagram.)

These names, both loss and gain, have come from voluntary exchange;

for to have more than one's own is called gaining, and to have less

than one's original share is called losing, e.g. in buying and selling

and in all other matters in which the law has left people free to

make their own terms; but when they get neither more nor less but

just what belongs to themselves, they say that they have their own

and that they neither lose nor gain.

Therefore the just is intermediate between a sort of gain and a sort

of loss, viz. those which are involuntary; it consists in having an

equal amount before and after the transaction.
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Some think that reciprocity is without qualification just, as the

Pythagoreans said; for they defined justice without qualification

as reciprocity. Now 'reciprocity' fits neither distributive nor rectificatory

justice-yet people want even the justice of Rhadamanthus to mean this:

Should a man suffer what he did, right justice would be done -for

in many cases reciprocity and rectificatory justice are not in accord;

e.g. (1) if an official has inflicted a wound, he should not be wounded

in return, and if some one has wounded an official, he ought not to

be wounded only but punished in addition. Further (2) there is a great

difference between a voluntary and an involuntary act. But in associations

for exchange this sort of justice does hold men together-reciprocity

in accordance with a proportion and not on the basis of precisely

equal return. For it is by proportionate requital that the city holds

together. Men seek to return either evil for evil-and if they cana

not do so, think their position mere slavery-or good for good-and

if they cannot do so there is no exchange, but it is by exchange that

they hold together. This is why they give a prominent place to the

temple of the Graces-to promote the requital of services; for this

is characteristic of grace-we should serve in return one who has shown

grace to us, and should another time take the initiative in showing

it.

Now proportionate return is secured by cross-conjunction. Let A be

a builder, B a shoemaker, C a house, D a shoe. The builder, then,

must get from the shoemaker the latter's work, and must himself give

him in return his own. If, then, first there is proportionate equality

of goods, and then reciprocal action takes place, the result we mention

will be effected. If not, the bargain is not equal, and does not hold;

for there is nothing to prevent the work of the one being better than

that of the other; they must therefore be equated. (And this is true

of the other arts also; for they would have been destroyed if what

the patient suffered had not been just what the agent did, and of

the same amount and kind.) For it is not two doctors that associate

for exchange, but a doctor and a farmer, or in general people who

are different and unequal; but these must be equated. This is why

all things that are exchanged must be somehow comparable. It is for

this end that money has been introduced, and it becomes in a sense

an intermediate; for it measures all things, and therefore the excess

and the defect-how many shoes are equal to a house or to a given amount

of food. The number of shoes exchanged for a house (or for a given

amount of food) must therefore correspond to the ratio of builder

to shoemaker. For if this be not so, there will be no exchange and

no intercourse. And this proportion will not be effected unless the

goods are somehow equal. All goods must therefore be measured by some

one thing, as we said before. Now this unit is in truth demand, which

holds all things together (for if men did not need one another's goods

at all, or did not need them equally, there would be either no exchange

or not the same exchange); but money has become by convention a sort

of representative of demand; and this is why it has the name 'money'

(nomisma)-because it exists not by nature but by law (nomos) and it

is in our power to change it and make it useless. There will, then,

be reciprocity when the terms have been equated so that as farmer

is to shoemaker, the amount of the shoemaker's work is to that of

the farmer's work for which it exchanges. But we must not bring them

into a figure of proportion when they have already exchanged (otherwise

one extreme will have both excesses), but when they still have their

own goods. Thus they are equals and associates just because this equality

can be effected in their case. Let A be a farmer, C food, B a shoemaker,

D his product equated to C. If it had not been possible for reciprocity

to be thus effected, there would have been no association of the parties.

That demand holds things together as a single unit is shown by the

fact that when men do not need one another, i.e. when neither needs

the other or one does not need the other, they do not exchange, as

we do when some one wants what one has oneself, e.g. when people permit

the exportation of corn in exchange for wine. This equation therefore

must be established. And for the future exchange-that if we do not

need a thing now we shall have it if ever we do need it-money is as

it were our surety; for it must be possible for us to get what we

want by bringing the money. Now the same thing happens to money itself

as to goods-it is not always worth the same; yet it tends to be steadier.

This is why all goods must have a price set on them; for then there

will always be exchange, and if so, association of man with man. Money,

then, acting as a measure, makes goods commensurate and equates them;

for neither would there have been association if there were not exchange,

nor exchange if there were not equality, nor equality if there were

not commensurability. Now in truth it is impossible that things differing

so much should become commensurate, but with reference to demand they

may become so sufficiently. There must, then, be a unit, and that

fixed by agreement (for which reason it is called money); for it is

this that makes all things commensurate, since all things are measured

by money. Let A be a house, B ten minae, C a bed. A is half of B,

if the house is worth five minae or equal to them; the bed, C, is

a tenth of B; it is plain, then, how many beds are equal to a house,

viz. five. That exchange took place thus before there was money is

plain; for it makes no difference whether it is five beds that exchange

for a house, or the money value of five beds.

We have now defined the unjust and the just. These having been marked

off from each other, it is plain that just action is intermediate

between acting unjustly and being unjustly treated; for the one is

to have too much and the other to have too little. Justice is a kind

of mean, but not in the same way as the other virtues, but because

it relates to an intermediate amount, while injustice relates to the

extremes. And justice is that in virtue of which the just man is said

to be a doer, by choice, of that which is just, and one who will distribute

either between himself and another or between two others not so as

to give more of what is desirable to himself and less to his neighbour

(and conversely with what is harmful), but so as to give what is equal

in accordance with proportion; and similarly in distributing between

two other persons. Injustice on the other hand is similarly related

to the unjust, which is excess and defect, contrary to proportion,

of the useful or hurtful. For which reason injustice is excess and

defect, viz. because it is productive of excess and defect-in one's

own case excess of what is in its own nature useful and defect of

what is hurtful, while in the case of others it is as a whole like

what it is in one's own case, but proportion may be violated in either

direction. In the unjust act to have too little is to be unjustly

treated; to have too much is to act unjustly.

Let this be taken as our account of the nature of justice and injustice,

and similarly of the just and the unjust in general.
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Since acting unjustly does not necessarily imply being unjust, we

must ask what sort of unjust acts imply that the doer is unjust with

respect to each type of injustice, e.g. a thief, an adulterer, or

a brigand. Surely the answer does not turn on the difference between

these types. For a man might even lie with a woman knowing who she

was, but the origin of his might be not deliberate choice but passion.

He acts unjustly, then, but is not unjust; e.g. a man is not a thief,

yet he stole, nor an adulterer, yet he committed adultery; and similarly

in all other cases.

Now we have previously stated how the reciprocal is related to the

just; but we must not forget that what we are looking for is not only

what is just without qualification but also political justice. This

is found among men who share their life with a view to selfsufficiency,

men who are free and either proportionately or arithmetically equal,

so that between those who do not fulfil this condition there is no

political justice but justice in a special sense and by analogy. For

justice exists only between men whose mutual relations are governed

by law; and law exists for men between whom there is injustice; for

legal justice is the discrimination of the just and the unjust. And

between men between whom there is injustice there is also unjust action

(though there is not injustice between all between whom there is unjust

action), and this is assigning too much to oneself of things good

in themselves and too little of things evil in themselves. This is

why we do not allow a man to rule, but rational principle, because

a man behaves thus in his own interests and becomes a tyrant. The

magistrate on the other hand is the guardian of justice, and, if of

justice, then of equality also. And since he is assumed to have no

more than his share, if he is just (for he does not assign to himself

more of what is good in itself, unless such a share is proportional

to his merits-so that it is for others that he labours, and it is

for this reason that men, as we stated previously, say that justice

is 'another's good'), therefore a reward must be given him, and this

is honour and privilege; but those for whom such things are not enough

become tyrants.

The justice of a master and that of a father are not the same as the

justice of citizens, though they are like it; for there can be no

injustice in the unqualified sense towards thing that are one's own,

but a man's chattel, and his child until it reaches a certain age

and sets up for itself, are as it were part of himself, and no one

chooses to hurt himself (for which reason there can be no injustice

towards oneself). Therefore the justice or injustice of citizens is

not manifested in these relations; for it was as we saw according

to law, and between people naturally subject to law, and these as

we saw' are people who have an equal share in ruling and being ruled.

Hence justice can more truly be manifested towards a wife than towards

children and chattels, for the former is household justice; but even

this is different from political justice.
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Of political justice part is natural, part legal, natural, that which

everywhere has the same force and does not exist by people's thinking

this or that; legal, that which is originally indifferent, but when

it has been laid down is not indifferent, e.g. that a prisoner's ransom

shall be a mina, or that a goat and not two sheep shall be sacrificed,

and again all the laws that are passed for particular cases, e.g.

that sacrifice shall be made in honour of Brasidas, and the provisions

of decrees. Now some think that all justice is of this sort, because

that which is by nature is unchangeable and has everywhere the same

force (as fire burns both here and in Persia), while they see change

in the things recognized as just. This, however, is not true in this

unqualified way, but is true in a sense; or rather, with the gods

it is perhaps not true at all, while with us there is something that

is just even by nature, yet all of it is changeable; but still some

is by nature, some not by nature. It is evident which sort of thing,

among things capable of being otherwise, is by nature, and which is

not but is legal and conventional, assuming that both are equally

changeable. And in all other things the same distinction will apply;

by nature the right hand is stronger, yet it is possible that all

men should come to be ambidextrous. The things which are just by virtue

of convention and expediency are like measures; for wine and corn

measures are not everywhere equal, but larger in wholesale and smaller

in retail markets. Similarly, the things which are just not by nature

but by human enactment are not everywhere the same, since constitutions

also are not the same, though there is but one which is everywhere

by nature the best. Of things just and lawful each is related as the

universal to its particulars; for the things that are done are many,

but of them each is one, since it is universal.

There is a difference between the act of injustice and what is unjust,

and between the act of justice and what is just; for a thing is unjust

by nature or by enactment; and this very thing, when it has been done,

is an act of injustice, but before it is done is not yet that but

is unjust. So, too, with an act of justice (though the general term

is rather 'just action', and 'act of justice' is applied to the correction

of the act of injustice).

Each of these must later be examined separately with regard to the

nature and number of its species and the nature of the things with

which it is concerned.
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Acts just and unjust being as we have described them, a man acts unjustly

or justly whenever he does such acts voluntarily; when involuntarily,

he acts neither unjustly nor justly except in an incidental way; for

he does things which happen to be just or unjust. Whether an act is

or is not one of injustice (or of justice) is determined by its voluntariness

or involuntariness; for when it is voluntary it is blamed, and at

the same time is then an act of injustice; so that there will be things

that are unjust but not yet acts of injustice, if voluntariness be

not present as well. By the voluntary I mean, as has been said before,

any of the things in a man's own power which he does with knowledge,

i.e. not in ignorance either of the person acted on or of the instrument

used or of the end that will be attained (e.g. whom he is striking,

with what, and to what end), each such act being done not incidentally

nor under compulsion (e.g. if A takes B's hand and therewith strikes

C, B does not act voluntarily; for the act was not in his own power).

The person struck may be the striker's father, and the striker may

know that it is a man or one of the persons present, but not know

that it is his father; a similar distinction may be made in the case

of the end, and with regard to the whole action. Therefore that which

is done in ignorance, or though not done in ignorance is not in the

agent's power, or is done under compulsion, is involuntary (for many

natural processes, even, we knowingly both perform and experience,

none of which is either voluntary or involuntary; e.g. growing old

or dying). But in the case of unjust and just acts alike the injustice

or justice may be only incidental; for a man might return a deposit

unwillingly and from fear, and then he must not be said either to

do what is just or to act justly, except in an incidental way. Similarly

the man who under compulsion and unwillingly fails to return the deposit

must be said to act unjustly, and to do what is unjust, only incidentally.

Of voluntary acts we do some by choice, others not by choice; by choice

those which we do after deliberation, not by choice those which we

do without previous deliberation. Thus there are three kinds of injury

in transactions between man and man; those done in ignorance are mistakes

when the person acted on, the act, the instrument, or the end that

will be attained is other than the agent supposed; the agent thought

either that he was not hiting any one or that he was not hitting with

this missile or not hitting this person or to this end, but a result

followed other than that which he thought likely (e.g. he threw not

with intent to wound but only to prick), or the person hit or the

missile was other than he supposed. Now when (1) the injury takes

place contrary to reasonable expectation, it is a misadventure. When

(2) it is not contrary to reasonable expectation, but does not imply

vice, it is a mistake (for a man makes a mistake when the fault originates

in him, but is the victim of accident when the origin lies outside

him). When (3) he acts with knowledge but not after deliberation,

it is an act of injustice-e.g. the acts due to anger or to other passions

necessary or natural to man; for when men do such harmful and mistaken

acts they act unjustly, and the acts are acts of injustice, but this

does not imply that the doers are unjust or wicked; for the injury

is not due to vice. But when (4) a man acts from choice, he is an

unjust man and a vicious man.

Hence acts proceeding from anger are rightly judged not to be done

of malice aforethought; for it is not the man who acts in anger but

he who enraged him that starts the mischief. Again, the matter in

dispute is not whether the thing happened or not, but its justice;

for it is apparent injustice that occasions rage. For they do not

dispute about the occurrence of the act-as in commercial transactions

where one of the two parties must be vicious-unless they do so owing

to forgetfulness; but, agreeing about the fact, they dispute on which

side justice lies (whereas a man who has deliberately injured another

cannot help knowing that he has done so), so that the one thinks he

is being treated unjustly and the other disagrees.

But if a man harms another by choice, he acts unjustly; and these

are the acts of injustice which imply that the doer is an unjust man,

provided that the act violates proportion or equality. Similarly,

a man is just when he acts justly by choice; but he acts justly if

he merely acts voluntarily.

Of involuntary acts some are excusable, others not. For the mistakes

which men make not only in ignorance but also from ignorance are excusable,

while those which men do not from ignorance but (though they do them

in ignorance) owing to a passion which is neither natural nor such

as man is liable to, are not excusable.
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Assuming that we have sufficiently defined the suffering and doing

of injustice, it may be asked (1) whether the truth in expressed in

Euripides' paradoxical words:

I slew my mother, that's my tale in brief.

Were you both willing, or unwilling both?

Is it truly possible to be willingly treated unjustly, or is all suffering

of injustice the contrary involuntary, as all unjust action is voluntary?

And is all suffering of injustice of the latter kind or else all of

the former, or is it sometimes voluntary, sometimes involuntary? So,

too, with the case of being justly treated; all just action is voluntary,

so that it is reasonable that there should be a similar opposition

in either case-that both being unjustly and being justly treated should

be either alike voluntary or alike involuntary. But it would be thought

paradoxical even in the case of being justly treated, if it were always

voluntary; for some are unwillingly treated justly. (2) One might

raise this question also, whether every one who has suffered what

is unjust is being unjustly treated, or on the other hand it is with

suffering as with acting. In action and in passivity alike it is possible

to partake of justice incidentally, and similarly (it is plain) of

injustice; for to do what is unjust is not the same as to act unjustly,

nor to suffer what is unjust as to be treated unjustly, and similarly

in the case of acting justly and being justly treated; for it is impossible

to be unjustly treated if the other does not act unjustly, or justly

treated unless he acts justly. Now if to act unjustly is simply to

harm some one voluntarily, and 'voluntarily' means 'knowing the person

acted on, the instrument, and the manner of one's acting', and the

incontinent man voluntarily harms himself, not only will he voluntarily

be unjustly treated but it will be possible to treat oneself unjustly.

(This also is one of the questions in doubt, whether a man can treat

himself unjustly.) Again, a man may voluntarily, owing to incontinence,

be harmed by another who acts voluntarily, so that it would be possible

to be voluntarily treated unjustly. Or is our definition incorrect;

must we to 'harming another, with knowledge both of the person acted

on, of the instrument, and of the manner' add 'contrary to the wish

of the person acted on'? Then a man may be voluntarily harmed and

voluntarily suffer what is unjust, but no one is voluntarily treated

unjustly; for no one wishes to be unjustly treated, not even the incontinent

man. He acts contrary to his wish; for no one wishes for what he does

not think to be good, but the incontinent man does do things that

he does not think he ought to do. Again, one who gives what is his

own, as Homer says Glaucus gave Diomede

Armour of gold for brazen, the price of a hundred beeves for nine,

is not unjustly treated; for though to give is in his power, to be

unjustly treated is not, but there must be some one to treat him unjustly.

It is plain, then, that being unjustly treated is not voluntary.

Of the questions we intended to discuss two still remain for discussion;

(3) whether it is the man who has assigned to another more than his

share that acts unjustly, or he who has the excessive share, and (4)

whether it is possible to treat oneself unjustly. The questions are

connected; for if the former alternative is possible and the distributor

acts unjustly and not the man who has the excessive share, then if

a man assigns more to another than to himself, knowingly and voluntarily,

he treats himself unjustly; which is what modest people seem to do,

since the virtuous man tends to take less than his share. Or does

this statement too need qualification? For (a) he perhaps gets more

than his share of some other good, e.g. of honour or of intrinsic

nobility. (b) The question is solved by applying the distinction we

applied to unjust action; for he suffers nothing contrary to his own

wish, so that he is not unjustly treated as far as this goes, but

at most only suffers harm.

It is plain too that the distributor acts unjustly, but not always

the man who has the excessive share; for it is not he to whom what

is unjust appertains that acts unjustly, but he to whom it appertains

to do the unjust act voluntarily, i.e. the person in whom lies the

origin of the action, and this lies in the distributor, not in the

receiver. Again, since the word 'do' is ambiguous, and there is a

sense in which lifeless things, or a hand, or a servant who obeys

an order, may be said to slay, he who gets an excessive share does

not act unjustly, though he 'does' what is unjust.

Again, if the distributor gave his judgement in ignorance, he does

not act unjustly in respect of legal justice, and his judgement is

not unjust in this sense, but in a sense it is unjust (for legal justice

and primordial justice are different); but if with knowledge he judged

unjustly, he is himself aiming at an excessive share either of gratitude

or of revenge. As much, then, as if he were to share in the plunder,

the man who has judged unjustly for these reasons has got too much;

the fact that what he gets is different from what he distributes makes

no difference, for even if he awards land with a view to sharing in

the plunder he gets not land but money.

Men think that acting unjustly is in their power, and therefore that

being just is easy. But it is not; to lie with one's neighbour's wife,

to wound another, to deliver a bribe, is easy and in our power, but

to do these things as a result of a certain state of character is

neither easy nor in our power. Similarly to know what is just and

what is unjust requires, men think, no great wisdom, because it is

not hard to understand the matters dealt with by the laws (though

these are not the things that are just, except incidentally); but

how actions must be done and distributions effected in order to be

just, to know this is a greater achievement than knowing what is good

for the health; though even there, while it is easy to know that honey,

wine, hellebore, cautery, and the use of the knife are so, to know

how, to whom, and when these should be applied with a view to producing

health, is no less an achievement than that of being a physician.

Again, for this very reason men think that acting unjustly is characteristic

of the just man no less than of the unjust, because he would be not

less but even more capable of doing each of these unjust acts; for

he could lie with a woman or wound a neighbour; and the brave man

could throw away his shield and turn to flight in this direction or

in that. But to play the coward or to act unjustly consists not in

doing these things, except incidentally, but in doing them as the

result of a certain state of character, just as to practise medicine

and healing consists not in applying or not applying the knife, in

using or not using medicines, but in doing so in a certain way.

Just acts occur between people who participate in things good in themselves

and can have too much or too little of them; for some beings (e.g.

presumably the gods) cannot have too much of them, and to others,

those who are incurably bad, not even the smallest share in them is

beneficial but all such goods are harmful, while to others they are

beneficial up to a point; therefore justice is essentially something

human.

10

Our next subject is equity and the equitable (to epiekes), and their

respective relations to justice and the just. For on examination they

appear to be neither absolutely the same nor generically different;

and while we sometime praise what is equitable and the equitable man

(so that we apply the name by way of praise even to instances of the

other virtues, instead of 'good' meaning by epieikestebon that a thing

is better), at other times, when we reason it out, it seems strange

if the equitable, being something different from the just, is yet

praiseworthy; for either the just or the equitable is not good, if

they are different; or, if both are good, they are the same.

These, then, are pretty much the considerations that give rise to

the problem about the equitable; they are all in a sense correct and

not opposed to one another; for the equitable, though it is better

than one kind of justice, yet is just, and it is not as being a different

class of thing that it is better than the just. The same thing, then,

is just and equitable, and while both are good the equitable is superior.

What creates the problem is that the equitable is just, but not the

legally just but a correction of legal justice. The reason is that

all law is universal but about some things it is not possible to make

a universal statement which shall be correct. In those cases, then,

in which it is necessary to speak universally, but not possible to

do so correctly, the law takes the usual case, though it is not ignorant

of the possibility of error. And it is none the less correct; for

the error is in the law nor in the legislator but in the nature of

the thing, since the matter of practical affairs is of this kind from

the start. When the law speaks universally, then, and a case arises

on it which is not covered by the universal statement, then it is

right, where the legislator fails us and has erred by oversimplicity,

to correct the omission-to say what the legislator himself would have

said had he been present, and would have put into his law if he had

known. Hence the equitable is just, and better than one kind of justice-not

better than absolute justice but better than the error that arises

from the absoluteness of the statement. And this is the nature of

the equitable, a correction of law where it is defective owing to

its universality. In fact this is the reason why all things are not

determined by law, that about some things it is impossible to lay

down a law, so that a decree is needed. For when the thing is indefinite

the rule also is indefinite, like the leaden rule used in making the

Lesbian moulding; the rule adapts itself to the shape of the stone

and is not rigid, and so too the decree is adapted to the facts.

It is plain, then, what the equitable is, and that it is just and

is better than one kind of justice. It is evident also from this who

the equitable man is; the man who chooses and does such acts, and

is no stickler for his rights in a bad sense but tends to take less

than his share though he has the law oft his side, is equitable, and

this state of character is equity, which is a sort of justice and

not a different state of character.
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Whether a man can treat himself unjustly or not, is evident from what

has been said. For (a) one class of just acts are those acts in accordance

with any virtue which are prescribed by the law; e.g. the law does

not expressly permit suicide, and what it does not expressly permit

it forbids. Again, when a man in violation of the law harms another

(otherwise than in retaliation) voluntarily, he acts unjustly, and

a voluntary agent is one who knows both the person he is affecting

by his action and the instrument he is using; and he who through anger

voluntarily stabs himself does this contrary to the right rule of

life, and this the law does not allow; therefore he is acting unjustly.

But towards whom? Surely towards the state, not towards himself. For

he suffers voluntarily, but no one is voluntarily treated unjustly.

This is also the reason why the state punishes; a certain loss of

civil rights attaches to the man who destroys himself, on the ground

that he is treating the state unjustly.

Further (b) in that sense of 'acting unjustly' in which the man who

'acts unjustly' is unjust only and not bad all round, it is not possible

to treat oneself unjustly (this is different from the former sense;

the unjust man in one sense of the term is wicked in a particularized

way just as the coward is, not in the sense of being wicked all round,

so that his 'unjust act' does not manifest wickedness in general).

For (i) that would imply the possibility of the same thing's having

been subtracted from and added to the same thing at the same time;

but this is impossible-the just and the unjust always involve more

than one person. Further, (ii) unjust action is voluntary and done

by choice, and takes the initiative (for the man who because he has

suffered does the same in return is not thought to act unjustly);

but if a man harms himself he suffers and does the same things at

the same time. Further, (iii) if a man could treat himself unjustly,

he could be voluntarily treated unjustly. Besides, (iv) no one acts

unjustly without committing particular acts of injustice; but no one

can commit adultery with his own wife or housebreaking on his own

house or theft on his own property,

In general, the question 'can a man treat himself unjustly?' is solved

also by the distinction we applied to the question 'can a man be voluntarily

treated unjustly?'

(It is evident too that both are bad, being unjustly treated and acting

unjustly; for the one means having less and the other having more

than the intermediate amount, which plays the part here that the healthy

does in the medical art, and that good condition does in the art of

bodily training. But still acting unjustly is the worse, for it involves

vice and is blameworthy-involves vice which is either of the complete

and unqualified kind or almost so (we must admit the latter alternative,

because not all voluntary unjust action implies injustice as a state

of character), while being unjustly treated does not involve vice

and injustice in oneself. In itself, then, being unjustly treated

is less bad, but there is nothing to prevent its being incidentally

a greater evil. But theory cares nothing for this; it calls pleurisy

a more serious mischief than a stumble; yet the latter may become

incidentally the more serious, if the fall due to it leads to your

being taken prisoner or put to death the enemy.)

Metaphorically and in virtue of a certain resemblance there is a justice,

not indeed between a man and himself, but between certain parts of

him; yet not every kind of justice but that of master and servant

or that of husband and wife. For these are the ratios in which the

part of the soul that has a rational principle stands to the irrational

part; and it is with a view to these parts that people also think

a man can be unjust to himself, viz. because these parts are liable

to suffer something contrary to their respective desires; there is

therefore thought to be a mutual justice between them as between ruler

and ruled.

Let this be taken as our account of justice and the other, i.e. the

other moral, virtues.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK VI

1

Since we have previously said that one ought to choose that which

is intermediate, not the excess nor the defect, and that the intermediate

is determined by the dictates of the right rule, let us discuss the

nature of these dictates. In all the states of character we have mentioned,

as in all other matters, there is a mark to which the man who has

the rule looks, and heightens or relaxes his activity accordingly,

and there is a standard which determines the mean states which we

say are intermediate between excess and defect, being in accordance

with the right rule. But such a statement, though true, is by no means

clear; for not only here but in all other pursuits which are objects

of knowledge it is indeed true to say that we must not exert ourselves

nor relax our efforts too much nor too little, but to an intermediate

extent and as the right rule dictates; but if a man had only this

knowledge he would be none the wiser e.g. we should not know what

sort of medicines to apply to our body if some one were to say 'all

those which the medical art prescribes, and which agree with the practice

of one who possesses the art'. Hence it is necessary with regard to

the states of the soul also not only that this true statement should

be made, but also that it should be determined what is the right rule

and what is the standard that fixes it.

We divided the virtues of the soul and a said that some are virtues

of character and others of intellect. Now we have discussed in detail

the moral virtues; with regard to the others let us express our view

as follows, beginning with some remarks about the soul. We said before

that there are two parts of the soul-that which grasps a rule or rational

principle, and the irrational; let us now draw a similar distinction

within the part which grasps a rational principle. And let it be assumed

that there are two parts which grasp a rational principle-one by which

we contemplate the kind of things whose originative causes are invariable,

and one by which we contemplate variable things; for where objects

differ in kind the part of the soul answering to each of the two is

different in kind, since it is in virtue of a certain likeness and

kinship with their objects that they have the knowledge they have.

Let one of these parts be called the scientific and the other the

calculative; for to deliberate and to calculate are the same thing,

but no one deliberates about the invariable. Therefore the calculative

is one part of the faculty which grasps a rational principle. We must,

then, learn what is the best state of each of these two parts; for

this is the virtue of each.

2

The virtue of a thing is relative to its proper work. Now there are

three things in the soul which control action and truth-sensation,

reason, desire.

Of these sensation originates no action; this is plain from the fact

that the lower animals have sensation but no share in action.

What affirmation and negation are in thinking, pursuit and avoidance

are in desire; so that since moral virtue is a state of character

concerned with choice, and choice is deliberate desire, therefore

both the reasoning must be true and the desire right, if the choice

is to be good, and the latter must pursue just what the former asserts.

Now this kind of intellect and of truth is practical; of the intellect

which is contemplative, not practical nor productive, the good and

the bad state are truth and falsity respectively (for this is the

work of everything intellectual); while of the part which is practical

and intellectual the good state is truth in agreement with right desire.

The origin of action-its efficient, not its final cause-is choice,

and that of choice is desire and reasoning with a view to an end.

This is why choice cannot exist either without reason and intellect

or without a moral state; for good action and its opposite cannot

exist without a combination of intellect and character. Intellect

itself, however, moves nothing, but only the intellect which aims

at an end and is practical; for this rules the productive intellect,

as well, since every one who makes makes for an end, and that which

is made is not an end in the unqualified sense (but only an end in

a particular relation, and the end of a particular operation)-only

that which is done is that; for good action is an end, and desire

aims at this. Hence choice is either desiderative reason or ratiocinative

desire, and such an origin of action is a man. (It is to be noted

that nothing that is past is an object of choice, e.g. no one chooses

to have sacked Troy; for no one deliberates about the past, but about

what is future and capable of being otherwise, while what is past

is not capable of not having taken place; hence Agathon is right in

saying

For this alone is lacking even to God,

To make undone things thathave once been done.)

The work of both the intellectual parts, then, is truth. Therefore

the states that are most strictly those in respect of which each of

these parts will reach truth are the virtues of the two parts.
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Let us begin, then, from the beginning, and discuss these states once

more. Let it be assumed that the states by virtue of which the soul

possesses truth by way of affirmation or denial are five in number,

i.e. art, scientific knowledge, practical wisdom, philosophic wisdom,

intuitive reason; we do not include judgement and opinion because

in these we may be mistaken.

Now what scientific knowledge is, if we are to speak exactly and not

follow mere similarities, is plain from what follows. We all suppose

that what we know is not even capable of being otherwise; of things

capable of being otherwise we do not know, when they have passed outside

our observation, whether they exist or not. Therefore the object of

scientific knowledge is of necessity. Therefore it is eternal; for

things that are of necessity in the unqualified sense are all eternal;

and things that are eternal are ungenerated and imperishable. Again,

every science is thought to be capable of being taught, and its object

of being learned. And all teaching starts from what is already known,

as we maintain in the Analytics also; for it proceeds sometimes through

induction and sometimes by syllogism. Now induction is the starting-point

which knowledge even of the universal presupposes, while syllogism

proceeds from universals. There are therefore starting-points from

which syllogism proceeds, which are not reached by syllogism; it is

therefore by induction that they are acquired. Scientific knowledge

is, then, a state of capacity to demonstrate, and has the other limiting

characteristics which we specify in the Analytics, for it is when

a man believes in a certain way and the starting-points are known

to him that he has scientific knowledge, since if they are not better

known to him than the conclusion, he will have his knowledge only

incidentally.

Let this, then, be taken as our account of scientific knowledge.

4

In the variable are included both things made and things done; making

and acting are different (for their nature we treat even the discussions

outside our school as reliable); so that the reasoned state of capacity

to act is different from the reasoned state of capacity to make. Hence

too they are not included one in the other; for neither is acting

making nor is making acting. Now since architecture is an art and

is essentially a reasoned state of capacity to make, and there is

neither any art that is not such a state nor any such state that is

not an art, art is identical with a state of capacity to make, involving

a true course of reasoning. All art is concerned with coming into

being, i.e. with contriving and considering how something may come

into being which is capable of either being or not being, and whose

origin is in the maker and not in the thing made; for art is concerned

neither with things that are, or come into being, by necessity, nor

with things that do so in accordance with nature (since these have

their origin in themselves). Making and acting being different, art

must be a matter of making, not of acting. And in a sense chance and

art are concerned with the same objects; as Agathon says, 'art loves

chance and chance loves art'. Art, then, as has been is a state concerned

with making, involving a true course of reasoning, and lack of art

on the contrary is a state concerned with making, involving a false

course of reasoning; both are concerned with the variable.
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Regarding practical wisdom we shall get at the truth by considering

who are the persons we credit with it. Now it is thought to be the

mark of a man of practical wisdom to be able to deliberate well about

what is good and expedient for himself, not in some particular respect,

e.g. about what sorts of thing conduce to health or to strength, but

about what sorts of thing conduce to the good life in general. This

is shown by the fact that we credit men with practical wisdom in some

particular respect when they have calculated well with a view to some

good end which is one of those that are not the object of any art.

It follows that in the general sense also the man who is capable of

deliberating has practical wisdom. Now no one deliberates about things

that are invariable, nor about things that it is impossible for him

to do. Therefore, since scientific knowledge involves demonstration,

but there is no demonstration of things whose first principles are

variable (for all such things might actually be otherwise), and since

it is impossible to deliberate about things that are of necessity,

practical wisdom cannot be scientific knowledge nor art; not science

because that which can be done is capable of being otherwise, not

art because action and making are different kinds of thing. The remaining

alternative, then, is that it is a true and reasoned state of capacity

to act with regard to the things that are good or bad for man. For

while making has an end other than itself, action cannot; for good

action itself is its end. It is for this reason that we think Pericles

and men like him have practical wisdom, viz. because they can see

what is good for themselves and what is good for men in general; we

consider that those can do this who are good at managing households

or states. (This is why we call temperance (sophrosune) by this name;

we imply that it preserves one's practical wisdom (sozousa tan phronsin).

Now what it preserves is a judgement of the kind we have described.

For it is not any and every judgement that pleasant and painful objects

destroy and pervert, e.g. the judgement that the triangle has or has

not its angles equal to two right angles, but only judgements about

what is to be done. For the originating causes of the things that

are done consist in the end at which they are aimed; but the man who

has been ruined by pleasure or pain forthwith fails to see any such

originating cause-to see that for the sake of this or because of this

he ought to choose and do whatever he chooses and does; for vice is

destructive of the originating cause of action.) Practical wisdom,

then, must be a reasoned and true state of capacity to act with regard

to human goods. But further, while there is such a thing as excellence

in art, there is no such thing as excellence in practical wisdom;

and in art he who errs willingly is preferable, but in practical wisdom,

as in the virtues, he is the reverse. Plainly, then, practical wisdom

is a virtue and not an art. There being two parts of the soul that

can follow a course of reasoning, it must be the virtue of one of

the two, i.e. of that part which forms opinions; for opinion is about

the variable and so is practical wisdom. But yet it is not only a

reasoned state; this is shown by the fact that a state of that sort

may forgotten but practical wisdom cannot.
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Scientific knowledge is judgement about things that are universal

and necessary, and the conclusions of demonstration, and all scientific

knowledge, follow from first principles (for scientific knowledge

involves apprehension of a rational ground). This being so, the first

principle from which what is scientifically known follows cannot be

an object of scientific knowledge, of art, or of practical wisdom;

for that which can be scientifically known can be demonstrated, and

art and practical wisdom deal with things that are variable. Nor are

these first principles the objects of philosophic wisdom, for it is

a mark of the philosopher to have demonstration about some things.

If, then, the states of mind by which we have truth and are never

deceived about things invariable or even variable are scientific knowlededge,

practical wisdom, philosophic wisdom, and intuitive reason, and it

cannot be any of the three (i.e. practical wisdom, scientific knowledge,

or philosophic wisdom), the remaining alternative is that it is intuitive

reason that grasps the first principles.
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Wisdom (1) in the arts we ascribe to their most finished exponents,

e.g. to Phidias as a sculptor and to Polyclitus as a maker of portrait-statues,

and here we mean nothing by wisdom except excellence in art; but (2)

we think that some people are wise in general, not in some particular

field or in any other limited respect, as Homer says in the Margites,

Him did the gods make neither a digger nor yet a ploughman

Nor wise in anything else. Therefore wisdom must plainly be the most

finished of the forms of knowledge. It follows that the wise man must

not only know what follows from the first principles, but must also

possess truth about the first principles. Therefore wisdom must be

intuitive reason combined with scientific knowledge-scientific knowledge

of the highest objects which has received as it were its proper completion.

Of the highest objects, we say; for it would be strange to think that

the art of politics, or practical wisdom, is the best knowledge, since

man is not the best thing in the world. Now if what is healthy or

good is different for men and for fishes, but what is white or straight

is always the same, any one would say that what is wise is the same

but what is practically wise is different; for it is to that which

observes well the various matters concerning itself that one ascribes

practical wisdom, and it is to this that one will entrust such matters.

This is why we say that some even of the lower animals have practical

wisdom, viz. those which are found to have a power of foresight with

regard to their own life. It is evident also that philosophic wisdom

and the art of politics cannot be the same; for if the state of mind

concerned with a man's own interests is to be called philosophic wisdom,

there will be many philosophic wisdoms; there will not be one concerned

with the good of all animals (any more than there is one art of medicine

for all existing things), but a different philosophic wisdom about

the good of each species.

But if the argument be that man is the best of the animals, this makes

no difference; for there are other things much more divine in their

nature even than man, e.g., most conspicuously, the bodies of which

the heavens are framed. From what has been said it is plain, then,

that philosophic wisdom is scientific knowledge, combined with intuitive

reason, of the things that are highest by nature. This is why we say

Anaxagoras, Thales, and men like them have philosophic but not practical

wisdom, when we see them ignorant of what is to their own advantage,

and why we say that they know things that are remarkable, admirable,

difficult, and divine, but useless; viz. because it is not human goods

that they seek.

Practical wisdom on the other hand is concerned with things human

and things about which it is possible to deliberate; for we say this

is above all the work of the man of practical wisdom, to deliberate

well, but no one deliberates about things invariable, nor about things

which have not an end, and that a good that can be brought about by

action. The man who is without qualification good at deliberating

is the man who is capable of aiming in accordance with calculation

at the best for man of things attainable by action. Nor is practical

wisdom concerned with universals only-it must also recognize the particulars;

for it is practical, and practice is concerned with particulars. This

is why some who do not know, and especially those who have experience,

are more practical than others who know; for if a man knew that light

meats are digestible and wholesome, but did not know which sorts of

meat are light, he would not produce health, but the man who knows

that chicken is wholesome is more likely to produce health.

Now practical wisdom is concerned with action; therefore one should

have both forms of it, or the latter in preference to the former.

But of practical as of philosophic wisdom there must be a controlling

kind.
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Political wisdom and practical wisdom are the same state of mind,

but their essence is not the same. Of the wisdom concerned with the

city, the practical wisdom which plays a controlling part is legislative

wisdom, while that which is related to this as particulars to their

universal is known by the general name 'political wisdom'; this has

to do with action and deliberation, for a decree is a thing to be

carried out in the form of an individual act. This is why the exponents

of this art are alone said to 'take part in politics'; for these alone

'do things' as manual labourers 'do things'.

Practical wisdom also is identified especially with that form of it

which is concerned with a man himself-with the individual; and this

is known by the general name 'practical wisdom'; of the other kinds

one is called household management, another legislation, the third

politics, and of the latter one part is called deliberative and the

other judicial. Now knowing what is good for oneself will be one kind

of knowledge, but it is very different from the other kinds; and the

man who knows and concerns himself with his own interests is thought

to have practical wisdom, while politicians are thought to be busybodies;

hence the word of Euripides,

But how could I be wise, who might at ease,

Numbered among the army's multitude,

Have had an equal share?

For those who aim too high and do too much. Those who think thus seek

their own good, and consider that one ought to do so. From this opinion,

then, has come the view that such men have practical wisdom; yet perhaps

one's own good cannot exist without household management, nor without

a form of government. Further, how one should order one's own affairs

is not clear and needs inquiry.

What has been said is confirmed by the fact that while young men become

geometricians and mathematicians and wise in matters like these, it

is thought that a young man of practical wisdom cannot be found. The

cause is that such wisdom is concerned not only with universals but

with particulars, which become familiar from experience, but a young

man has no experience, for it is length of time that gives experience;

indeed one might ask this question too, why a boy may become a mathematician,

but not a philosopher or a physicist. It is because the objects of

mathematics exist by abstraction, while the first principles of these

other subjects come from experience, and because young men have no

conviction about the latter but merely use the proper language, while

the essence of mathematical objects is plain enough to them?

Further, error in deliberation may be either about the universal or

about the particular; we may fall to know either that all water that

weighs heavy is bad, or that this particular water weighs heavy.

That practical wisdom is not scientific knowledge is evident; for

it is, as has been said, concerned with the ultimate particular fact,

since the thing to be done is of this nature. It is opposed, then,

to intuitive reason; for intuitive reason is of the limiting premisses,

for which no reason can be given, while practical wisdom is concerned

with the ultimate particular, which is the object not of scientific

knowledge but of perception-not the perception of qualities peculiar

to one sense but a perception akin to that by which we perceive that

the particular figure before us is a triangle; for in that direction

as well as in that of the major premiss there will be a limit. But

this is rather perception than practical wisdom, though it is another

kind of perception than that of the qualities peculiar to each sense.
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There is a difference between inquiry and deliberation; for deliberation

is inquiry into a particular kind of thing. We must grasp the nature

of excellence in deliberation as well whether it is a form of scientific

knowledge, or opinion, or skill in conjecture, or some other kind

of thing. Scientific knowledge it is not; for men do not inquire about

the things they know about, but good deliberation is a kind of deliberation,

and he who deliberates inquires and calculates. Nor is it skill in

conjecture; for this both involves no reasoning and is something that

is quick in its operation, while men deliberate a long time, and they

say that one should carry out quickly the conclusions of one's deliberation,

but should deliberate slowly. Again, readiness of mind is different

from excellence in deliberation; it is a sort of skill in conjecture.

Nor again is excellence in deliberation opinion of any sort. But since

the man who deliberates badly makes a mistake, while he who deliberates

well does so correctly, excellence in deliberation is clearly a kind

of correctness, but neither of knowledge nor of opinion; for there

is no such thing as correctness of knowledge (since there is no such

thing as error of knowledge), and correctness of opinion is truth;

and at the same time everything that is an object of opinion is already

determined. But again excellence in deliberation involves reasoning.

The remaining alternative, then, is that it is correctness of thinking;

for this is not yet assertion, since, while even opinion is not inquiry

but has reached the stage of assertion, the man who is deliberating,

whether he does so well or ill, is searching for something and calculating.

But excellence in deliberation is a certain correctness of deliberation;

hence we must first inquire what deliberation is and what it is about.

And, there being more than one kind of correctness, plainly excellence

in deliberation is not any and every kind; for (1) the incontinent

man and the bad man, if he is clever, will reach as a result of his

calculation what he sets before himself, so that he will have deliberated

correctly, but he will have got for himself a great evil. Now to have

deliberated well is thought to be a good thing; for it is this kind

of correctness of deliberation that is excellence in deliberation,

viz. that which tends to attain what is good. But (2) it is possible

to attain even good by a false syllogism, and to attain what one ought

to do but not by the right means, the middle term being false; so

that this too is not yet excellence in deliberation this state in

virtue of which one attains what one ought but not by the right means.

Again (3) it is possible to attain it by long deliberation while another

man attains it quickly. Therefore in the former case we have not yet

got excellence in deliberation, which is rightness with regard to

the expedient-rightness in respect both of the end, the manner, and

the time. (4) Further it is possible to have deliberated well either

in the unqualified sense or with reference to a particular end. Excellence

in deliberation in the unqualified sense, then, is that which succeeds

with reference to what is the end in the unqualified sense, and excellence

in deliberation in a particular sense is that which succeeds relatively

to a particular end. If, then, it is characteristic of men of practical

wisdom to have deliberated well, excellence in deliberation will be

correctness with regard to what conduces to the end of which practical

wisdom is the true apprehension.
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Understanding, also, and goodness of understanding, in virtue of which

men are said to be men of understanding or of good understanding,

are neither entirely the same as opinion or scientific knowledge (for

at that rate all men would have been men of understanding), nor are

they one of the particular sciences, such as medicine, the science

of things connected with health, or geometry, the science of spatial

magnitudes. For understanding is neither about things that are always

and are unchangeable, nor about any and every one of the things that

come into being, but about things which may become subjects of questioning

and deliberation. Hence it is about the same objects as practical

wisdom; but understanding and practical wisdom are not the same. For

practical wisdom issues commands, since its end is what ought to be

done or not to be done; but understanding only judges. (Understanding

is identical with goodness of understanding, men of understanding

with men of good understanding.) Now understanding is neither the

having nor the acquiring of practical wisdom; but as learning is called

understanding when it means the exercise of the faculty of knowledge,

so 'understanding' is applicable to the exercise of the faculty of

opinion for the purpose of judging of what some one else says about

matters with which practical wisdom is concerned-and of judging soundly;

for 'well' and 'soundly' are the same thing. And from this has come

the use of the name 'understanding' in virtue of which men are said

to be 'of good understanding', viz. from the application of the word

to the grasping of scientific truth; for we often call such grasping

understanding.

11

What is called judgement, in virtue of which men are said to 'be sympathetic

judges' and to 'have judgement', is the right discrimination of the

equitable. This is shown by the fact that we say the equitable man

is above all others a man of sympathetic judgement, and identify equity

with sympathetic judgement about certain facts. And sympathetic judgement

is judgement which discriminates what is equitable and does so correctly;

and correct judgement is that which judges what is true.

Now all the states we have considered converge, as might be expected,

to the same point; for when we speak of judgement and understanding

and practical wisdom and intuitive reason we credit the same people

with possessing judgement and having reached years of reason and with

having practical wisdom and understanding. For all these faculties

deal with ultimates, i.e. with particulars; and being a man of understanding

and of good or sympathetic judgement consists in being able judge

about the things with which practical wisdom is concerned; for the

equities are common to all good men in relation to other men. Now

all things which have to be done are included among particulars or

ultimates; for not only must the man of practical wisdom know particular

facts, but understanding and judgement are also concerned with things

to be done, and these are ultimates. And intuitive reason is concerned

with the ultimates in both directions; for both the first terms and

the last are objects of intuitive reason and not of argument, and

the intuitive reason which is presupposed by demonstrations grasps

the unchangeable and first terms, while the intuitive reason involved

in practical reasonings grasps the last and variable fact, i.e. the

minor premiss. For these variable facts are the starting-points for

the apprehension of the end, since the universals are reached from

the particulars; of these therefore we must have perception, and this

perception is intuitive reason.

This is why these states are thought to be natural endowments-why,

while no one is thought to be a philosopher by nature, people are

thought to have by nature judgement, understanding, and intuitive

reason. This is shown by the fact that we think our powers correspond

to our time of life, and that a particular age brings with it intuitive

reason and judgement; this implies that nature is the cause. (Hence

intuitive reason is both beginning and end; for demonstrations are

from these and about these.) Therefore we ought to attend to the undemonstrated

sayings and opinions of experienced and older people or of people

of practical wisdom not less than to demonstrations; for because experience

has given them an eye they see aright.

We have stated, then, what practical and philosophic wisdom are, and

with what each of them is concerned, and we have said that each is

the virtue of a different part of the soul.
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Difficulties might be raised as to the utility of these qualities

of mind. For (1) philosophic wisdom will contemplate none of the things

that will make a man happy (for it is not concerned with any coming

into being), and though practical wisdom has this merit, for what

purpose do we need it? Practical wisdom is the quality of mind concerned

with things just and noble and good for man, but these are the things

which it is the mark of a good man to do, and we are none the more

able to act for knowing them if the virtues are states of character,

just as we are none the better able to act for knowing the things

that are healthy and sound, in the sense not of producing but of issuing

from the state of health; for we are none the more able to act for

having the art of medicine or of gymnastics. But (2) if we are to

say that a man should have practical wisdom not for the sake of knowing

moral truths but for the sake of becoming good, practical wisdom will

be of no use to those who are good; again it is of no use to those

who have not virtue; for it will make no difference whether they have

practical wisdom themselves or obey others who have it, and it would

be enough for us to do what we do in the case of health; though we

wish to become healthy, yet we do not learn the art of medicine. (3)

Besides this, it would be thought strange if practical wisdom, being

inferior to philosophic wisdom, is to be put in authority over it,

as seems to be implied by the fact that the art which produces anything

rules and issues commands about that thing.

These, then, are the questions we must discuss; so far we have only

stated the difficulties.

(1) Now first let us say that in themselves these states must be worthy

of choice because they are the virtues of the two parts of the soul

respectively, even if neither of them produce anything.

(2) Secondly, they do produce something, not as the art of medicine

produces health, however, but as health produces health; so does philosophic

wisdom produce happiness; for, being a part of virtue entire, by being

possessed and by actualizing itself it makes a man happy.

(3) Again, the work of man is achieved only in accordance with practical

wisdom as well as with moral virtue; for virtue makes us aim at the

right mark, and practical wisdom makes us take the right means. (Of

the fourth part of the soul-the nutritive-there is no such virtue;

for there is nothing which it is in its power to do or not to do., 4) With regard to our being none the more able to do because of our

practical wisdom what is noble and just, let us begin a little further

back, starting with the following principle. As we say that some people

who do just acts are not necessarily just, i.e. those who do the acts

ordained by the laws either unwillingly or owing to ignorance or for

some other reason and not for the sake of the acts themselves (though,

to be sure, they do what they should and all the things that the good

man ought), so is it, it seems, that in order to be good one must

be in a certain state when one does the several acts, i.e. one must

do them as a result of choice and for the sake of the acts themselves.

Now virtue makes the choice right, but the question of the things

which should naturally be done to carry out our choice belongs not

to virtue but to another faculty. We must devote our attention to

these matters and give a clearer statement about them. There is a

faculty which is called cleverness; and this is such as to be able

to do the things that tend towards the mark we have set before ourselves,

and to hit it. Now if the mark be noble, the cleverness is laudable,

but if the mark be bad, the cleverness is mere smartness; hence we

call even men of practical wisdom clever or smart. Practical wisdom

is not the faculty, but it does not exist without this faculty. And

this eye of the soul acquires its formed state not without the aid

of virtue, as has been said and is plain; for the syllogisms which

deal with acts to be done are things which involve a starting-point,

viz. 'since the end, i.e. what is best, is of such and such a nature',

whatever it may be (let it for the sake of argument be what we please);

and this is not evident except to the good man; for wickedness perverts

us and causes us to be deceived about the starting-points of action.

Therefore it is evident that it is impossible to be practically wise

without being good.
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We must therefore consider virtue also once more; for virtue too is

similarly related; as practical wisdom is to cleverness-not the same,

but like it-so is natural virtue to virtue in the strict sense. For

all men think that each type of character belongs to its possessors

in some sense by nature; for from the very moment of birth we are

just or fitted for selfcontrol or brave or have the other moral qualities;

but yet we seek something else as that which is good in the strict

sense-we seek for the presence of such qualities in another way. For

both children and brutes have the natural dispositions to these qualities,

but without reason these are evidently hurtful. Only we seem to see

this much, that, while one may be led astray by them, as a strong

body which moves without sight may stumble badly because of its lack

of sight, still, if a man once acquires reason, that makes a difference

in action; and his state, while still like what it was, will then

be virtue in the strict sense. Therefore, as in the part of us which

forms opinions there are two types, cleverness and practical wisdom,

so too in the moral part there are two types, natural virtue and virtue

in the strict sense, and of these the latter involves practical wisdom.

This is why some say that all the virtues are forms of practical wisdom,

and why Socrates in one respect was on the right track while in another

he went astray; in thinking that all the virtues were forms of practical

wisdom he was wrong, but in saying they implied practical wisdom he

was right. This is confirmed by the fact that even now all men, when

they define virtue, after naming the state of character and its objects

add 'that (state) which is in accordance with the right rule'; now

the right rule is that which is in accordance with practical wisdom.

All men, then, seem somehow to divine that this kind of state is virtue,

viz. that which is in accordance with practical wisdom. But we must

go a little further. For it is not merely the state in accordance

with the right rule, but the state that implies the presence of the

right rule, that is virtue; and practical wisdom is a right rule about

such matters. Socrates, then, thought the virtues were rules or rational

principles (for he thought they were, all of them, forms of scientific

knowledge), while we think they involve a rational principle.

It is clear, then, from what has been said, that it is not possible

to be good in the strict sense without practical wisdom, nor practically

wise without moral virtue. But in this way we may also refute the

dialectical argument whereby it might be contended that the virtues

exist in separation from each other; the same man, it might be said,

is not best equipped by nature for all the virtues, so that he will

have already acquired one when he has not yet acquired another. This

is possible in respect of the natural virtues, but not in respect

of those in respect of which a man is called without qualification

good; for with the presence of the one quality, practical wisdom,

will be given all the virtues. And it is plain that, even if it were

of no practical value, we should have needed it because it is the

virtue of the part of us in question; plain too that the choice will

not be right without practical wisdom any more than without virtue;

for the one deter, mines the end and the other makes us do the things

that lead to the end.

But again it is not supreme over philosophic wisdom, i.e. over the

superior part of us, any more than the art of medicine is over health;

for it does not use it but provides for its coming into being; it

issues orders, then, for its sake, but not to it. Further, to maintain

its supremacy would be like saying that the art of politics rules

the gods because it issues orders about all the affairs of the state.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK VII

1

Let us now make a fresh beginning and point out that of moral states

to be avoided there are three kinds-vice, incontinence, brutishness.

The contraries of two of these are evident,-one we call virtue, the

other continence; to brutishness it would be most fitting to oppose

superhuman virtue, a heroic and divine kind of virtue, as Homer has

represented Priam saying of Hector that he was very good,

For he seemed not, he,

The child of a mortal man, but as one that of God's seed came.

Therefore if, as they say, men become gods by excess of virtue, of

this kind must evidently be the state opposed to the brutish state;

for as a brute has no vice or virtue, so neither has a god; his state

is higher than virtue, and that of a brute is a different kind of

state from vice.

Now, since it is rarely that a godlike man is found-to use the epithet

of the Spartans, who when they admire any one highly call him a 'godlike

man'-so too the brutish type is rarely found among men; it is found

chiefly among barbarians, but some brutish qualities are also produced

by disease or deformity; and we also call by this evil name those

men who go beyond all ordinary standards by reason of vice. Of this

kind of disposition, however, we must later make some mention, while

we have discussed vice before we must now discuss incontinence and

softness (or effeminacy), and continence and endurance; for we must

treat each of the two neither as identical with virtue or wickedness,

nor as a different genus. We must, as in all other cases, set the

observed facts before us and, after first discussing the difficulties,

go on to prove, if possible, the truth of all the common opinions

about these affections of the mind, or, failing this, of the greater

number and the most authoritative; for if we both refute the objections

and leave the common opinions undisturbed, we shall have proved the

case sufficiently.

Now (1) both continence and endurance are thought to be included among

things good and praiseworthy, and both incontinence and soft, ness

among things bad and blameworthy; and the same man is thought to be

continent and ready to abide by the result of his calculations, or

incontinent and ready to abandon them. And (2) the incontinent man,

knowing that what he does is bad, does it as a result of passion,

while the continent man, knowing that his appetites are bad, refuses

on account of his rational principle to follow them (3) The temperate

man all men call continent and disposed to endurance, while the continent

man some maintain to be always temperate but others do not; and some

call the self-indulgent man incontinent and the incontinent man selfindulgent

indiscriminately, while others distinguish them. (4) The man of practical

wisdom, they sometimes say, cannot be incontinent, while sometimes

they say that some who are practically wise and clever are incontinent.

Again (5) men are said to be incontinent even with respect to anger,

honour, and gain.-These, then, are the things that are said.
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Now we may ask (1) how a man who judges rightly can behave incontinently.

That he should behave so when he has knowledge, some say is impossible;

for it would be strange-so Socrates thought-if when knowledge was

in a man something else could master it and drag it about like a slave.

For Socrates was entirely opposed to the view in question, holding

that there is no such thing as incontinence; no one, he said, when

he judges acts against what he judges best-people act so only by reason

of ignorance. Now this view plainly contradicts the observed facts,

and we must inquire about what happens to such a man; if he acts by

reason of ignorance, what is the manner of his ignorance? For that

the man who behaves incontinently does not, before he gets into this

state, think he ought to act so, is evident. But there are some who

concede certain of Socrates' contentions but not others; that nothing

is stronger than knowledge they admit, but not that on one acts contrary

to what has seemed to him the better course, and therefore they say

that the incontinent man has not knowledge when he is mastered by

his pleasures, but opinion. But if it is opinion and not knowledge,

if it is not a strong conviction that resists but a weak one, as in

men who hesitate, we sympathize with their failure to stand by such

convictions against strong appetites; but we do not sympathize with

wickedness, nor with any of the other blameworthy states. Is it then

practical wisdom whose resistance is mastered? That is the strongest

of all states. But this is absurd; the same man will be at once practically

wise and incontinent, but no one would say that it is the part of

a practically wise man to do willingly the basest acts. Besides, it

has been shown before that the man of practical wisdom is one who

will act (for he is a man concerned with the individual facts) and

who has the other virtues.

(2) Further, if continence involves having strong and bad appetites,

the temperate man will not be continent nor the continent man temperate;

for a temperate man will have neither excessive nor bad appetites.

But the continent man must; for if the appetites are good, the state

of character that restrains us from following them is bad, so that

not all continence will be good; while if they are weak and not bad,

there is nothing admirable in resisting them, and if they are weak

and bad, there is nothing great in resisting these either.

(3) Further, if continence makes a man ready to stand by any and every

opinion, it is bad, i.e. if it makes him stand even by a false opinion;

and if incontinence makes a man apt to abandon any and every opinion,

there will be a good incontinence, of which Sophocles' Neoptolemus

in the Philoctetes will be an instance; for he is to be praised for

not standing by what Odysseus persuaded him to do, because he is pained

at telling a lie.

(4) Further, the sophistic argument presents a difficulty; the syllogism

arising from men's wish to expose paradoxical results arising from

an opponent's view, in order that they may be admired when they succeed,

is one that puts us in a difficulty (for thought is bound fast when

it will not rest because the conclusion does not satisfy it, and cannot

advance because it cannot refute the argument). There is an argument

from which it follows that folly coupled with incontinence is virtue;

for a man does the opposite of what he judges, owing to incontinence,

but judges what is good to be evil and something that he should not

do, and consequence he will do what is good and not what is evil.

(5) Further, he who on conviction does and pursues and chooses what

is pleasant would be thought to be better than one who does so as

a result not of calculation but of incontinence; for he is easier

to cure since he may be persuaded to change his mind. But to the incontinent

man may be applied the proverb 'when water chokes, what is one to

wash it down with?' If he had been persuaded of the rightness of what

he does, he would have desisted when he was persuaded to change his

mind; but now he acts in spite of his being persuaded of something

quite different.

(6) Further, if incontinence and continence are concerned with any

and every kind of object, who is it that is incontinent in the unqualified

sense? No one has all the forms of incontinence, but we say some people

are incontinent without qualification.
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Of some such kind are the difficulties that arise; some of these points

must be refuted and the others left in possession of the field; for

the solution of the difficulty is the discovery of the truth. (1)

We must consider first, then, whether incontinent people act knowingly

or not, and in what sense knowingly; then (2) with what sorts of object

the incontinent and the continent man may be said to be concerned

(i.e. whether with any and every pleasure and pain or with certain

determinate kinds), and whether the continent man and the man of endurance

are the same or different; and similarly with regard to the other

matters germane to this inquiry. The starting-point of our investigation

is (a) the question whether the continent man and the incontinent

are differentiated by their objects or by their attitude, i.e. whether

the incontinent man is incontinent simply by being concerned with

such and such objects, or, instead, by his attitude, or, instead of

that, by both these things; (b) the second question is whether incontinence

and continence are concerned with any and every object or not. The

man who is incontinent in the unqualified sense is neither concerned

with any and every object, but with precisely those with which the

self-indulgent man is concerned, nor is he characterized by being

simply related to these (for then his state would be the same as self-indulgence),

but by being related to them in a certain way. For the one is led

on in accordance with his own choice, thinking that he ought always

to pursue the present pleasure; while the other does not think so,

but yet pursues it.

(1) As for the suggestion that it is true opinion and not knowledge

against which we act incontinently, that makes no difference to the

argument; for some people when in a state of opinion do not hesitate,

but think they know exactly. If, then, the notion is that owing to

their weak conviction those who have opinion are more likely to act

against their judgement than those who know, we answer that there

need be no difference between knowledge and opinion in this respect;

for some men are no less convinced of what they think than others

of what they know; as is shown by the of Heraclitus. But (a), since

we use the word 'know' in two senses (for both the man who has knowledge

but is not using it and he who is using it are said to know), it will

make a difference whether, when a man does what he should not, he

has the knowledge but is not exercising it, or is exercising it; for

the latter seems strange, but not the former.

(b) Further, since there are two kinds of premisses, there is nothing

to prevent a man's having both premisses and acting against his knowledge,

provided that he is using only the universal premiss and not the particular;

for it is particular acts that have to be done. And there are also

two kinds of universal term; one is predicable of the agent, the other

of the object; e.g. 'dry food is good for every man', and 'I am a

man', or 'such and such food is dry'; but whether 'this food is such

and such', of this the incontinent man either has not or is not exercising

the knowledge. There will, then, be, firstly, an enormous difference

between these manners of knowing, so that to know in one way when

we act incontinently would not seem anything strange, while to know

in the other way would be extraordinary.

And further (c) the possession of knowledge in another sense than

those just named is something that happens to men; for within the

case of having knowledge but not using it we see a difference of state,

admitting of the possibility of having knowledge in a sense and yet

not having it, as in the instance of a man asleep, mad, or drunk.

But now this is just the condition of men under the influence of passions;

for outbursts of anger and sexual appetites and some other such passions,

it is evident, actually alter our bodily condition, and in some men

even produce fits of madness. It is plain, then, that incontinent

people must be said to be in a similar condition to men asleep, mad,

or drunk. The fact that men use the language that flows from knowledge

proves nothing; for even men under the influence of these passions

utter scientific proofs and verses of Empedocles, and those who have

just begun to learn a science can string together its phrases, but

do not yet know it; for it has to become part of themselves, and that

takes time; so that we must suppose that the use of language by men

in an incontinent state means no more than its utterance by actors

on the stage. (d) Again, we may also view the cause as follows with

reference to the facts of human nature. The one opinion is universal,

the other is concerned with the particular facts, and here we come

to something within the sphere of perception; when a single opinion

results from the two, the soul must in one type of case affirm the

conclusion, while in the case of opinions concerned with production

it must immediately act (e.g. if 'everything sweet ought to be tasted',

and 'this is sweet', in the sense of being one of the particular sweet

things, the man who can act and is not prevented must at the same

time actually act accordingly). When, then, the universal opinion

is present in us forbidding us to taste, and there is also the opinion

that 'everything sweet is pleasant', and that 'this is sweet' (now

this is the opinion that is active), and when appetite happens to

be present in us, the one opinion bids us avoid the object, but appetite

leads us towards it (for it can move each of our bodily parts); so

that it turns out that a man behaves incontinently under the influence

(in a sense) of a rule and an opinion, and of one not contrary in

itself, but only incidentally-for the appetite is contrary, not the

opinion-to the right rule. It also follows that this is the reason

why the lower animals are not incontinent, viz. because they have

no universal judgement but only imagination and memory of particulars.

The explanation of how the ignorance is dissolved and the incontinent

man regains his knowledge, is the same as in the case of the man drunk

or asleep and is not peculiar to this condition; we must go to the

students of natural science for it. Now, the last premiss both being

an opinion about a perceptible object, and being what determines our

actions this a man either has not when he is in the state of passion,

or has it in the sense in which having knowledge did not mean knowing

but only talking, as a drunken man may utter the verses of Empedocles.

And because the last term is not universal nor equally an object of

scientific knowledge with the universal term, the position that Socrates

sought to establish actually seems to result; for it is not in the

presence of what is thought to be knowledge proper that the affection

of incontinence arises (nor is it this that is 'dragged about' as

a result of the state of passion), but in that of perceptual knowledge.

This must suffice as our answer to the question of action with and

without knowledge, and how it is possible to behave incontinently

with knowledge.

4

(2) We must next discuss whether there is any one who is incontinent

without qualification, or all men who are incontinent are so in a

particular sense, and if there is, with what sort of objects he is

concerned. That both continent persons and persons of endurance, and

incontinent and soft persons, are concerned with pleasures and pains,

is evident.

Now of the things that produce pleasure some are necessary, while

others are worthy of choice in themselves but admit of excess, the

bodily causes of pleasure being necessary (by such I mean both those

concerned with food and those concerned with sexual intercourse, i.e.

the bodily matters with which we defined self-indulgence and temperance

as being concerned), while the others are not necessary but worthy

of choice in themselves (e.g. victory, honour, wealth, and good and

pleasant things of this sort). This being so, (a) those who go to

excess with reference to the latter, contrary to the right rule which

is in themselves, are not called incontinent simply, but incontinent

with the qualification 'in respect of money, gain, honour, or anger',-not

simply incontinent, on the ground that they are different from incontinent

people and are called incontinent by reason of a resemblance. (Compare

the case of Anthropos (Man), who won a contest at the Olympic games;

in his case the general definition of man differed little from the

definition peculiar to him, but yet it was different.) This is shown

by the fact that incontinence either without qualification or in respect

of some particular bodily pleasure is blamed not only as a fault but

as a kind of vice, while none of the people who are incontinent in

these other respects is so blamed.

But (b) of the people who are incontinent with respect to bodily enjoyments,

with which we say the temperate and the self-indulgent man are concerned,

he who pursues the excesses of things pleasant-and shuns those of

things painful, of hunger and thirst and heat and cold and all the

objects of touch and taste-not by choice but contrary to his choice

and his judgement, is called incontinent, not with the qualification

'in respect of this or that', e.g. of anger, but just simply. This

is confirmed by the fact that men are called 'soft' with regard to

these pleasures, but not with regard to any of the others. And for

this reason we group together the incontinent and the self-indulgent,

the continent and the temperate man-but not any of these other types-because

they are concerned somehow with the same pleasures and pains; but

though these are concerned with the same objects, they are not similarly

related to them, but some of them make a deliberate choice while the

others do not.

This is why we should describe as self-indulgent rather the man who

without appetite or with but a slight appetite pursues the excesses

of pleasure and avoids moderate pains, than the man who does so because

of his strong appetites; for what would the former do, if he had in

addition a vigorous appetite, and a violent pain at the lack of the

'necessary' objects?

Now of appetites and pleasures some belong to the class of things

generically noble and good-for some pleasant things are by nature

worthy of choice, while others are contrary to these, and others are

intermediate, to adopt our previous distinction-e.g. wealth, gain,

victory, honour. And with reference to all objects whether of this

or of the intermediate kind men are not blamed for being affected

by them, for desiring and loving them, but for doing so in a certain

way, i.e. for going to excess. (This is why all those who contrary

to the rule either are mastered by or pursue one of the objects which

are naturally noble and good, e.g. those who busy themselves more

than they ought about honour or about children and parents, (are not

wicked); for these too are good, and those who busy themselves about

them are praised; but yet there is an excess even in them-if like

Niobe one were to fight even against the gods, or were to be as much

devoted to one's father as Satyrus nicknamed 'the filial', who was

thought to be very silly on this point.) There is no wickedness, then,

with regard to these objects, for the reason named, viz. because each

of them is by nature a thing worthy of choice for its own sake; yet

excesses in respect of them are bad and to be avoided. Similarly there

is no incontinence with regard to them; for incontinence is not only

to be avoided but is also a thing worthy of blame; but owing to a

similarity in the state of feeling people apply the name incontinence,

adding in each case what it is in respect of, as we may describe as

a bad doctor or a bad actor one whom we should not call bad, simply.

As, then, in this case we do not apply the term without qualification

because each of these conditions is no shadness but only analogous

to it, so it is clear that in the other case also that alone must

be taken to be incontinence and continence which is concerned with

the same objects as temperance and self-indulgence, but we apply the

term to anger by virtue of a resemblance; and this is why we say with

a qualification 'incontinent in respect of anger' as we say 'incontinent

in respect of honour, or of gain'.
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(1) Some things are pleasant by nature, and of these (a) some are

so without qualification, and (b) others are so with reference to

particular classes either of animals or of men; while (2) others are

not pleasant by nature, but (a) some of them become so by reason of

injuries to the system, and (b) others by reason of acquired habits,

and (c) others by reason of originally bad natures. This being so,

it is possible with regard to each of the latter kinds to discover

similar states of character to those recognized with regard to the

former; I mean (A) the brutish states, as in the case of the female

who, they say, rips open pregnant women and devours the infants, or

of the things in which some of the tribes about the Black Sea that

have gone savage are said to delight-in raw meat or in human flesh,

or in lending their children to one another to feast upon-or of the

story told of Phalaris.

These states are brutish, but (B) others arise as a result of disease

(or, in some cases, of madness, as with the man who sacrificed and

ate his mother, or with the slave who ate the liver of his fellow),

and others are morbid states (C) resulting from custom, e.g. the habit

of plucking out the hair or of gnawing the nails, or even coals or

earth, and in addition to these paederasty; for these arise in some

by nature and in others, as in those who have been the victims of

lust from childhood, from habit.

Now those in whom nature is the cause of such a state no one would

call incontinent, any more than one would apply the epithet to women

because of the passive part they play in copulation; nor would one

apply it to those who are in a morbid condition as a result of habit.

To have these various types of habit is beyond the limits of vice,

as brutishness is too; for a man who has them to master or be mastered

by them is not simple (continence or) incontinence but that which

is so by analogy, as the man who is in this condition in respect of

fits of anger is to be called incontinent in respect of that feeling

but not incontinent simply. For every excessive state whether of folly,

of cowardice, of self-indulgence, or of bad temper, is either brutish

or morbid; the man who is by nature apt to fear everything, even the

squeak of a mouse, is cowardly with a brutish cowardice, while the

man who feared a weasel did so in consequence of disease; and of foolish

people those who by nature are thoughtless and live by their senses

alone are brutish, like some races of the distant barbarians, while

those who are so as a result of disease (e.g. of epilepsy) or of madness

are morbid. Of these characteristics it is possible to have some only

at times, and not to be mastered by them. e.g. Phalaris may have restrained

a desire to eat the flesh of a child or an appetite for unnatural

sexual pleasure; but it is also possible to be mastered, not merely

to have the feelings. Thus, as the wickedness which is on the human

level is called wickedness simply, while that which is not is called

wickedness not simply but with the qualification 'brutish' or 'morbid',

in the same way it is plain that some incontinence is brutish and

some morbid, while only that which corresponds to human self-indulgence

is incontinence simply.

That incontinence and continence, then, are concerned only with the

same objects as selfindulgence and temperance and that what is concerned

with other objects is a type distinct from incontinence, and called

incontinence by a metaphor and not simply, is plain.
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That incontinence in respect of anger is less disgraceful than that

in respect of the appetites is what we will now proceed to see. (1)

Anger seems to listen to argument to some extent, but to mishear it,

as do hasty servants who run out before they have heard the whole

of what one says, and then muddle the order, or as dogs bark if there

is but a knock at the door, before looking to see if it is a friend;

so anger by reason of the warmth and hastiness of its nature, though

it hears, does not hear an order, and springs to take revenge. For

argument or imagination informs us that we have been insulted or slighted,

and anger, reasoning as it were that anything like this must be fought

against, boils up straightway; while appetite, if argument or perception

merely says that an object is pleasant, springs to the enjoyment of

it. Therefore anger obeys the argument in a sense, but appetite does

not. It is therefore more disgraceful; for the man who is incontinent

in respect of anger is in a sense conquered by argument, while the

other is conquered by appetite and not by argument.

(2) Further, we pardon people more easily for following natural desires,

since we pardon them more easily for following such appetites as are

common to all men, and in so far as they are common; now anger and

bad temper are more natural than the appetites for excess, i.e. for

unnecessary objects. Take for instance the man who defended himself

on the charge of striking his father by saying 'yes, but he struck

his father, and he struck his, and' (pointing to his child) 'this

boy will strike me when he is a man; it runs in the family'; or the

man who when he was being dragged along by his son bade him stop at

the doorway, since he himself had dragged his father only as far as

that.

(2) Further, those who are more given to plotting against others are

more criminal. Now a passionate man is not given to plotting, nor

is anger itself-it is open; but the nature of appetite is illustrated

by what the poets call Aphrodite, 'guile-weaving daughter of Cyprus',

and by Homer's words about her 'embroidered girdle':

And the whisper of wooing is there,

Whose subtlety stealeth the wits of the wise, how prudent soe'er.

Therefore if this form of incontinence is more criminal and disgraceful

than that in respect of anger, it is both incontinence without qualification

and in a sense vice.

(4) Further, no one commits wanton outrage with a feeling of pain,

but every one who acts in anger acts with pain, while the man who

commits outrage acts with pleasure. If, then, those acts at which

it is most just to be angry are more criminal than others, the incontinence

which is due to appetite is the more criminal; for there is no wanton

outrage involved in anger.

Plainly, then, the incontinence concerned with appetite is more disgraceful

than that concerned with anger, and continence and incontinence are

concerned with bodily appetites and pleasures; but we must grasp the

differences among the latter themselves. For, as has been said at

the beginning, some are human and natural both in kind and in magnitude,

others are brutish, and others are due to organic injuries and diseases.

Only with the first of these are temperance and self-indulgence concerned;

this is why we call the lower animals neither temperate nor self-indulgent

except by a metaphor, and only if some one race of animals exceeds

another as a whole in wantonness, destructiveness, and omnivorous

greed; these have no power of choice or calculation, but they are

departures from the natural norm, as, among men, madmen are. Now brutishness

is a less evil than vice, though more alarming; for it is not that

the better part has been perverted, as in man,-they have no better

part. Thus it is like comparing a lifeless thing with a living in

respect of badness; for the badness of that which has no originative

source of movement is always less hurtful, and reason is an originative

source. Thus it is like comparing injustice in the abstract with an

unjust man. Each is in some sense worse; for a bad man will do ten

thousand times as much evil as a brute.
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With regard to the pleasures and pains and appetites and aversions

arising through touch and taste, to which both self-indulgence and

temperance were formerly narrowed down, it possible to be in such

a state as to be defeated even by those of them which most people

master, or to master even those by which most people are defeated;

among these possibilities, those relating to pleasures are incontinence

and continence, those relating to pains softness and endurance. The

state of most people is intermediate, even if they lean more towards

the worse states.

Now, since some pleasures are necessary while others are not, and

are necessary up to a point while the excesses of them are not, nor

the deficiencies, and this is equally true of appetites and pains,

the man who pursues the excesses of things pleasant, or pursues to

excess necessary objects, and does so by choice, for their own sake

and not at all for the sake of any result distinct from them, is self-indulgent;

for such a man is of necessity unlikely to repent, and therefore incurable,

since a man who cannot repent cannot be cured. The man who is deficient

in his pursuit of them is the opposite of self-indulgent; the man

who is intermediate is temperate. Similarly, there is the man who

avoids bodily pains not because he is defeated by them but by choice.

(Of those who do not choose such acts, one kind of man is led to them

as a result of the pleasure involved, another because he avoids the

pain arising from the appetite, so that these types differ from one

another. Now any one would think worse of a man with no appetite or

with weak appetite were he to do something disgraceful, than if he

did it under the influence of powerful appetite, and worse of him

if he struck a blow not in anger than if he did it in anger; for what

would he have done if he had been strongly affected? This is why the

self-indulgent man is worse than the incontinent.) of the states named,

then, the latter is rather a kind of softness; the former is self-indulgence.

While to the incontinent man is opposed the continent, to the soft

is opposed the man of endurance; for endurance consists in resisting,

while continence consists in conquering, and resisting and conquering

are different, as not being beaten is different from winning; this

is why continence is also more worthy of choice than endurance. Now

the man who is defective in respect of resistance to the things which

most men both resist and resist successfully is soft and effeminate;

for effeminacy too is a kind of softness; such a man trails his cloak

to avoid the pain of lifting it, and plays the invalid without thinking

himself wretched, though the man he imitates is a wretched man.

The case is similar with regard to continence and incontinence. For

if a man is defeated by violent and excessive pleasures or pains,

there is nothing wonderful in that; indeed we are ready to pardon

him if he has resisted, as Theodectes' Philoctetes does when bitten

by the snake, or Carcinus' Cercyon in the Alope, and as people who

try to restrain their laughter burst out into a guffaw, as happened

to Xenophantus. But it is surprising if a man is defeated by and cannot

resist pleasures or pains which most men can hold out against, when

this is not due to heredity or disease, like the softness that is

hereditary with the kings of the Scythians, or that which distinguishes

the female sex from the male.

The lover of amusement, too, is thought to be self-indulgent, but

is really soft. For amusement is a relaxation, since it is a rest

from work; and the lover of amusement is one of the people who go

to excess in this.

Of incontinence one kind is impetuosity, another weakness. For some

men after deliberating fail, owing to their emotion, to stand by the

conclusions of their deliberation, others because they have not deliberated

are led by their emotion; since some men (just as people who first

tickle others are not tickled themselves), if they have first perceived

and seen what is coming and have first roused themselves and their

calculative faculty, are not defeated by their emotion, whether it

be pleasant or painful. It is keen and excitable people that suffer

especially from the impetuous form of incontinence; for the former

by reason of their quickness and the latter by reason of the violence

of their passions do not await the argument, because they are apt

to follow their imagination.

8

The self-indulgent man, as was said, is not apt to repent; for he

stands by his choice; but incontinent man is likely to repent. This

is why the position is not as it was expressed in the formulation

of the problem, but the selfindulgent man is incurable and the incontinent

man curable; for wickedness is like a disease such as dropsy or consumption,

while incontinence is like epilepsy; the former is a permanent, the

latter an intermittent badness. And generally incontinence and vice

are different in kind; vice is unconscious of itself, incontinence

is not (of incontinent men themselves, those who become temporarily

beside themselves are better than those who have the rational principle

but do not abide by it, since the latter are defeated by a weaker

passion, and do not act without previous deliberation like the others);

for the incontinent man is like the people who get drunk quickly and

on little wine, i.e. on less than most people.

Evidently, then, incontinence is not vice (though perhaps it is so

in a qualified sense); for incontinence is contrary to choice while

vice is in accordance with choice; not but what they are similar in

respect of the actions they lead to; as in the saying of Demodocus

about the Milesians, 'the Milesians are not without sense, but they

do the things that senseless people do', so too incontinent people

are not criminal, but they will do criminal acts.

Now, since the incontinent man is apt to pursue, not on conviction,

bodily pleasures that are excessive and contrary to the right rule,

while the self-indulgent man is convinced because he is the sort of

man to pursue them, it is on the contrary the former that is easily

persuaded to change his mind, while the latter is not. For virtue

and vice respectively preserve and destroy the first principle, and

in actions the final cause is the first principle, as the hypotheses

are in mathematics; neither in that case is it argument that teaches

the first principles, nor is it so here-virtue either natural or produced

by habituation is what teaches right opinion about the first principle.

Such a man as this, then, is temperate; his contrary is the self-indulgent.

But there is a sort of man who is carried away as a result of passion

and contrary to the right rule-a man whom passion masters so that

he does not act according to the right rule, but does not master to

the extent of making him ready to believe that he ought to pursue

such pleasures without reserve; this is the incontinent man, who is

better than the self-indulgent man, and not bad without qualification;

for the best thing in him, the first principle, is preserved. And

contrary to him is another kind of man, he who abides by his convictions

and is not carried away, at least as a result of passion. It is evident

from these considerations that the latter is a good state and the

former a bad one.
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Is the man continent who abides by any and every rule and any and

every choice, or the man who abides by the right choice, and is he

incontinent who abandons any and every choice and any and every rule,

or he who abandons the rule that is not false and the choice that

is right; this is how we put it before in our statement of the problem.

Or is it incidentally any and every choice but per se the true rule

and the right choice by which the one abides and the other does not?

If any one chooses or pursues this for the sake of that, per se he

pursues and chooses the latter, but incidentally the former. But when

we speak without qualification we mean what is per se. Therefore in

a sense the one abides by, and the other abandons, any and every opinion;

but without qualification, the true opinion.

There are some who are apt to abide by their opinion, who are called

strong-headed, viz. those who are hard to persuade in the first instance

and are not easily persuaded to change; these have in them something

like the continent man, as the prodigal is in a way like the liberal

man and the rash man like the confident man; but they are different

in many respects. For it is to passion and appetite that the one will

not yield, since on occasion the continent man will be easy to persuade;

but it is to argument that the others refuse to yield, for they do

form appetites and many of them are led by their pleasures. Now the

people who are strong-headed are the opinionated, the ignorant, and

the boorish-the opinionated being influenced by pleasure and pain;

for they delight in the victory they gain if they are not persuaded

to change, and are pained if their decisions become null and void

as decrees sometimes do; so that they are liker the incontinent than

the continent man.

But there are some who fail to abide by their resolutions, not as

a result of incontinence, e.g. Neoptolemus in Sophocles' Philoctetes;

yet it was for the sake of pleasure that he did not stand fast-but

a noble pleasure; for telling the truth was noble to him, but he had

been persuaded by Odysseus to tell the lie. For not every one who

does anything for the sake of pleasure is either self-indulgent or

bad or incontinent, but he who does it for a disgraceful pleasure.

Since there is also a sort of man who takes less delight than he should

in bodily things, and does not abide by the rule, he who is intermediate

between him and the incontinent man is the continent man; for the

incontinent man fails to abide by the rule because he delights too

much in them, and this man because he delights in them too little;

while the continent man abides by the rule and does not change on

either account. Now if continence is good, both the contrary states

must be bad, as they actually appear to be; but because the other

extreme is seen in few people and seldom, as temperance is thought

to be contrary only to self-indulgence, so is continence to incontinence.

Since many names are applied analogically, it is by analogy that we

have come to speak of the 'continence' the temperate man; for both

the continent man and the temperate man are such as to do nothing

contrary to the rule for the sake of the bodily pleasures, but the

former has and the latter has not bad appetites, and the latter is

such as not to feel pleasure contrary to the rule, while the former

is such as to feel pleasure but not to be led by it. And the incontinent

and the self-indulgent man are also like another; they are different,

but both pursue bodily pleasures- the latter, however, also thinking

that he ought to do so, while the former does not think this.
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Nor can the same man have practical wisdom and be incontinent; for

it has been shown' that a man is at the same time practically wise,

and good in respect of character. Further, a man has practical wisdom

not by knowing only but by being able to act; but the incontinent

man is unable to act-there is, however, nothing to prevent a clever

man from being incontinent; this is why it is sometimes actually thought

that some people have practical wisdom but are incontinent, viz. because

cleverness and practical wisdom differ in the way we have described

in our first discussions, and are near together in respect of their

reasoning, but differ in respect of their purpose-nor yet is the incontinent

man like the man who knows and is contemplating a truth, but like

the man who is asleep or drunk. And he acts willingly (for he acts

in a sense with knowledge both of what he does and of the end to which

he does it), but is not wicked, since his purpose is good; so that

he is half-wicked. And he is not a criminal; for he does not act of

malice aforethought; of the two types of incontinent man the one does

not abide by the conclusions of his deliberation, while the excitable

man does not deliberate at all. And thus the incontinent man like

a city which passes all the right decrees and has good laws, but makes

no use of them, as in Anaxandrides' jesting remark,

The city willed it, that cares nought for laws; but the wicked man

is like a city that uses its laws, but has wicked laws to use.

Now incontinence and continence are concerned with that which is in

excess of the state characteristic of most men; for the continent

man abides by his resolutions more and the incontinent man less than

most men can.

Of the forms of incontinence, that of excitable people is more curable

than that of those who deliberate but do not abide by their decisions,

and those who are incontinent through habituation are more curable

than those in whom incontinence is innate; for it is easier to change

a habit than to change one's nature; even habit is hard to change

just because it is like nature, as Evenus says:

I say that habit's but a long practice, friend,

And this becomes men's nature in the end.

We have now stated what continence, incontinence, endurance, and softness

are, and how these states are related to each other.
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The study of pleasure and pain belongs to the province of the political

philosopher; for he is the architect of the end, with a view to which

we call one thing bad and another good without qualification. Further,

it is one of our necessary tasks to consider them; for not only did

we lay it down that moral virtue and vice are concerned with pains

and pleasures, but most people say that happiness involves pleasure;

this is why the blessed man is called by a name derived from a word

meaning enjoyment.

Now (1) some people think that no pleasure is a good, either in itself

or incidentally, since the good and pleasure are not the same; (2)

others think that some pleasures are good but that most are bad. (3)

Again there is a third view, that even if all pleasures are good,

yet the best thing in the world cannot be pleasure. (1) The reasons

given for the view that pleasure is not a good at all are (a) that

every pleasure is a perceptible process to a natural state, and that

no process is of the same kind as its end, e.g. no process of building

of the same kind as a house. (b) A temperate man avoids pleasures.

(c) A man of practical wisdom pursues what is free from pain, not

what is pleasant. (d) The pleasures are a hindrance to thought, and

the more so the more one delights in them, e.g. in sexual pleasure;

for no one could think of anything while absorbed in this. (e) There

is no art of pleasure; but every good is the product of some art.

(f) Children and the brutes pursue pleasures. (2) The reasons for

the view that not all pleasures are good are that (a) there are pleasures

that are actually base and objects of reproach, and (b) there are

harmful pleasures; for some pleasant things are unhealthy. (3) The

reason for the view that the best thing in the world is not pleasure

is that pleasure is not an end but a process.
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These are pretty much the things that are said. That it does not follow

from these grounds that pleasure is not a good, or even the chief

good, is plain from the following considerations. (A, a) First, since

that which is good may be so in either of two senses (one thing good

simply and another good for a particular person), natural constitutions

and states of being, and therefore also the corresponding movements

and processes, will be correspondingly divisible. Of those which are

thought to be bad some will be bad if taken without qualification

but not bad for a particular person, but worthy of his choice, and

some will not be worthy of choice even for a particular person, but

only at a particular time and for a short period, though not without

qualification; while others are not even pleasures, but seem to be

so, viz. all those which involve pain and whose end is curative, e.g.

the processes that go on in sick persons.

(b) Further, one kind of good being activity and another being state,

the processes that restore us to our natural state are only incidentally

pleasant; for that matter the activity at work in the appetites for

them is the activity of so much of our state and nature as has remained

unimpaired; for there are actually pleasures that involve no pain

or appetite (e.g. those of contemplation), the nature in such a case

not being defective at all. That the others are incidental is indicated

by the fact that men do not enjoy the same pleasant objects when their

nature is in its settled state as they do when it is being replenished,

but in the former case they enjoy the things that are pleasant without

qualification, in the latter the contraries of these as well; for

then they enjoy even sharp and bitter things, none of which is pleasant

either by nature or without qualification. The states they produce,

therefore, are not pleasures naturally or without qualification; for

as pleasant things differ, so do the pleasures arising from them.

(c) Again, it is not necessary that there should be something else

better than pleasure, as some say the end is better than the process;

for leasures are not processes nor do they all involve process-they

are activities and ends; nor do they arise when we are becoming something,

but when we are exercising some faculty; and not all pleasures have

an end different from themselves, but only the pleasures of persons

who are being led to the perfecting of their nature. This is why it

is not right to say that pleasure is perceptible process, but it should

rather be called activity of the natural state, and instead of 'perceptible'

'unimpeded'. It is thought by some people to be process just because

they think it is in the strict sense good; for they think that activity

is process, which it is not.

(B) The view that pleasures are bad because some pleasant things are

unhealthy is like saying that healthy things are bad because some

healthy things are bad for money-making; both are bad in the respect

mentioned, but they are not bad for that reason-indeed, thinking itself

is sometimes injurious to health.

Neither practical wisdom nor any state of being is impeded by the

pleasure arising from it; it is foreign pleasures that impede, for

the pleasures arising from thinking and learning will make us think

and learn all the more.

(C) The fact that no pleasure is the product of any art arises naturally

enough; there is no art of any other activity either, but only of

the corresponding faculty; though for that matter the arts of the

perfumer and the cook are thought to be arts of pleasure.

(D) The arguments based on the grounds that the temperate man avoids

pleasure and that the man of practical wisdom pursues the painless

life, and that children and the brutes pursue pleasure, are all refuted

by the same consideration. We have pointed out in what sense pleasures

are good without qualification and in what sense some are not good;

now both the brutes and children pursue pleasures of the latter kind

(and the man of practical wisdom pursues tranquil freedom from that

kind), viz. those which imply appetite and pain, i.e. the bodily pleasures

(for it is these that are of this nature) and the excesses of them,

in respect of which the self-indulgent man is self-indulent. This

is why the temperate man avoids these pleasures; for even he has pleasures

of his own.
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But further (E) it is agreed that pain is bad and to be avoided; for

some pain is without qualification bad, and other pain is bad because

it is in some respect an impediment to us. Now the contrary of that

which is to be avoided, qua something to be avoided and bad, is good.

Pleasure, then, is necessarily a good. For the answer of Speusippus,

that pleasure is contrary both to pain and to good, as the greater

is contrary both to the less and to the equal, is not successful;

since he would not say that pleasure is essentially just a species

of evil.

And (F) if certain pleasures are bad, that does not prevent the chief

good from being some pleasure, just as the chief good may be some

form of knowledge though certain kinds of knowledge are bad. Perhaps

it is even necessary, if each disposition has unimpeded activities,

that, whether the activity (if unimpeded) of all our dispositions

or that of some one of them is happiness, this should be the thing

most worthy of our choice; and this activity is pleasure. Thus the

chief good would be some pleasure, though most pleasures might perhaps

be bad without qualification. And for this reason all men think that

the happy life is pleasant and weave pleasure into their ideal of

happiness-and reasonably too; for no activity is perfect when it is

impeded, and happiness is a perfect thing; this is why the happy man

needs the goods of the body and external goods, i.e. those of fortune,

viz. in order that he may not be impeded in these ways. Those who

say that the victim on the rack or the man who falls into great misfortunes

is happy if he is good, are, whether they mean to or not, talking

nonsense. Now because we need fortune as well as other things, some

people think good fortune the same thing as happiness; but it is not

that, for even good fortune itself when in excess is an impediment,

and perhaps should then be no longer called good fortune; for its

limit is fixed by reference to happiness.

And indeed the fact that all things, both brutes and men, pursue pleasure

is an indication of its being somehow the chief good:

No voice is wholly lost that many peoples... But since no one nature

or state either is or is thought the best for all, neither do all

pursue the same pleasure; yet all pursue pleasure. And perhaps they

actually pursue not the pleasure they think they pursue nor that which

they would say they pursue, but the same pleasure; for all things

have by nature something divine in them. But the bodily pleasures

have appropriated the name both because we oftenest steer our course

for them and because all men share in them; thus because they alone

are familiar, men think there are no others.

It is evident also that if pleasure, i.e. the activity of our faculties,

is not a good, it will not be the case that the happy man lives a

pleasant life; for to what end should he need pleasure, if it is not

a good but the happy man may even live a painful life? For pain is

neither an evil nor a good, if pleasure is not; why then should he

avoid it? Therefore, too, the life of the good man will not be pleasanter

than that of any one else, if his activities are not more pleasant.
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(G) With regard to the bodily pleasures, those who say that some pleasures

are very much to be chosen, viz. the noble pleasures, but not the

bodily pleasures, i.e. those with which the self-indulgent man is

concerned, must consider why, then, the contrary pains are bad. For

the contrary of bad is good. Are the necessary pleasures good in the

sense in which even that which is not bad is good? Or are they good

up to a point? Is it that where you have states and processes of which

there cannot be too much, there cannot be too much of the corresponding

pleasure, and that where there can be too much of the one there can

be too much of the other also? Now there can be too much of bodily

goods, and the bad man is bad by virtue of pursuing the excess, not

by virtue of pursuing the necessary pleasures (for all men enjoy in

some way or other both dainty foods and wines and sexual intercourse,

but not all men do so as they ought). The contrary is the case with

pain; for he does not avoid the excess of it, he avoids it altogether;

and this is peculiar to him, for the alternative to excess of pleasure

is not pain, except to the man who pursues this excess.

Since we should state not only the truth, but also the cause of error-for

this contributes towards producing conviction, since when a reasonable

explanation is given of why the false view appears true, this tends

to produce belief in the true view-therefore we must state why the

bodily pleasures appear the more worthy of choice. (a) Firstly, then,

it is because they expel pain; owing to the excesses of pain that

men experience, they pursue excessive and in general bodily pleasure

as being a cure for the pain. Now curative agencies produce intense

feeling-which is the reason why they are pursued-because they show

up against the contrary pain. (Indeed pleasure is thought not to be

good for these two reasons, as has been said, viz. that (a) some of

them are activities belonging to a bad nature-either congenital, as

in the case of a brute, or due to habit, i.e. those of bad men; while

(b) others are meant to cure a defective nature, and it is better

to be in a healthy state than to be getting into it, but these arise

during the process of being made perfect and are therefore only incidentally

good., b) Further, they are pursued because of their violence by

those who cannot enjoy other pleasures. (At all events they go out

of their way to manufacture thirsts somehow for themselves. When these

are harmless, the practice is irreproachable; when they are hurtful,

it is bad.) For they have nothing else to enjoy, and, besides, a neutral

state is painful to many people because of their nature. For the animal

nature is always in travail, as the students of natural science also

testify, saying that sight and hearing are painful; but we have become

used to this, as they maintain. Similarly, while, in youth, people

are, owing to the growth that is going on, in a situation like that

of drunken men, and youth is pleasant, on the other hand people of

excitable nature always need relief; for even their body is ever in

torment owing to its special composition, and they are always under

the influence of violent desire; but pain is driven out both by the

contrary pleasure, and by any chance pleasure if it be strong; and

for these reasons they become self-indulgent and bad. But the pleasures

that do not involve pains do not admit of excess; and these are among

the things pleasant by nature and not incidentally. By things pleasant

incidentally I mean those that act as cures (for because as a result

people are cured, through some action of the part that remains healthy,

for this reason the process is thought pleasant); by things naturally

pleasant I mean those that stimulate the action of the healthy nature.

There is no one thing that is always pleasant, because our nature

is not simple but there is another element in us as well, inasmuch

as we are perishable creatures, so that if the one element does something,

this is unnatural to the other nature, and when the two elements are

evenly balanced, what is done seems neither painful nor pleasant;

for if the nature of anything were simple, the same action would always

be most pleasant to it. This is why God always enjoys a single and

simple pleasure; for there is not only an activity of movement but

an activity of immobility, and pleasure is found more in rest than

in movement. But 'change in all things is sweet', as the poet says,

because of some vice; for as it is the vicious man that is changeable,

so the nature that needs change is vicious; for it is not simple nor

good.

We have now discussed continence and incontinence, and pleasure and

pain, both what each is and in what sense some of them are good and

others bad; it remains to speak of friendship.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK VIII

1

After what we have said, a discussion of friendship would naturally

follow, since it is a virtue or implies virtue, and is besides most

necessary with a view to living. For without friends no one would

choose to live, though he had all other goods; even rich men and those

in possession of office and of dominating power are thought to need

friends most of all; for what is the use of such prosperity without

the opportunity of beneficence, which is exercised chiefly and in

its most laudable form towards friends? Or how can prosperity be guarded

and preserved without friends? The greater it is, the more exposed

is it to risk. And in poverty and in other misfortunes men think friends

are the only refuge. It helps the young, too, to keep from error;

it aids older people by ministering to their needs and supplementing

the activities that are failing from weakness; those in the prime

of life it stimulates to noble actions-'two going together'-for with

friends men are more able both to think and to act. Again, parent

seems by nature to feel it for offspring and offspring for parent,

not only among men but among birds and among most animals; it is felt

mutually by members of the same race, and especially by men, whence

we praise lovers of their fellowmen. We may even in our travels how

near and dear every man is to every other. Friendship seems too to

hold states together, and lawgivers to care more for it than for justice;

for unanimity seems to be something like friendship, and this they

aim at most of all, and expel faction as their worst enemy; and when

men are friends they have no need of justice, while when they are

just they need friendship as well, and the truest form of justice

is thought to be a friendly quality.

But it is not only necessary but also noble; for we praise those who

love their friends, and it is thought to be a fine thing to have many

friends; and again we think it is the same people that are good men

and are friends.

Not a few things about friendship are matters of debate. Some define

it as a kind of likeness and say like people are friends, whence come

the sayings 'like to like', 'birds of a feather flock together', and

so on; others on the contrary say 'two of a trade never agree'. On

this very question they inquire for deeper and more physical causes,

Euripides saying that 'parched earth loves the rain, and stately heaven

when filled with rain loves to fall to earth', and Heraclitus that

'it is what opposes that helps' and 'from different tones comes the

fairest tune' and 'all things are produced through strife'; while

Empedocles, as well as others, expresses the opposite view that like

aims at like. The physical problems we may leave alone (for they do

not belong to the present inquiry); let us examine those which are

human and involve character and feeling, e.g. whether friendship can

arise between any two people or people cannot be friends if they are

wicked, and whether there is one species of friendship or more than

one. Those who think there is only one because it admits of degrees

have relied on an inadequate indication; for even things different

in species admit of degree. We have discussed this matter previously.
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The kinds of friendship may perhaps be cleared up if we first come

to know the object of love. For not everything seems to be loved but

only the lovable, and this is good, pleasant, or useful; but it would

seem to be that by which some good or pleasure is produced that is

useful, so that it is the good and the useful that are lovable as

ends. Do men love, then, the good, or what is good for them? These

sometimes clash. So too with regard to the pleasant. Now it is thought

that each loves what is good for himself, and that the good is without

qualification lovable, and what is good for each man is lovable for

him; but each man loves not what is good for him but what seems good.

This however will make no difference; we shall just have to say that

this is 'that which seems lovable'. Now there are three grounds on

which people love; of the love of lifeless objects we do not use the

word 'friendship'; for it is not mutual love, nor is there a wishing

of good to the other (for it would surely be ridiculous to wish wine

well; if one wishes anything for it, it is that it may keep, so that

one may have it oneself); but to a friend we say we ought to wish

what is good for his sake. But to those who thus wish good we ascribe

only goodwill, if the wish is not reciprocated; goodwill when it is

reciprocal being friendship. Or must we add 'when it is recognized'?

For many people have goodwill to those whom they have not seen but

judge to be good or useful; and one of these might return this feeling.

These people seem to bear goodwill to each other; but how could one

call them friends when they do not know their mutual feelings? To

be friends, then, the must be mutually recognized as bearing goodwill

and wishing well to each other for one of the aforesaid reasons.
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Now these reasons differ from each other in kind; so, therefore, do

the corresponding forms of love and friendship. There are therefore

three kinds of friendship, equal in number to the things that are

lovable; for with respect to each there is a mutual and recognized

love, and those who love each other wish well to each other in that

respect in which they love one another. Now those who love each other

for their utility do not love each other for themselves but in virtue

of some good which they get from each other. So too with those who

love for the sake of pleasure; it is not for their character that

men love ready-witted people, but because they find them pleasant.

Therefore those who love for the sake of utility love for the sake

of what is good for themselves, and those who love for the sake of

pleasure do so for the sake of what is pleasant to themselves, and

not in so far as the other is the person loved but in so far as he

is useful or pleasant. And thus these friendships are only incidental;

for it is not as being the man he is that the loved person is loved,

but as providing some good or pleasure. Such friendships, then, are

easily dissolved, if the parties do not remain like themselves; for

if the one party is no longer pleasant or useful the other ceases

to love him.

Now the useful is not permanent but is always changing. Thus when

the motive of the friendship is done away, the friendship is dissolved,

inasmuch as it existed only for the ends in question. This kind of

friendship seems to exist chiefly between old people (for at that

age people pursue not the pleasant but the useful) and, of those who

are in their prime or young, between those who pursue utility. And

such people do not live much with each other either; for sometimes

they do not even find each other pleasant; therefore they do not need

such companionship unless they are useful to each other; for they

are pleasant to each other only in so far as they rouse in each other

hopes of something good to come. Among such friendships people also

class the friendship of a host and guest. On the other hand the friendship

of young people seems to aim at pleasure; for they live under the

guidance of emotion, and pursue above all what is pleasant to themselves

and what is immediately before them; but with increasing age their

pleasures become different. This is why they quickly become friends

and quickly cease to be so; their friendship changes with the object

that is found pleasant, and such pleasure alters quickly. Young people

are amorous too; for the greater part of the friendship of love depends

on emotion and aims at pleasure; this is why they fall in love and

quickly fall out of love, changing often within a single day. But

these people do wish to spend their days and lives together; for it

is thus that they attain the purpose of their friendship.

Perfect friendship is the friendship of men who are good, and alike

in virtue; for these wish well alike to each other qua good, and they

are good themselves. Now those who wish well to their friends for

their sake are most truly friends; for they do this by reason of own

nature and not incidentally; therefore their friendship lasts as long

as they are good-and goodness is an enduring thing. And each is good

without qualification and to his friend, for the good are both good

without qualification and useful to each other. So too they are pleasant;

for the good are pleasant both without qualification and to each other,

since to each his own activities and others like them are pleasurable,

and the actions of the good are the same or like. And such a friendship

is as might be expected permanent, since there meet in it all the

qualities that friends should have. For all friendship is for the

sake of good or of pleasure-good or pleasure either in the abstract

or such as will be enjoyed by him who has the friendly feeling-and

is based on a certain resemblance; and to a friendship of good men

all the qualities we have named belong in virtue of the nature of

the friends themselves; for in the case of this kind of friendship

the other qualities also are alike in both friends, and that which

is good without qualification is also without qualification pleasant,

and these are the most lovable qualities. Love and friendship therefore

are found most and in their best form between such men.

But it is natural that such friendships should be infrequent; for

such men are rare. Further, such friendship requires time and familiarity;

as the proverb says, men cannot know each other till they have 'eaten

salt together'; nor can they admit each other to friendship or be

friends till each has been found lovable and been trusted by each.

Those who quickly show the marks of friendship to each other wish

to be friends, but are not friends unless they both are lovable and

know the fact; for a wish for friendship may arise quickly, but friendship

does not.
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This kind of friendship, then, is perfect both in respect of duration

and in all other respects, and in it each gets from each in all respects

the same as, or something like what, he gives; which is what ought

to happen between friends. Friendship for the sake of pleasure bears

a resemblance to this kind; for good people too are pleasant to each

other. So too does friendship for the sake of utility; for the good

are also useful to each other. Among men of these inferior sorts too,

friendships are most permanent when the friends get the same thing

from each other (e.g. pleasure), and not only that but also from the

same source, as happens between readywitted people, not as happens

between lover and beloved. For these do not take pleasure in the same

things, but the one in seeing the beloved and the other in receiving

attentions from his lover; and when the bloom of youth is passing

the friendship sometimes passes too (for the one finds no pleasure

in the sight of the other, and the other gets no attentions from the

first); but many lovers on the other hand are constant, if familiarity

has led them to love each other's characters, these being alike. But

those who exchange not pleasure but utility in their amour are both

less truly friends and less constant. Those who are friends for the

sake of utility part when the advantage is at an end; for they were

lovers not of each other but of profit.

For the sake of pleasure or utility, then, even bad men may be friends

of each other, or good men of bad, or one who is neither good nor

bad may be a friend to any sort of person, but for their own sake

clearly only good men can be friends; for bad men do not delight in

each other unless some advantage come of the relation.

The friendship of the good too and this alone is proof against slander;

for it is not easy to trust any one talk about a man who has long

been tested by oneself; and it is among good men that trust and the

feeling that 'he would never wrong me' and all the other things that

are demanded in true friendship are found. In the other kinds of friendship,

however, there is nothing to prevent these evils arising. For men

apply the name of friends even to those whose motive is utility, in

which sense states are said to be friendly (for the alliances of states

seem to aim at advantage), and to those who love each other for the

sake of pleasure, in which sense children are called friends. Therefore

we too ought perhaps to call such people friends, and say that there

are several kinds of friendship-firstly and in the proper sense that

of good men qua good, and by analogy the other kinds; for it is in

virtue of something good and something akin to what is found in true

friendship that they are friends, since even the pleasant is good

for the lovers of pleasure. But these two kinds of friendship are

not often united, nor do the same people become friends for the sake

of utility and of pleasure; for things that are only incidentally

connected are not often coupled together.

Friendship being divided into these kinds, bad men will be friends

for the sake of pleasure or of utility, being in this respect like

each other, but good men will be friends for their own sake, i.e.

in virtue of their goodness. These, then, are friends without qualification;

the others are friends incidentally and through a resemblance to these.
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As in regard to the virtues some men are called good in respect of

a state of character, others in respect of an activity, so too in

the case of friendship; for those who live together delight in each

other and confer benefits on each other, but those who are asleep

or locally separated are not performing, but are disposed to perform,

the activities of friendship; distance does not break off the friendship

absolutely, but only the activity of it. But if the absence is lasting,

it seems actually to make men forget their friendship; hence the saying

'out of sight, out of mind'. Neither old people nor sour people seem

to make friends easily; for there is little that is pleasant in them,

and no one can spend his days with one whose company is painful, or

not pleasant, since nature seems above all to avoid the painful and

to aim at the pleasant. Those, however, who approve of each other

but do not live together seem to be well-disposed rather than actual

friends. For there is nothing so characteristic of friends as living

together (since while it people who are in need that desire benefits,

even those who are supremely happy desire to spend their days together;

for solitude suits such people least of all); but people cannot live

together if they are not pleasant and do not enjoy the same things,

as friends who are companions seem to do.

The truest friendship, then, is that of the good, as we have frequently

said; for that which is without qualification good or pleasant seems

to be lovable and desirable, and for each person that which is good

or pleasant to him; and the good man is lovable and desirable to the

good man for both these reasons. Now it looks as if love were a feeling,

friendship a state of character; for love may be felt just as much

towards lifeless things, but mutual love involves choice and choice

springs from a state of character; and men wish well to those whom

they love, for their sake, not as a result of feeling but as a result

of a state of character. And in loving a friend men love what is good

for themselves; for the good man in becoming a friend becomes a good

to his friend. Each, then, both loves what is good for himself, and

makes an equal return in goodwill and in pleasantness; for friendship

is said to be equality, and both of these are found most in the friendship

of the good.
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Between sour and elderly people friendship arises less readily, inasmuch

as they are less good-tempered and enjoy companionship less; for these

are thou to be the greatest marks of friendship productive of it.

This is why, while men become friends quickly, old men do not; it

is because men do not become friends with those in whom they do not

delight; and similarly sour people do not quickly make friends either.

But such men may bear goodwill to each other; for they wish one another

well and aid one another in need; but they are hardly friends because

they do not spend their days together nor delight in each other, and

these are thought the greatest marks of friendship.

One cannot be a friend to many people in the sense of having friendship

of the perfect type with them, just as one cannot be in love with

many people at once (for love is a sort of excess of feeling, and

it is the nature of such only to be felt towards one person); and

it is not easy for many people at the same time to please the same

person very greatly, or perhaps even to be good in his eyes. One must,

too, acquire some experience of the other person and become familiar

with him, and that is very hard. But with a view to utility or pleasure

it is possible that many people should please one; for many people

are useful or pleasant, and these services take little time.

Of these two kinds that which is for the sake of pleasure is the more

like friendship, when both parties get the same things from each other

and delight in each other or in the things, as in the friendships

of the young; for generosity is more found in such friendships. Friendship

based on utility is for the commercially minded. People who are supremely

happy, too, have no need of useful friends, but do need pleasant friends;

for they wish to live with some one and, though they can endure for

a short time what is painful, no one could put up with it continuously,

nor even with the Good itself if it were painful to him; this is why

they look out for friends who are pleasant. Perhaps they should look

out for friends who, being pleasant, are also good, and good for them

too; for so they will have all the characteristics that friends should

have.

People in positions of authority seem to have friends who fall into

distinct classes; some people are useful to them and others are pleasant,

but the same people are rarely both; for they seek neither those whose

pleasantness is accompanied by virtue nor those whose utility is with

a view to noble objects, but in their desire for pleasure they seek

for ready-witted people, and their other friends they choose as being

clever at doing what they are told, and these characteristics are

rarely combined. Now we have said that the good man is at the same

time pleasant and useful; but such a man does not become the friend

of one who surpasses him in station, unless he is surpassed also in

virtue; if this is not so, he does not establish equality by being

proportionally exceeded in both respects. But people who surpass him

in both respects are not so easy to find.

However that may be, the aforesaid friendships involve equality; for

the friends get the same things from one another and wish the same

things for one another, or exchange one thing for another, e.g. pleasure

for utility; we have said, however, that they are both less truly

friendships and less permanent.

But it is from their likeness and their unlikeness to the same thing

that they are thought both to be and not to be friendships. It is

by their likeness to the friendship of virtue that they seem to be

friendships (for one of them involves pleasure and the other utility,

and these characteristics belong to the friendship of virtue as well);

while it is because the friendship of virtue is proof against slander

and permanent, while these quickly change (besides differing from

the former in many other respects), that they appear not to be friendships;

i.e. it is because of their unlikeness to the friendship of virtue.
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But there is another kind of friendship, viz. that which involves

an inequality between the parties, e.g. that of father to son and

in general of elder to younger, that of man to wife and in general

that of ruler to subject. And these friendships differ also from each

other; for it is not the same that exists between parents and children

and between rulers and subjects, nor is even that of father to son

the same as that of son to father, nor that of husband to wife the

same as that of wife to husband. For the virtue and the function of

each of these is different, and so are the reasons for which they

love; the love and the friendship are therefore different also. Each

party, then, neither gets the same from the other, nor ought to seek

it; but when children render to parents what they ought to render

to those who brought them into the world, and parents render what

they should to their children, the friendship of such persons will

be abiding and excellent. In all friendships implying inequality the

love also should be proportional, i.e. the better should be more loved

than he loves, and so should the more useful, and similarly in each

of the other cases; for when the love is in proportion to the merit

of the parties, then in a sense arises equality, which is certainly

held to be characteristic of friendship.

But equality does not seem to take the same form in acts of justice

and in friendship; for in acts of justice what is equal in the primary

sense is that which is in proportion to merit, while quantitative

equality is secondary, but in friendship quantitative equality is

primary and proportion to merit secondary. This becomes clear if there

is a great interval in respect of virtue or vice or wealth or anything

else between the parties; for then they are no longer friends, and

do not even expect to be so. And this is most manifest in the case

of the gods; for they surpass us most decisively in all good things.

But it is clear also in the case of kings; for with them, too, men

who are much their inferiors do not expect to be friends; nor do men

of no account expect to be friends with the best or wisest men. In

such cases it is not possible to define exactly up to what point friends

can remain friends; for much can be taken away and friendship remain,

but when one party is removed to a great distance, as God is, the

possibility of friendship ceases. This is in fact the origin of the

question whether friends really wish for their friends the greatest

goods, e.g. that of being gods; since in that case their friends will

no longer be friends to them, and therefore will not be good things

for them (for friends are good things). The answer is that if we were

right in saying that friend wishes good to friend for his sake, his

friend must remain the sort of being he is, whatever that may be;

therefore it is for him oily so long as he remains a man that he will

wish the greatest goods. But perhaps not all the greatest goods; for

it is for himself most of all that each man wishes what is good.
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Most people seem, owing to ambition, to wish to be loved rather than

to love; which is why most men love flattery; for the flatterer is

a friend in an inferior position, or pretends to be such and to love

more than he is loved; and being loved seems to be akin to being honoured,

and this is what most people aim at. But it seems to be not for its

own sake that people choose honour, but incidentally. For most people

enjoy being honoured by those in positions of authority because of

their hopes (for they think that if they want anything they will get

it from them; and therefore they delight in honour as a token of favour

to come); while those who desire honour from good men, and men who

know, are aiming at confirming their own opinion of themselves; they

delight in honour, therefore, because they believe in their own goodness

on the strength of the judgement of those who speak about them. In

being loved, on the other hand, people delight for its own sake; whence

it would seem to be better than being honoured, and friendship to

be desirable in itself. But it seems to lie in loving rather than

in being loved, as is indicated by the delight mothers take in loving;

for some mothers hand over their children to be brought up, and so

long as they know their fate they love them and do not seek to be

loved in return (if they cannot have both), but seem to be satisfied

if they see them prospering; and they themselves love their children

even if these owing to their ignorance give them nothing of a mother's

due. Now since friendship depends more on loving, and it is those

who love their friends that are praised, loving seems to be the characteristic

virtue of friends, so that it is only those in whom this is found

in due measure that are lasting friends, and only their friendship

that endures.

It is in this way more than any other that even unequals can be friends;

they can be equalized. Now equality and likeness are friendship, and

especially the likeness of those who are like in virtue; for being

steadfast in themselves they hold fast to each other, and neither

ask nor give base services, but (one may say) even prevent them; for

it is characteristic of good men neither to go wrong themselves nor

to let their friends do so. But wicked men have no steadfastness (for

they do not remain even like to themselves), but become friends for

a short time because they delight in each other's wickedness. Friends

who are useful or pleasant last longer; i.e. as long as they provide

each other with enjoyments or advantages. Friendship for utility's

sake seems to be that which most easily exists between contraries,

e.g. between poor and rich, between ignorant and learned; for what

a man actually lacks he aims at, and one gives something else in return.

But under this head, too, might bring lover and beloved, beautiful

and ugly. This is why lovers sometimes seem ridiculous, when they

demand to be loved as they love; if they are equally lovable their

claim can perhaps be justified, but when they have nothing lovable

about them it is ridiculous. Perhaps, however, contrary does not even

aim at contrary by its own nature, but only incidentally, the desire

being for what is intermediate; for that is what is good, e.g. it

is good for the dry not to become wet but to come to the intermediate

state, and similarly with the hot and in all other cases. These subjects

we may dismiss; for they are indeed somewhat foreign to our inquiry.
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Friendship and justice seem, as we have said at the outset of our

discussion, to be concerned with the same objects and exhibited between

the same persons. For in every community there is thought to be some

form of justice, and friendship too; at least men address as friends

their fellow-voyagers and fellowsoldiers, and so too those associated

with them in any other kind of community. And the extent of their

association is the extent of their friendship, as it is the extent

to which justice exists between them. And the proverb 'what friends

have is common property' expresses the truth; for friendship depends

on community. Now brothers and comrades have all things in common,

but the others to whom we have referred have definite things in common-some

more things, others fewer; for of friendships, too, some are more

and others less truly friendships. And the claims of justice differ

too; the duties of parents to children, and those of brothers to each

other are not the same, nor those of comrades and those of fellow-citizens,

and so, too, with the other kinds of friendship. There is a difference,

therefore, also between the acts that are unjust towards each of these

classes of associates, and the injustice increases by being exhibited

towards those who are friends in a fuller sense; e.g. it is a more

terrible thing to defraud a comrade than a fellow-citizen, more terrible

not to help a brother than a stranger, and more terrible to wound

a father than any one else. And the demands of justice also seem to

increase with the intensity of the friendship, which implies that

friendship and justice exist between the same persons and have an

equal extension.

Now all forms of community are like parts of the political community;

for men journey together with a view to some particular advantage,

and to provide something that they need for the purposes of life;

and it is for the sake of advantage that the political community too

seems both to have come together originally and to endure, for this

is what legislators aim at, and they call just that which is to the

common advantage. Now the other communities aim at advantage bit by

bit, e.g. sailors at what is advantageous on a voyage with a view

to making money or something of the kind, fellow-soldiers at what

is advantageous in war, whether it is wealth or victory or the taking

of a city that they seek, and members of tribes and demes act similarly

(Some communities seem to arise for the sake or pleasure, viz. religious

guilds and social clubs; for these exist respectively for the sake

of offering sacrifice and of companionship. But all these seem to

fall under the political community; for it aims not at present advantage

but at what is advantageous for life as a whole), offering sacrifices

and arranging gatherings for the purpose, and assigning honours to

the gods, and providing pleasant relaxations for themselves. For the

ancient sacrifices and gatherings seem to take place after the harvest

as a sort of firstfruits, because it was at these seasons that people

had most leisure. All the communities, then, seem to be parts of the

political community; and the particular kinds friendship will correspond

to the particular kinds of community.
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There are three kinds of constitution, and an equal number of deviation-forms--perversions,

as it were, of them. The constitutions are monarchy, aristocracy,

and thirdly that which is based on a property qualification, which

it seems appropriate to call timocratic, though most people are wont

to call it polity. The best of these is monarchy, the worst timocracy.

The deviation from monarchy is tyrany; for both are forms of one-man

rule, but there is the greatest difference between them; the tyrant

looks to his own advantage, the king to that of his subjects. For

a man is not a king unless he is sufficient to himself and excels

his subjects in all good things; and such a man needs nothing further;

therefore he will not look to his own interests but to those of his

subjects; for a king who is not like that would be a mere titular

king. Now tyranny is the very contrary of this; the tyrant pursues

his own good. And it is clearer in the case of tyranny that it is

the worst deviation-form; but it is the contrary of the best that

is worst. Monarchy passes over into tyranny; for tyranny is the evil

form of one-man rule and the bad king becomes a tyrant. Aristocracy

passes over into oligarchy by the badness of the rulers, who distribute

contrary to equity what belongs to the city-all or most of the good

things to themselves, and office always to the same people, paying

most regard to wealth; thus the rulers are few and are bad men instead

of the most worthy. Timocracy passes over into democracy; for these

are coterminous, since it is the ideal even of timocracy to be the

rule of the majority, and all who have the property qualification

count as equal. Democracy is the least bad of the deviations; for

in its case the form of constitution is but a slight deviation. These

then are the changes to which constitutions are most subject; for

these are the smallest and easiest transitions.

One may find resemblances to the constitutions and, as it were, patterns

of them even in households. For the association of a father with his

sons bears the form of monarchy, since the father cares for his children;

and this is why Homer calls Zeus 'father'; it is the ideal of monarchy

to be paternal rule. But among the Persians the rule of the father

is tyrannical; they use their sons as slaves. Tyrannical too is the

rule of a master over slaves; for it is the advantage of the master

that is brought about in it. Now this seems to be a correct form of

government, but the Persian type is perverted; for the modes of rule

appropriate to different relations are diverse. The association of

man and wife seems to be aristocratic; for the man rules in accordance

with his worth, and in those matters in which a man should rule, but

the matters that befit a woman he hands over to her. If the man rules

in everything the relation passes over into oligarchy; for in doing

so he is not acting in accordance with their respective worth, and

not ruling in virtue of his superiority. Sometimes, however, women

rule, because they are heiresses; so their rule is not in virtue of

excellence but due to wealth and power, as in oligarchies. The association

of brothers is like timocracy; for they are equal, except in so far

as they differ in age; hence if they differ much in age, the friendship

is no longer of the fraternal type. Democracy is found chiefly in

masterless dwellings (for here every one is on an equality), and in

those in which the ruler is weak and every one has licence to do as

he pleases.
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Each of the constitutions may be seen to involve friendship just in

so far as it involves justice. The friendship between a king and his

subjects depends on an excess of benefits conferred; for he confers

benefits on his subjects if being a good man he cares for them with

a view to their well-being, as a shepherd does for his sheep (whence

Homer called Agamemnon 'shepherd of the peoples'). Such too is the

friendship of a father, though this exceeds the other in the greatness

of the benefits conferred; for he is responsible for the existence

of his children, which is thought the greatest good, and for their

nurture and upbringing.

These things are ascribed to ancestors as well. Further, by nature

a father tends to rule over his sons, ancestors over descendants,

a king over his subjects. These friendships imply superiority of one

party over the other, which is why ancestors are honoured. The justice

therefore that exists between persons so related is not the same on

both sides but is in every case proportioned to merit; for that is

true of the friendship as well. The friendship of man and wife, again,

is the same that is found in an aristocracy; for it is in accordance

with virtue the better gets more of what is good, and each gets what

befits him; and so, too, with the justice in these relations. The

friendship of brothers is like that of comrades; for they are equal

and of like age, and such persons are for the most part like in their

feelings and their character. Like this, too, is the friendship appropriate

to timocratic government; for in such a constitution the ideal is

for the citizens to be equal and fair; therefore rule is taken in

turn, and on equal terms; and the friendship appropriate here will

correspond.

But in the deviation-forms, as justice hardly exists, so too does

friendship. It exists least in the worst form; in tyranny there is

little or no friendship. For where there is nothing common to ruler

and ruled, there is not friendship either, since there is not justice;

e.g. between craftsman and tool, soul and body, master and slave;

the latter in each case is benefited by that which uses it, but there

is no friendship nor justice towards lifeless things. But neither

is there friendship towards a horse or an ox, nor to a slave qua slave.

For there is nothing common to the two parties; the slave is a living

tool and the tool a lifeless slave. Qua slave then, one cannot be

friends with him. But qua man one can; for there seems to be some

justice between any man and any other who can share in a system of

law or be a party to an agreement; therefore there can also be friendship

with him in so far as he is a man. Therefore while in tyrannies friendship

and justice hardly exist, in democracies they exist more fully; for

where the citizens are equal they have much in common.

12

Every form of friendship, then, involves association, as has been

said. One might, however, mark off from the rest both the friendship

of kindred and that of comrades. Those of fellow-citizens, fellow-tribesmen,

fellow-voyagers, and the like are more like mere friendships of association;

for they seem to rest on a sort of compact. With them we might class

the friendship of host and guest. The friendship of kinsmen itself,

while it seems to be of many kinds, appears to depend in every case

on parental friendship; for parents love their children as being a

part of themselves, and children their parents as being something

originating from them. Now (1) arents know their offspring better

than there children know that they are their children, and (2) the

originator feels his offspring to be his own more than the offspring

do their begetter; for the product belongs to the producer (e.g. a

tooth or hair or anything else to him whose it is), but the producer

does not belong to the product, or belongs in a less degree. And (3)

the length of time produces the same result; parents love their children

as soon as these are born, but children love their parents only after

time has elapsed and they have acquired understanding or the power

of discrimination by the senses. From these considerations it is also

plain why mothers love more than fathers do. Parents, then, love their

children as themselves (for their issue are by virtue of their separate

existence a sort of other selves), while children love their parents

as being born of them, and brothers love each other as being born

of the same parents; for their identity with them makes them identical

with each other (which is the reason why people talk of 'the same

blood', 'the same stock', and so on). They are, therefore, in a sense

the same thing, though in separate individuals. Two things that contribute

greatly to friendship are a common upbringing and similarity of age;

for 'two of an age take to each other', and people brought up together

tend to be comrades; whence the friendship of brothers is akin to

that of comrades. And cousins and other kinsmen are bound up together

by derivation from brothers, viz. by being derived from the same parents.

They come to be closer together or farther apart by virtue of the

nearness or distance of the original ancestor.

The friendship of children to parents, and of men to gods, is a relation

to them as to something good and superior; for they have conferred

the greatest benefits, since they are the causes of their being and

of their nourishment, and of their education from their birth; and

this kind of friendship possesses pleasantness and utility also, more

than that of strangers, inasmuch as their life is lived more in common.

The friendship of brothers has the characteristics found in that of

comrades (and especially when these are good), and in general between

people who are like each other, inasmuch as they belong more to each

other and start with a love for each other from their very birth,

and inasmuch as those born of the same parents and brought up together

and similarly educated are more akin in character; and the test of

time has been applied most fully and convincingly in their case.

Between other kinsmen friendly relations are found in due proportion.

Between man and wife friendship seems to exist by nature; for man

is naturally inclined to form couples-even more than to form cities,

inasmuch as the household is earlier and more necessary than the city,

and reproduction is more common to man with the animals. With the

other animals the union extends only to this point, but human beings

live together not only for the sake of reproduction but also for the

various purposes of life; for from the start the functions are divided,

and those of man and woman are different; so they help each other

by throwing their peculiar gifts into the common stock. It is for

these reasons that both utility and pleasure seem to be found in this

kind of friendship. But this friendship may be based also on virtue,

if the parties are good; for each has its own virtue and they will

delight in the fact. And children seem to be a bond of union (which

is the reason why childless people part more easily); for children

are a good common to both and what is common holds them together.

How man and wife and in general friend and friend ought mutually to

behave seems to be the same question as how it is just for them to

behave; for a man does not seem to have the same duties to a friend,

a stranger, a comrade, and a schoolfellow.

13

There are three kinds of friendship, as we said at the outset of our

inquiry, and in respect of each some are friends on an equality and

others by virtue of a superiority (for not only can equally good men

become friends but a better man can make friends with a worse, and

similarly in friendships of pleasure or utility the friends may be

equal or unequal in the benefits they confer). This being so, equals

must effect the required equalization on a basis of equality in love

and in all other respects, while unequals must render what is in proportion

to their superiority or inferiority. Complaints and reproaches arise

either only or chiefly in the friendship of utility, and this is only

to be expected. For those who are friends on the ground of virtue

are anxious to do well by each other (since that is a mark of virtue

and of friendship), and between men who are emulating each other in

this there cannot be complaints or quarrels; no one is offended by

a man who loves him and does well by him-if he is a person of nice

feeling he takes his revenge by doing well by the other. And the man

who excels the other in the services he renders will not complain

of his friend, since he gets what he aims at; for each man desires

what is good. Nor do complaints arise much even in friendships of

pleasure; for both get at the same time what they desire, if they

enjoy spending their time together; and even a man who complained

of another for not affording him pleasure would seem ridiculous, since

it is in his power not to spend his days with him.

But the friendship of utility is full of complaints; for as they use

each other for their own interests they always want to get the better

of the bargain, and think they have got less than they should, and

blame their partners because they do not get all they 'want and deserve';

and those who do well by others cannot help them as much as those

whom they benefit want.

Now it seems that, as justice is of two kinds, one unwritten and the

other legal, one kind of friendship of utility is moral and the other

legal. And so complaints arise most of all when men do not dissolve

the relation in the spirit of the same type of friendship in which

they contracted it. The legal type is that which is on fixed terms;

its purely commercial variety is on the basis of immediate payment,

while the more liberal variety allows time but stipulates for a definite

quid pro quo. In this variety the debt is clear and not ambiguous,

but in the postponement it contains an element of friendliness; and

so some states do not allow suits arising out of such agreements,

but think men who have bargained on a basis of credit ought to accept

the consequences. The moral type is not on fixed terms; it makes a

gift, or does whatever it does, as to a friend; but one expects to

receive as much or more, as having not given but lent; and if a man

is worse off when the relation is dissolved than he was when it was

contracted he will complain. This happens because all or most men,

while they wish for what is noble, choose what is advantageous; now

it is noble to do well by another without a view to repayment, but

it is the receiving of benefits that is advantageous. Therefore if

we can we should return the equivalent of what we have received (for

we must not make a man our friend against his will; we must recognize

that we were mistaken at the first and took a benefit from a person

we should not have taken it from-since it was not from a friend, nor

from one who did it just for the sake of acting so-and we must settle

up just as if we had been benefited on fixed terms). Indeed, one would

agree to repay if one could (if one could not, even the giver would

not have expected one to do so); therefore if it is possible we must

repay. But at the outset we must consider the man by whom we are being

benefited and on what terms he is acting, in order that we may accept

the benefit on these terms, or else decline it.

It is disputable whether we ought to measure a service by its utility

to the receiver and make the return with a view to that, or by the

benevolence of the giver. For those who have received say they have

received from their benefactors what meant little to the latter and

what they might have got from others-minimizing the service; while

the givers, on the contrary, say it was the biggest thing they had,

and what could not have been got from others, and that it was given

in times of danger or similar need. Now if the friendship is one that

aims at utility, surely the advantage to the receiver is the measure.

For it is he that asks for the service, and the other man helps him

on the assumption that he will receive the equivalent; so the assistance

has been precisely as great as the advantage to the receiver, and

therefore he must return as much as he has received, or even more

(for that would be nobler). In friendships based on virtue on the

other hand, complaints do not arise, but the purpose of the doer is

a sort of measure; for in purpose lies the essential element of virtue

and character.
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Differences arise also in friendships based on superiority; for each

expects to get more out of them, but when this happens the friendship

is dissolved. Not only does the better man think he ought to get more,

since more should be assigned to a good man, but the more useful similarly

expects this; they say a useless man should not get as much as they

should, since it becomes an act of public service and not a friendship

if the proceeds of the friendship do not answer to the worth of the

benefits conferred. For they think that, as in a commercial partnership

those who put more in get more out, so it should be in friendship.

But the man who is in a state of need and inferiority makes the opposite

claim; they think it is the part of a good friend to help those who

are in need; what, they say, is the use of being the friend of a good

man or a powerful man, if one is to get nothing out of it?

At all events it seems that each party is justified in his claim,

and that each should get more out of the friendship than the other-not

more of the same thing, however, but the superior more honour and

the inferior more gain; for honour is the prize of virtue and of beneficence,

while gain is the assistance required by inferiority.

It seems to be so in constitutional arrangements also; the man who

contributes nothing good to the common stock is not honoured; for

what belongs to the public is given to the man who benefits the public,

and honour does belong to the public. It is not possible to get wealth

from the common stock and at the same time honour. For no one puts

up with the smaller share in all things; therefore to the man who

loses in wealth they assign honour and to the man who is willing to

be paid, wealth, since the proportion to merit equalizes the parties

and preserves the friendship, as we have said. This then is also the

way in which we should associate with unequals; the man who is benefited

in respect of wealth or virtue must give honour in return, repaying

what he can. For friendship asks a man to do what he can, not what

is proportional to the merits of the case; since that cannot always

be done, e.g. in honours paid to the gods or to parents; for no one

could ever return to them the equivalent of what he gets, but the

man who serves them to the utmost of his power is thought to be a

good man. This is why it would not seem open to a man to disown his

father (though a father may disown his son); being in debt, he should

repay, but there is nothing by doing which a son will have done the

equivalent of what he has received, so that he is always in debt.

But creditors can remit a debt; and a father can therefore do so too.

At the same time it is thought that presumably no one would repudiate

a son who was not far gone in wickedness; for apart from the natural

friendship of father and son it is human nature not to reject a son's

assistance. But the son, if he is wicked, will naturally avoid aiding

his father, or not be zealous about it; for most people wish to get

benefits, but avoid doing them, as a thing unprofitable.-So much for

these questions.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK IX

1

In all friendships between dissimilars it is, as we have said, proportion

that equalizes the parties and preserves the friendship; e.g. in the

political form of friendship the shoemaker gets a return for his shoes

in proportion to his worth, and the weaver and all other craftsmen

do the same. Now here a common measure has been provided in the form

of money, and therefore everything is referred to this and measured

by this; but in the friendship of lovers sometimes the lover complains

that his excess of love is not met by love in return though perhaps

there is nothing lovable about him), while often the beloved complains

that the lover who formerly promised everything now performs nothing.

Such incidents happen when the lover loves the beloved for the sake

of pleasure while the beloved loves the lover for the sake of utility,

and they do not both possess the qualities expected of them. If these

be the objects of the friendship it is dissolved when they do not

get the things that formed the motives of their love; for each did

not love the other person himself but the qualities he had, and these

were not enduring; that is why the friendships also are transient.

But the love of characters, as has been said, endures because it is

self-dependent. Differences arise when what they get is something

different and not what they desire; for it is like getting nothing

at all when we do not get what we aim at; compare the story of the

person who made promises to a lyre-player, promising him the more,

the better he sang, but in the morning, when the other demanded the

fulfilment of his promises, said that he had given pleasure for pleasure.

Now if this had been what each wanted, all would have been well; but

if the one wanted enjoyment but the other gain, and the one has what

he wants while the other has not, the terms of the association will

not have been properly fulfilled; for what each in fact wants is what

he attends to, and it is for the sake of that that that he will give

what he has.

But who is to fix the worth of the service; he who makes the sacrifice

or he who has got the advantage? At any rate the other seems to leave

it to him. This is what they say Protagoras used to do; whenever he

taught anything whatsoever, he bade the learner assess the value of

the knowledge, and accepted the amount so fixed. But in such matters

some men approve of the saying 'let a man have his fixed reward'.

Those who get the money first and then do none of the things they

said they would, owing to the extravagance of their promises, naturally

find themselves the objects of complaint; for they do not fulfil what

they agreed to. The sophists are perhaps compelled to do this because

no one would give money for the things they do know. These people

then, if they do not do what they have been paid for, are naturally

made the objects of complaint.

But where there is no contract of service, those who give up something

for the sake of the other party cannot (as we have said) be complained

of (for that is the nature of the friendship of virtue), and the return

to them must be made on the basis of their purpose (for it is purpose

that is the characteristic thing in a friend and in virtue). And so

too, it seems, should one make a return to those with whom one has

studied philosophy; for their worth cannot be measured against money,

and they can get no honour which will balance their services, but

still it is perhaps enough, as it is with the gods and with one's

parents, to give them what one can.

If the gift was not of this sort, but was made with a view to a return,

it is no doubt preferable that the return made should be one that

seems fair to both parties, but if this cannot be achieved, it would

seem not only necessary that the person who gets the first service

should fix the reward, but also just; for if the other gets in return

the equivalent of the advantage the beneficiary has received, or the

price lie would have paid for the pleasure, he will have got what

is fair as from the other.

We see this happening too with things put up for sale, and in some

places there are laws providing that no actions shall arise out of

voluntary contracts, on the assumption that one should settle with

a person to whom one has given credit, in the spirit in which one

bargained with him. The law holds that it is more just that the person

to whom credit was given should fix the terms than that the person

who gave credit should do so. For most things are not assessed at

the same value by those who have them and those who want them; each

class values highly what is its own and what it is offering; yet the

return is made on the terms fixed by the receiver. But no doubt the

receiver should assess a thing not at what it seems worth when he

has it, but at what he assessed it at before he had it.
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A further problem is set by such questions as, whether one should

in all things give the preference to one's father and obey him, or

whether when one is ill one should trust a doctor, and when one has

to elect a general should elect a man of military skill; and similarly

whether one should render a service by preference to a friend or to

a good man, and should show gratitude to a benefactor or oblige a

friend, if one cannot do both.

All such questions are hard, are they not, to decide with precision?

For they admit of many variations of all sorts in respect both of

the magnitude of the service and of its nobility necessity. But that

we should not give the preference in all things to the same person

is plain enough; and we must for the most part return benefits rather

than oblige friends, as we must pay back a loan to a creditor rather

than make one to a friend. But perhaps even this is not always true;

e.g. should a man who has been ransomed out of the hands of brigands

ransom his ransomer in return, whoever he may be (or pay him if he

has not been captured but demands payment) or should he ransom his

father? It would seem that he should ransom his father in preference

even to himself. As we have said, then, generally the debt should

be paid, but if the gift is exceedingly noble or exceedingly necessary,

one should defer to these considerations. For sometimes it is not

even fair to return the equivalent of what one has received, when

the one man has done a service to one whom he knows to be good, while

the other makes a return to one whom he believes to be bad. For that

matter, one should sometimes not lend in return to one who has lent

to oneself; for the one person lent to a good man, expecting to recover

his loan, while the other has no hope of recovering from one who is

believed to be bad. Therefore if the facts really are so, the demand

is not fair; and if they are not, but people think they are, they

would be held to be doing nothing strange in refusing. As we have

often pointed out, then, discussions about feelings and actions have

just as much definiteness as their subject-matter.

That we should not make the same return to every one, nor give a father

the preference in everything, as one does not sacrifice everything

to Zeus, is plain enough; but since we ought to render different things

to parents, brothers, comrades, and benefactors, we ought to render

to each class what is appropriate and becoming. And this is what people

seem in fact to do; to marriages they invite their kinsfolk; for these

have a part in the family and therefore in the doings that affect

the family; and at funerals also they think that kinsfolk, before

all others, should meet, for the same reason. And it would be thought

that in the matter of food we should help our parents before all others,

since we owe our own nourishment to them, and it is more honourable

to help in this respect the authors of our being even before ourselves;

and honour too one should give to one's parents as one does to the

gods, but not any and every honour; for that matter one should not

give the same honour to one's father and one's mother, nor again should

one give them the honour due to a philosopher or to a general, but

the honour due to a father, or again to a mother. To all older persons,

too, one should give honour appropriate to their age, by rising to

receive them and finding seats for them and so on; while to comrades

and brothers one should allow freedom of speech and common use of

all things. To kinsmen, too, and fellow-tribesmen and fellow-citizens

and to every other class one should always try to assign what is appropriate,

and to compare the claims of each class with respect to nearness of

relation and to virtue or usefulness. The comparison is easier when

the persons belong to the same class, and more laborious when they

are different. Yet we must not on that account shrink from the task,

but decide the question as best we can.
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Another question that arises is whether friendships should or should

not be broken off when the other party does not remain the same. Perhaps

we may say that there is nothing strange in breaking off a friendship

based on utility or pleasure, when our friends no longer have these

attributes. For it was of these attributes that we were the friends;

and when these have failed it is reasonable to love no longer. But

one might complain of another if, when he loved us for our usefulness

or pleasantness, he pretended to love us for our character. For, as

we said at the outset, most differences arise between friends when

they are not friends in the spirit in which they think they are. So

when a man has deceived himself and has thought he was being loved

for his character, when the other person was doing nothing of the

kind, he must blame himself; when he has been deceived by the pretences

of the other person, it is just that he should complain against his

deceiver; he will complain with more justice than one does against

people who counterfeit the currency, inasmuch as the wrongdoing is

concerned with something more valuable.

But if one accepts another man as good, and he turns out badly and

is seen to do so, must one still love him? Surely it is impossible,

since not everything can be loved, but only what is good. What is

evil neither can nor should be loved; for it is not one's duty to

be a lover of evil, nor to become like what is bad; and we have said

that like is dear like. Must the friendship, then, be forthwith broken

off? Or is this not so in all cases, but only when one's friends are

incurable in their wickedness? If they are capable of being reformed

one should rather come to the assistance of their character or their

property, inasmuch as this is better and more characteristic of friendship.

But a man who breaks off such a friendship would seem to be doing

nothing strange; for it was not to a man of this sort that he was

a friend; when his friend has changed, therefore, and he is unable

to save him, he gives him up.

But if one friend remained the same while the other became better

and far outstripped him in virtue, should the latter treat the former

as a friend? Surely he cannot. When the interval is great this becomes

most plain, e.g. in the case of childish friendships; if one friend

remained a child in intellect while the other became a fully developed

man, how could they be friends when they neither approved of the same

things nor delighted in and were pained by the same things? For not

even with regard to each other will their tastes agree, and without

this (as we saw) they cannot be friends; for they cannot live together.

But we have discussed these matters.

Should he, then, behave no otherwise towards him than he would if

he had never been his friend? Surely he should keep a remembrance

of their former intimacy, and as we think we ought to oblige friends

rather than strangers, so to those who have been our friends we ought

to make some allowance for our former friendship, when the breach

has not been due to excess of wickedness.
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Friendly relations with one's neighbours, and the marks by which friendships

are defined, seem to have proceeded from a man's relations to himself.

For (1) we define a friend as one who wishes and does what is good,

or seems so, for the sake of his friend, or (2) as one who wishes

his friend to exist and live, for his sake; which mothers do to their

children, and friends do who have come into conflict. And (3) others

define him as one who lives with and (4) has the same tastes as another,

or (5) one who grieves and rejoices with his friend; and this too

is found in mothers most of all. It is by some one of these characterstics

that friendship too is defined.

Now each of these is true of the good man's relation to himself (and

of all other men in so far as they think themselves good; virtue and

the good man seem, as has been said, to be the measure of every class

of things). For his opinions are harmonious, and he desires the same

things with all his soul; and therefore he wishes for himself what

is good and what seems so, and does it (for it is characteristic of

the good man to work out the good), and does so for his own sake (for

he does it for the sake of the intellectual element in him, which

is thought to be the man himself); and he wishes himself to live and

be preserved, and especially the element by virtue of which he thinks.

For existence is good to the virtuous man, and each man wishes himself

what is good, while no one chooses to possess the whole world if he

has first to become some one else (for that matter, even now God possesses

the good); he wishes for this only on condition of being whatever

he is; and the element that thinks would seem to be the individual

man, or to be so more than any other element in him. And such a man

wishes to live with himself; for he does so with pleasure, since the

memories of his past acts are delightful and his hopes for the future

are good, and therefore pleasant. His mind is well stored too with

subjects of contemplation. And he grieves and rejoices, more than

any other, with himself; for the same thing is always painful, and

the same thing always pleasant, and not one thing at one time and

another at another; he has, so to speak, nothing to repent of.

Therefore, since each of these characteristics belongs to the good

man in relation to himself, and he is related to his friend as to

himself (for his friend is another self), friendship too is thought

to be one of these attributes, and those who have these attributes

to be friends. Whether there is or is not friendship between a man

and himself is a question we may dismiss for the present; there would

seem to be friendship in so far as he is two or more, to judge from

the afore-mentioned attributes of friendship, and from the fact that

the extreme of friendship is likened to one's love for oneself.

But the attributes named seem to belong even to the majority of men,

poor creatures though they may be. Are we to say then that in so far

as they are satisfied with themselves and think they are good, they

share in these attributes? Certainly no one who is thoroughly bad

and impious has these attributes, or even seems to do so. They hardly

belong even to inferior people; for they are at variance with themselves,

and have appetites for some things and rational desires for others.

This is true, for instance, of incontinent people; for they choose,

instead of the things they themselves think good, things that are

pleasant but hurtful; while others again, through cowardice and laziness,

shrink from doing what they think best for themselves. And those who

have done many terrible deeds and are hated for their wickedness even

shrink from life and destroy themselves. And wicked men seek for people

with whom to spend their days, and shun themselves; for they remember

many a grevious deed, and anticipate others like them, when they are

by themselves, but when they are with others they forget. And having

nothing lovable in them they have no feeling of love to themselves.

Therefore also such men do not rejoice or grieve with themselves;

for their soul is rent by faction, and one element in it by reason

of its wickedness grieves when it abstains from certain acts, while

the other part is pleased, and one draws them this way and the other

that, as if they were pulling them in pieces. If a man cannot at the

same time be pained and pleased, at all events after a short time

he is pained because he was pleased, and he could have wished that

these things had not been pleasant to him; for bad men are laden with

repentance.

Therefore the bad man does not seem to be amicably disposed even to

himself, because there is nothing in him to love; so that if to be

thus is the height of wretchedness, we should strain every nerve to

avoid wickedness and should endeavour to be good; for so and only

so can one be either friendly to oneself or a friend to another.
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Goodwill is a friendly sort of relation, but is not identical with

friendship; for one may have goodwill both towards people whom one

does not know, and without their knowing it, but not friendship. This

has indeed been said already.' But goodwill is not even friendly feeling.

For it does not involve intensity or desire, whereas these accompany

friendly feeling; and friendly feeling implies intimacy while goodwill

may arise of a sudden, as it does towards competitors in a contest;

we come to feel goodwill for them and to share in their wishes, but

we would not do anything with them; for, as we said, we feel goodwill

suddenly and love them only superficially.

Goodwill seems, then, to be a beginning of friendship, as the pleasure

of the eye is the beginning of love. For no one loves if he has not

first been delighted by the form of the beloved, but he who delights

in the form of another does not, for all that, love him, but only

does so when he also longs for him when absent and craves for his

presence; so too it is not possible for people to be friends if they

have not come to feel goodwill for each other, but those who feel

goodwill are not for all that friends; for they only wish well to

those for whom they feel goodwill, and would not do anything with

them nor take trouble for them. And so one might by an extension of

the term friendship say that goodwill is inactive friendship, though

when it is prolonged and reaches the point of intimacy it becomes

friendship-not the friendship based on utility nor that based on pleasure;

for goodwill too does not arise on those terms. The man who has received

a benefit bestows goodwill in return for what has been done to him,

but in doing so is only doing what is just; while he who wishes some

one to prosper because he hopes for enrichment through him seems to

have goodwill not to him but rather to himself, just as a man is not

a friend to another if he cherishes him for the sake of some use to

be made of him. In general, goodwill arises on account of some excellence

and worth, when one man seems to another beautiful or brave or something

of the sort, as we pointed out in the case of competitors in a contest.
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Unanimity also seems to be a friendly relation. For this reason it

is not identity of opinion; for that might occur even with people

who do not know each other; nor do we say that people who have the

same views on any and every subject are unanimous, e.g. those who

agree about the heavenly bodies (for unanimity about these is not

a friendly relation), but we do say that a city is unanimous when

men have the same opinion about what is to their interest, and choose

the same actions, and do what they have resolved in common. It is

about things to be done, therefore, that people are said to be unanimous,

and, among these, about matters of consequence and in which it is

possible for both or all parties to get what they want; e.g. a city

is unanimous when all its citizens think that the offices in it should

be elective, or that they should form an alliance with Sparta, or

that Pittacus should be their ruler-at a time when he himself was

also willing to rule. But when each of two people wishes himself to

have the thing in question, like the captains in the Phoenissae, they

are in a state of faction; for it is not unanimity when each of two

parties thinks of the same thing, whatever that may be, but only when

they think of the same thing in the same hands, e.g. when both the

common people and those of the better class wish the best men to rule;

for thus and thus alone do all get what they aim at. Unanimity seems,

then, to be political friendship, as indeed it is commonly said to

be; for it is concerned with things that are to our interest and have

an influence on our life.

Now such unanimity is found among good men; for they are unanimous

both in themselves and with one another, being, so to say, of one

mind (for the wishes of such men are constant and not at the mercy

of opposing currents like a strait of the sea), and they wish for

what is just and what is advantageous, and these are the objects of

their common endeavour as well. But bad men cannot be unanimous except

to a small extent, any more than they can be friends, since they aim

at getting more than their share of advantages, while in labour and

public service they fall short of their share; and each man wishing

for advantage to himself criticizes his neighbour and stands in his

way; for if people do not watch it carefully the common weal is soon

destroyed. The result is that they are in a state of faction, putting

compulsion on each other but unwilling themselves to do what is just.
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Benefactors are thought to love those they have benefited, more than

those who have been well treated love those that have treated them

well, and this is discussed as though it were paradoxical. Most people

think it is because the latter are in the position of debtors and

the former of creditors; and therefore as, in the case of loans, debtors

wish their creditors did not exist, while creditors actually take

care of the safety of their debtors, so it is thought that benefactors

wish the objects of their action to exist since they will then get

their gratitude, while the beneficiaries take no interest in making

this return. Epicharmus would perhaps declare that they say this because

they 'look at things on their bad side', but it is quite like human

nature; for most people are forgetful, and are more anxious to be

well treated than to treat others well. But the cause would seem to

be more deeply rooted in the nature of things; the case of those who

have lent money is not even analogous. For they have no friendly feeling

to their debtors, but only a wish that they may kept safe with a view

to what is to be got from them; while those who have done a service

to others feel friendship and love for those they have served even

if these are not of any use to them and never will be. This is what

happens with craftsmen too; every man loves his own handiwork better

than he would be loved by it if it came alive; and this happens perhaps

most of all with poets; for they have an excessive love for their

own poems, doting on them as if they were their children. This is

what the position of benefactors is like; for that which they have

treated well is their handiwork, and therefore they love this more

than the handiwork does its maker. The cause of this is that existence

is to all men a thing to be chosen and loved, and that we exist by

virtue of activity (i.e. by living and acting), and that the handiwork

is in a sense, the producer in activity; he loves his handiwork, therefore,

because he loves existence. And this is rooted in the nature of things;

for what he is in potentiality, his handiwork manifests in activity.

At the same time to the benefactor that is noble which depends on

his action, so that he delights in the object of his action, whereas

to the patient there is nothing noble in the agent, but at most something

advantageous, and this is less pleasant and lovable. What is pleasant

is the activity of the present, the hope of the future, the memory

of the past; but most pleasant is that which depends on activity,

and similarly this is most lovable. Now for a man who has made something

his work remains (for the noble is lasting), but for the person acted

on the utility passes away. And the memory of noble things is pleasant,

but that of useful things is not likely to be pleasant, or is less

so; though the reverse seems true of expectation.

Further, love is like activity, being loved like passivity; and loving

and its concomitants are attributes of those who are the more active.

Again, all men love more what they have won by labour; e.g. those

who have made their money love it more than those who have inherited

it; and to be well treated seems to involve no labour, while to treat

others well is a laborious task. These are the reasons, too, why mothers

are fonder of their children than fathers; bringing them into the

world costs them more pains, and they know better that the children

are their own. This last point, too, would seem to apply to benefactors.
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The question is also debated, whether a man should love himself most,

or some one else. People criticize those who love themselves most,

and call them self-lovers, using this as an epithet of disgrace, and

a bad man seems to do everything for his own sake, and the more so

the more wicked he is-and so men reproach him, for instance, with

doing nothing of his own accord-while the good man acts for honour's

sake, and the more so the better he is, and acts for his friend's

sake, and sacrifices his own interest.

But the facts clash with these arguments, and this is not surprising.

For men say that one ought to love best one's best friend, and man's

best friend is one who wishes well to the object of his wish for his

sake, even if no one is to know of it; and these attributes are found

most of all in a man's attitude towards himself, and so are all the

other attributes by which a friend is defined; for, as we have said,

it is from this relation that all the characteristics of friendship

have extended to our neighbours. All the proverbs, too, agree with

this, e.g. 'a single soul', and 'what friends have is common property',

and 'friendship is equality', and 'charity begins at home'; for all

these marks will be found most in a man's relation to himself; he

is his own best friend and therefore ought to love himself best. It

is therefore a reasonable question, which of the two views we should

follow; for both are plausible.

Perhaps we ought to mark off such arguments from each other and determine

how far and in what respects each view is right. Now if we grasp the

sense in which each school uses the phrase 'lover of self', the truth

may become evident. Those who use the term as one of reproach ascribe

self-love to people who assign to themselves the greater share of

wealth, honours, and bodily pleasures; for these are what most people

desire, and busy themselves about as though they were the best of

all things, which is the reason, too, why they become objects of competition.

So those who are grasping with regard to these things gratify their

appetites and in general their feelings and the irrational element

of the soul; and most men are of this nature (which is the reason

why the epithet has come to be used as it is-it takes its meaning

from the prevailing type of self-love, which is a bad one); it is

just, therefore, that men who are lovers of self in this way are reproached

for being so. That it is those who give themselves the preference

in regard to objects of this sort that most people usually call lovers

of self is plain; for if a man were always anxious that he himself,

above all things, should act justly, temperately, or in accordance

with any other of the virtues, and in general were always to try to

secure for himself the honourable course, no one will call such a

man a lover of self or blame him.

But such a man would seem more than the other a lover of self; at

all events he assigns to himself the things that are noblest and best,

and gratifies the most authoritative element in and in all things

obeys this; and just as a city or any other systematic whole is most

properly identified with the most authoritative element in it, so

is a man; and therefore the man who loves this and gratifies it is

most of all a lover of self. Besides, a man is said to have or not

to have self-control according as his reason has or has not the control,

on the assumption that this is the man himself; and the things men

have done on a rational principle are thought most properly their

own acts and voluntary acts. That this is the man himself, then, or

is so more than anything else, is plain, and also that the good man

loves most this part of him. Whence it follows that he is most truly

a lover of self, of another type than that which is a matter of reproach,

and as different from that as living according to a rational principle

is from living as passion dictates, and desiring what is noble from

desiring what seems advantageous. Those, then, who busy themselves

in an exceptional degree with noble actions all men approve and praise;

and if all were to strive towards what is noble and strain every nerve

to do the noblest deeds, everything would be as it should be for the

common weal, and every one would secure for himself the goods that

are greatest, since virtue is the greatest of goods.

Therefore the good man should be a lover of self (for he will both

himself profit by doing noble acts, and will benefit his fellows),

but the wicked man should not; for he will hurt both himself and his

neighbours, following as he does evil passions. For the wicked man,

what he does clashes with what he ought to do, but what the good man

ought to do he does; for reason in each of its possessors chooses

what is best for itself, and the good man obeys his reason. It is

true of the good man too that he does many acts for the sake of his

friends and his country, and if necessary dies for them; for he will

throw away both wealth and honours and in general the goods that are

objects of competition, gaining for himself nobility; since he would

prefer a short period of intense pleasure to a long one of mild enjoyment,

a twelvemonth of noble life to many years of humdrum existence, and

one great and noble action to many trivial ones. Now those who die

for others doubtless attain this result; it is therefore a great prize

that they choose for themselves. They will throw away wealth too on

condition that their friends will gain more; for while a man's friend

gains wealth he himself achieves nobility; he is therefore assigning

the greater good to himself. The same too is true of honour and office;

all these things he will sacrifice to his friend; for this is noble

and laudable for himself. Rightly then is he thought to be good, since

he chooses nobility before all else. But he may even give up actions

to his friend; it may be nobler to become the cause of his friend's

acting than to act himself. In all the actions, therefore, that men

are praised for, the good man is seen to assign to himself the greater

share in what is noble. In this sense, then, as has been said, a man

should be a lover of self; but in the sense in which most men are

so, he ought not.
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It is also disputed whether the happy man will need friends or not.

It is said that those who are supremely happy and self-sufficient

have no need of friends; for they have the things that are good, and

therefore being self-sufficient they need nothing further, while a

friend, being another self, furnishes what a man cannot provide by

his own effort; whence the saying 'when fortune is kind, what need

of friends?' But it seems strange, when one assigns all good things

to the happy man, not to assign friends, who are thought the greatest

of external goods. And if it is more characteristic of a friend to

do well by another than to be well done by, and to confer benefits

is characteristic of the good man and of virtue, and it is nobler

to do well by friends than by strangers, the good man will need people

to do well by. This is why the question is asked whether we need friends

more in prosperity or in adversity, on the assumption that not only

does a man in adversity need people to confer benefits on him, but

also those who are prospering need people to do well by. Surely it

is strange, too, to make the supremely happy man a solitary; for no

one would choose the whole world on condition of being alone, since

man is a political creature and one whose nature is to live with others.

Therefore even the happy man lives with others; for he has the things

that are by nature good. And plainly it is better to spend his days

with friends and good men than with strangers or any chance persons.

Therefore the happy man needs friends.

What then is it that the first school means, and in what respect is

it right? Is it that most identify friends with useful people? Of

such friends indeed the supremely happy man will have no need, since

he already has the things that are good; nor will he need those whom

one makes one's friends because of their pleasantness, or he will

need them only to a small extent (for his life, being pleasant, has

no need of adventitious pleasure); and because he does not need such

friends he is thought not to need friends.

But that is surely not true. For we have said at the outset that happiness

is an activity; and activity plainly comes into being and is not present

at the start like a piece of property. If (1) happiness lies in living

and being active, and the good man's activity is virtuous and pleasant

in itself, as we have said at the outset, and (2) a thing's being

one's own is one of the attributes that make it pleasant, and (3)

we can contemplate our neighbours better than ourselves and their

actions better than our own, and if the actions of virtuous men who

are their friends are pleasant to good men (since these have both

the attributes that are naturally pleasant),-if this be so, the supremely

happy man will need friends of this sort, since his purpose is to

contemplate worthy actions and actions that are his own, and the actions

of a good man who is his friend have both these qualities.

Further, men think that the happy man ought to live pleasantly. Now

if he were a solitary, life would be hard for him; for by oneself

it is not easy to be continuously active; but with others and towards

others it is easier. With others therefore his activity will be more

continuous, and it is in itself pleasant, as it ought to be for the

man who is supremely happy; for a good man qua good delights in virtuous

actions and is vexed at vicious ones, as a musical man enjoys beautiful

tunes but is pained at bad ones. A certain training in virtue arises

also from the company of the good, as Theognis has said before us.

If we look deeper into the nature of things, a virtuous friend seems

to be naturally desirable for a virtuous man. For that which is good

by nature, we have said, is for the virtuous man good and pleasant

in itself. Now life is defined in the case of animals by the power

of perception in that of man by the power of perception or thought;

and a power is defined by reference to the corresponding activity,

which is the essential thing; therefore life seems to be essentially

the act of perceiving or thinking. And life is among the things that

are good and pleasant in themselves, since it is determinate and the

determinate is of the nature of the good; and that which is good by

nature is also good for the virtuous man (which is the reason why

life seems pleasant to all men); but we must not apply this to a wicked

and corrupt life nor to a life spent in pain; for such a life is indeterminate,

as are its attributes. The nature of pain will become plainer in what

follows. But if life itself is good and pleasant (which it seems to

be, from the very fact that all men desire it, and particularly those

who are good and supremely happy; for to such men life is most desirable,

and their existence is the most supremely happy) and if he who sees

perceives that he sees, and he who hears, that he hears, and he who

walks, that he walks, and in the case of all other activities similarly

there is something which perceives that we are active, so that if

we perceive, we perceive that we perceive, and if we think, that we

think; and if to perceive that we perceive or think is to perceive

that we exist (for existence was defined as perceiving or thinking);

and if perceiving that one lives is in itself one of the things that

are pleasant (for life is by nature good, and to perceive what is

good present in oneself is pleasant); and if life is desirable, and

particularly so for good men, because to them existence is good and

pleasant for they are pleased at the consciousness of the presence

in them of what is in itself good); and if as the virtuous man is

to himself, he is to his friend also (for his friend is another self):-if

all this be true, as his own being is desirable for each man, so,

or almost so, is that of his friend. Now his being was seen to be

desirable because he perceived his own goodness, and such perception

is pleasant in itself. He needs, therefore, to be conscious of the

existence of his friend as well, and this will be realized in their

living together and sharing in discussion and thought; for this is

what living together would seem to mean in the case of man, and not,

as in the case of cattle, feeding in the same place.

If, then, being is in itself desirable for the supremely happy man

(since it is by its nature good and pleasant), and that of his friend

is very much the same, a friend will be one of the things that are

desirable. Now that which is desirable for him he must have, or he

will be deficient in this respect. The man who is to be happy will

therefore need virtuous friends.
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Should we, then, make as many friends as possible, or-as in the case

of hospitality it is thought to be suitable advice, that one should

be 'neither a man of many guests nor a man with none'-will that apply

to friendship as well; should a man neither be friendless nor have

an excessive number of friends?

To friends made with a view to utility this saying would seem thoroughly

applicable; for to do services to many people in return is a laborious

task and life is not long enough for its performance. Therefore friends

in excess of those who are sufficient for our own life are superfluous,

and hindrances to the noble life; so that we have no need of them.

Of friends made with a view to pleasure, also, few are enough, as

a little seasoning in food is enough.

But as regards good friends, should we have as many as possible, or

is there a limit to the number of one's friends, as there is to the

size of a city? You cannot make a city of ten men, and if there are

a hundred thousand it is a city no longer. But the proper number is

presumably not a single number, but anything that falls between certain

fixed points. So for friends too there is a fixed number perhaps the

largest number with whom one can live together (for that, we found,

thought to be very characteristic of friendship); and that one cannot

live with many people and divide oneself up among them is plain. Further,

they too must be friends of one another, if they are all to spend

their days together; and it is a hard business for this condition

to be fulfilled with a large number. It is found difficult, too, to

rejoice and to grieve in an intimate way with many people, for it

may likely happen that one has at once to be happy with one friend

and to mourn with another. Presumably, then, it is well not to seek

to have as many friends as possible, but as many as are enough for

the purpose of living together; for it would seem actually impossible

to be a great friend to many people. This is why one cannot love several

people; love is ideally a sort of excess of friendship, and that can

only be felt towards one person; therefore great friendship too can

only be felt towards a few people. This seems to be confirmed in practice;

for we do not find many people who are friends in the comradely way

of friendship, and the famous friendships of this sort are always

between two people. Those who have many friends and mix intimately

with them all are thought to be no one's friend, except in the way

proper to fellow-citizens, and such people are also called obsequious.

In the way proper to fellow-citizens, indeed, it is possible to be

the friend of many and yet not be obsequious but a genuinely good

man; but one cannot have with many people the friendship based on

virtue and on the character of our friends themselves, and we must

be content if we find even a few such.
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Do we need friends more in good fortune or in bad? They are sought

after in both; for while men in adversity need help, in prosperity

they need people to live with and to make the objects of their beneficence;

for they wish to do well by others. Friendship, then, is more necessary

in bad fortune, and so it is useful friends that one wants in this

case; but it is more noble in good fortune, and so we also seek for

good men as our friends, since it is more desirable to confer benefits

on these and to live with these. For the very presence of friends

is pleasant both in good fortune and also in bad, since grief is lightened

when friends sorrow with us. Hence one might ask whether they share

as it were our burden, or-without that happening-their presence by

its pleasantness, and the thought of their grieving with us, make

our pain less. Whether it is for these reasons or for some other that

our grief is lightened, is a question that may be dismissed; at all

events what we have described appears to take place.

But their presence seems to contain a mixture of various factors.

The very seeing of one's friends is pleasant, especially if one is

in adversity, and becomes a safeguard against grief (for a friend

tends to comfort us both by the sight of him and by his words, if

he is tactful, since he knows our character and the things that please

or pain us); but to see him pained at our misfortunes is painful;

for every one shuns being a cause of pain to his friends. For this

reason people of a manly nature guard against making their friends

grieve with them, and, unless he be exceptionally insensible to pain,

such a man cannot stand the pain that ensues for his friends, and

in general does not admit fellow-mourners because he is not himself

given to mourning; but women and womanly men enjoy sympathisers in

their grief, and love them as friends and companions in sorrow. But

in all things one obviously ought to imitate the better type of person.

On the other hand, the presence of friends in our prosperity implies

both a pleasant passing of our time and the pleasant thought of their

pleasure at our own good fortune. For this cause it would seem that

we ought to summon our friends readily to share our good fortunes

(for the beneficent character is a noble one), but summon them to

our bad fortunes with hesitation; for we ought to give them as little

a share as possible in our evils whence the saying 'enough is my misfortune'.

We should summon friends to us most of all when they are likely by

suffering a few inconveniences to do us a great service.

Conversely, it is fitting to go unasked and readily to the aid of

those in adversity (for it is characteristic of a friend to render

services, and especially to those who are in need and have not demanded

them; such action is nobler and pleasanter for both persons); but

when our friends are prosperous we should join readily in their activities

(for they need friends for these too), but be tardy in coming forward

to be the objects of their kindness; for it is not noble to be keen

to receive benefits. Still, we must no doubt avoid getting the reputation

of kill-joys by repulsing them; for that sometimes happens.

The presence of friends, then, seems desirable in all circumstances.
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Does it not follow, then, that, as for lovers the sight of the beloved

is the thing they love most, and they prefer this sense to the others

because on it love depends most for its being and for its origin,

so for friends the most desirable thing is living together? For friendship

is a partnership, and as a man is to himself, so is he to his friend;

now in his own case the consciousness of his being is desirable, and

so therefore is the consciousness of his friend's being, and the activity

of this consciousness is produced when they live together, so that

it is natural that they aim at this. And whatever existence means

for each class of men, whatever it is for whose sake they value life,

in that they wish to occupy themselves with their friends; and so

some drink together, others dice together, others join in athletic

exercises and hunting, or in the study of philosophy, each class spending

their days together in whatever they love most in life; for since

they wish to live with their friends, they do and share in those things

which give them the sense of living together. Thus the friendship

of bad men turns out an evil thing (for because of their instability

they unite in bad pursuits, and besides they become evil by becoming

like each other), while the friendship of good men is good, being

augmented by their companionship; and they are thought to become better

too by their activities and by improving each other; for from each

other they take the mould of the characteristics they approve-whence

the saying 'noble deeds from noble men'.-So much, then, for friendship;

our next task must be to discuss pleasure.

----------------------------------------------------------------------

BOOK X

1

After these matters we ought perhaps next to discuss pleasure. For

it is thought to be most intimately connected with our human nature,

which is the reason why in educating the young we steer them by the

rudders of pleasure and pain; it is thought, too, that to enjoy the

things we ought and to hate the things we ought has the greatest bearing

on virtue of character. For these things extend right through life,

with a weight and power of their own in respect both to virtue and

to the happy life, since men choose what is pleasant and avoid what

is painful; and such things, it will be thought, we should least of

all omit to discuss, especially since they admit of much dispute.

For some say pleasure is the good, while others, on the contrary,

say it is thoroughly bad-some no doubt being persuaded that the facts

are so, and others thinking it has a better effect on our life to

exhibit pleasure as a bad thing even if it is not; for most people

(they think) incline towards it and are the slaves of their pleasures,

for which reason they ought to lead them in the opposite direction,

since thus they will reach the middle state. But surely this is not

correct. For arguments about matters concerned with feelings and actions

are less reliable than facts: and so when they clash with the facts

of perception they are despised, and discredit the truth as well;

if a man who runs down pleasure is once seen to be alming at it, his

inclining towards it is thought to imply that it is all worthy of

being aimed at; for most people are not good at drawing distinctions.

True arguments seem, then, most useful, not only with a view to knowledge,

but with a view to life also; for since they harmonize with the facts

they are believed, and so they stimulate those who understand them

to live according to them.-Enough of such questions; let us proceed

to review the opinions that have been expressed about pleasure.
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Eudoxus thought pleasure was the good because he saw all things, both

rational and irrational, aiming at it, and because in all things that

which is the object of choice is what is excellent, and that which

is most the object of choice the greatest good; thus the fact that

all things moved towards the same object indicated that this was for

all things the chief good (for each thing, he argued, finds its own

good, as it finds its own nourishment); and that which is good for

all things and at which all aim was the good. His arguments were credited

more because of the excellence of his character than for their own

sake; he was thought to be remarkably self-controlled, and therefore

it was thought that he was not saying what he did say as a friend

of pleasure, but that the facts really were so. He believed that the

same conclusion followed no less plainly from a study of the contrary

of pleasure; pain was in itself an object of aversion to all things,

and therefore its contrary must be similarly an object of choice.

And again that is most an object of choice which we choose not because

or for the sake of something else, and pleasure is admittedly of this

nature; for no one asks to what end he is pleased, thus implying that

pleasure is in itself an object of choice. Further, he argued that

pleasure when added to any good, e.g. to just or temperate action,

makes it more worthy of choice, and that it is only by itself that

the good can be increased.

This argument seems to show it to be one of the goods, and no more

a good than any other; for every good is more worthy of choice along

with another good than taken alone. And so it is by an argument of

this kind that Plato proves the good not to be pleasure; he argues

that the pleasant life is more desirable with wisdom than without,

and that if the mixture is better, pleasure is not the good; for the

good cannot become more desirable by the addition of anything to it.

Now it is clear that nothing else, any more than pleasure, can be

the good if it is made more desirable by the addition of any of the

things that are good in themselves. What, then, is there that satisfies

this criterion, which at the same time we can participate in? It is

something of this sort that we are looking for. Those who object that

that at which all things aim is not necessarily good are, we may surmise,

talking nonsense. For we say that that which every one thinks really

is so; and the man who attacks this belief will hardly have anything

more credible to maintain instead. If it is senseless creatures that

desire the things in question, there might be something in what they

say; but if intelligent creatures do so as well, what sense can there

be in this view? But perhaps even in inferior creatures there is some

natural good stronger than themselves which aims at their proper good.

Nor does the argument about the contrary of pleasure seem to be correct.

They say that if pain is an evil it does not follow that pleasure

is a good; for evil is opposed to evil and at the same time both are

opposed to the neutral state-which is correct enough but does not

apply to the things in question. For if both pleasure and pain belonged

to the class of evils they ought both to be objects of aversion, while

if they belonged to the class of neutrals neither should be an object

of aversion or they should both be equally so; but in fact people

evidently avoid the one as evil and choose the other as good; that

then must be the nature of the opposition between them.
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Nor again, if pleasure is not a quality, does it follow that it is

not a good; for the activities of virtue are not qualities either,

nor is happiness. They say, however, that the good is determinate,

while pleasure is indeterminate, because it admits of degrees. Now

if it is from the feeling of pleasure that they judge thus, the same

will be true of justice and the other virtues, in respect of which

we plainly say that people of a certain character are so more or less,

and act more or less in accordance with these virtues; for people

may be more just or brave, and it is possible also to act justly or

temperately more or less. But if their judgement is based on the various

pleasures, surely they are not stating the real cause, if in fact

some pleasures are unmixed and others mixed. Again, just as health

admits of degrees without being indeterminate, why should not pleasure?

The same proportion is not found in all things, nor a single proportion

always in the same thing, but it may be relaxed and yet persist up

to a point, and it may differ in degree. The case of pleasure also

may therefore be of this kind.

Again, they assume that the good is perfect while movements and comings

into being are imperfect, and try to exhibit pleasure as being a movement

and a coming into being. But they do not seem to be right even in

saying that it is a movement. For speed and slowness are thought to

be proper to every movement, and if a movement, e.g. that of the heavens,

has not speed or slowness in itself, it has it in relation to something

else; but of pleasure neither of these things is true. For while we

may become pleased quickly as we may become angry quickly, we cannot

be pleased quickly, not even in relation to some one else, while we

can walk, or grow, or the like, quickly. While, then, we can change

quickly or slowly into a state of pleasure, we cannot quickly exhibit

the activity of pleasure, i.e. be pleased. Again, how can it be a

coming into being? It is not thought that any chance thing can come

out of any chance thing, but that a thing is dissolved into that out

of which it comes into being; and pain would be the destruction of

that of which pleasure is the coming into being.

They say, too, that pain is the lack of that which is according to

nature, and pleasure is replenishment. But these experiences are bodily.

If then pleasure is replenishment with that which is according to

nature, that which feels pleasure will be that in which the replenishment

takes place, i.e. the body; but that is not thought to be the case;

therefore the replenishment is not pleasure, though one would be pleased

when replenishment was taking place, just as one would be pained if

one was being operated on. This opinion seems to be based on the pains

and pleasures connected with nutrition; on the fact that when people

have been short of food and have felt pain beforehand they are pleased

by the replenishment. But this does not happen with all pleasures;

for the pleasures of learning and, among the sensuous pleasures, those

of smell, and also many sounds and sights, and memories and hopes,

do not presuppose pain. Of what then will these be the coming into

being? There has not been lack of anything of which they could be

the supplying anew.

In reply to those who bring forward the disgraceful pleasures one

may say that these are not pleasant; if things are pleasant to people

of vicious constitution, we must not suppose that they are also pleasant

to others than these, just as we do not reason so about the things

that are wholesome or sweet or bitter to sick people, or ascribe whiteness

to the things that seem white to those suffering from a disease of

the eye. Or one might answer thus-that the pleasures are desirable,

but not from these sources, as wealth is desirable, but not as the

reward of betrayal, and health, but not at the cost of eating anything

and everything. Or perhaps pleasures differ in kind; for those derived

from noble sources are different from those derived from base sources,

and one cannot the pleasure of the just man without being just, nor

that of the musical man without being musical, and so on.

The fact, too, that a friend is different from a flatterer seems to

make it plain that pleasure is not a good or that pleasures are different

in kind; for the one is thought to consort with us with a view to

the good, the other with a view to our pleasure, and the one is reproached

for his conduct while the other is praised on the ground that he consorts

with us for different ends. And no one would choose to live with the

intellect of a child throughout his life, however much he were to

be pleased at the things that children are pleased at, nor to get

enjoyment by doing some most disgraceful deed, though he were never

to feel any pain in consequence. And there are many things we should

be keen about even if they brought no pleasure, e.g. seeing, remembering,

knowing, possessing the virtues. If pleasures necessarily do accompany

these, that makes no odds; we should choose these even if no pleasure

resulted. It seems to be clear, then, that neither is pleasure the

good nor is all pleasure desirable, and that some pleasures are desirable

in themselves, differing in kind or in their sources from the others.

So much for the things that are said about pleasure and pain.
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What pleasure is, or what kind of thing it is, will become plainer

if we take up the question aga from the beginning. Seeing seems to

be at any moment complete, for it does not lack anything which coming

into being later will complete its form; and pleasure also seems to

be of this nature. For it is a whole, and at no time can one find

a pleasure whose form will be completed if the pleasure lasts longer.

For this reason, too, it is not a movement. For every movement (e.g.

that of building) takes time and is for the sake of an end, and is

complete when it has made what it aims at. It is complete, therefore,

only in the whole time or at that final moment. In their parts and

during the time they occupy, all movements are incomplete, and are

different in kind from the whole movement and from each other. For

the fitting together of the stones is different from the fluting of

the column, and these are both different from the making of the temple;

and the making of the temple is complete (for it lacks nothing with

a view to the end proposed), but the making of the base or of the

triglyph is incomplete; for each is the making of only a part. They

differ in kind, then, and it is not possible to find at any and every

time a movement complete in form, but if at all, only in the whole

time. So, too, in the case of walking and all other movements. For

if locomotion is a movement from to there, it, too, has differences

in kind-flying, walking, leaping, and so on. And not only so, but

in walking itself there are such differences; for the whence and whither

are not the same in the whole racecourse and in a part of it, nor

in one part and in another, nor is it the same thing to traverse this

line and that; for one traverses not only a line but one which is

in a place, and this one is in a different place from that. We have

discussed movement with precision in another work, but it seems that

it is not complete at any and every time, but that the many movements

are incomplete and different in kind, since the whence and whither

give them their form. But of pleasure the form is complete at any

and every time. Plainly, then, pleasure and movement must be different

from each other, and pleasure must be one of the things that are whole

and complete. This would seem to be the case, too, from the fact that

it is not possible to move otherwise than in time, but it is possible

to be pleased; for that which takes place in a moment is a whole.

From these considerations it is clear, too, that these thinkers are

not right in saying there is a movement or a coming into being of

pleasure. For these cannot be ascribed to all things, but only to

those that are divisible and not wholes; there is no coming into being

of seeing nor of a point nor of a unit, nor is any of these a movement

or coming into being; therefore there is no movement or coming into

being of pleasure either; for it is a whole.

Since every sense is active in relation to its object, and a sense

which is in good condition acts perfectly in relation to the most

beautiful of its objects (for perfect activity seems to be ideally

of this nature; whether we say that it is active, or the organ in

which it resides, may be assumed to be immaterial), it follows that

in the case of each sense the best activity is that of the best-conditioned

organ in relation to the finest of its objects. And this activity

will be the most complete and pleasant. For, while there is pleasure

in respect of any sense, and in respect of thought and contemplation

no less, the most complete is pleasantest, and that of a well-conditioned

organ in relation to the worthiest of its objects is the most complete;

and the pleasure completes the activity. But the pleasure does not

complete it in the same way as the combination of object and sense,

both good, just as health and the doctor are not in the same way the

cause of a man's being healthy. (That pleasure is produced in respect

to each sense is plain; for we speak of sights and sounds as pleasant.

It is also plain that it arises most of all when both the sense is

at its best and it is active in reference to an object which corresponds;

when both object and perceiver are of the best there will always be

pleasure, since the requisite agent and patient are both present.)

Pleasure completes the activity not as the corresponding permanent

state does, by its immanence, but as an end which supervenes as the

bloom of youth does on those in the flower of their age. So long,

then, as both the intelligible or sensible object and the discriminating

or contemplative faculty are as they should be, the pleasure will

be involved in the activity; for when both the passive and the active

factor are unchanged and are related to each other in the same way,

the same result naturally follows.

How, then, is it that no one is continuously pleased? Is it that we

grow weary? Certainly all human beings are incapable of continuous

activity. Therefore pleasure also is not continuous; for it accompanies

activity. Some things delight us when they are new, but later do so

less, for the same reason; for at first the mind is in a state of

stimulation and intensely active about them, as people are with respect

to their vision when they look hard at a thing, but afterwards our

activity is not of this kind, but has grown relaxed; for which reason

the pleasure also is dulled.

One might think that all men desire pleasure because they all aim

at life; life is an activity, and each man is active about those things

and with those faculties that he loves most; e.g. the musician is

active with his hearing in reference to tunes, the student with his

mind in reference to theoretical questions, and so on in each case;

now pleasure completes the activities, and therefore life, which they

desire. It is with good reason, then, that they aim at pleasure too,

since for every one it completes life, which is desirable. But whether

we choose life for the sake of pleasure or pleasure for the sake of

life is a question we may dismiss for the present. For they seem to

be bound up together and not to admit of separation, since without

activity pleasure does not arise, and every activity is completed

by the attendant pleasure.
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For this reason pleasures seem, too, to differ in kind. For things

different in kind are, we think, completed by different things (we

see this to be true both of natural objects and of things produced

by art, e.g. animals, trees, a painting, a sculpture, a house, an

implement); and, similarly, we think that activities differing in

kind are completed by things differing in kind. Now the activities

of thought differ from those of the senses, and both differ among

themselves, in kind; so, therefore, do the pleasures that complete

them.

This may be seen, too, from the fact that each of the pleasures is

bound up with the activity it completes. For an activity is intensified

by its proper pleasure, since each class of things is better judged

of and brought to precision by those who engage in the activity with

pleasure; e.g. it is those who enjoy geometrical thinking that become

geometers and grasp the various propositions better, and, similarly,

those who are fond of music or of building, and so on, make progress

in their proper function by enjoying it; so the pleasures intensify

the activities, and what intensifies a thing is proper to it, but

things different in kind have properties different in kind.

This will be even more apparent from the fact that activities are

hindered by pleasures arising from other sources. For people who are

fond of playing the flute are incapable of attending to arguments

if they overhear some one playing the flute, since they enjoy flute-playing

more than the activity in hand; so the pleasure connected with fluteplaying

destroys the activity concerned with argument. This happens, similarly,

in all other cases, when one is active about two things at once; the

more pleasant activity drives out the other, and if it is much more

pleasant does so all the more, so that one even ceases from the other.

This is why when we enjoy anything very much we do not throw ourselves

into anything else, and do one thing only when we are not much pleased

by another; e.g. in the theatre the people who eat sweets do so most

when the actors are poor. Now since activities are made precise and

more enduring and better by their proper pleasure, and injured by

alien pleasures, evidently the two kinds of pleasure are far apart.

For alien pleasures do pretty much what proper pains do, since activities

are destroyed by their proper pains; e.g. if a man finds writing or

doing sums unpleasant and painful, he does not write, or does not

do sums, because the activity is painful. So an activity suffers contrary

effects from its proper pleasures and pains, i.e. from those that

supervene on it in virtue of its own nature. And alien pleasures have

been stated to do much the same as pain; they destroy the activity,

only not to the same degree.

Now since activities differ in respect of goodness and badness, and

some are worthy to be chosen, others to be avoided, and others neutral,

so, too, are the pleasures; for to each activity there is a proper

pleasure. The pleasure proper to a worthy activity is good and that

proper to an unworthy activity bad; just as the appetites for noble

objects are laudable, those for base objects culpable. But the pleasures

involved in activities are more proper to them than the desires; for

the latter are separated both in time and in nature, while the former

are close to the activities, and so hard to distinguish from them

that it admits of dispute whether the activity is not the same as

the pleasure. (Still, pleasure does not seem to be thought or perception-that

would be strange; but because they are not found apart they appear

to some people the same.) As activities are different, then, so are

the corresponding pleasures. Now sight is superior to touch in purity,

and hearing and smell to taste; the pleasures, therefore, are similarly

superior, and those of thought superior to these, and within each

of the two kinds some are superior to others.

Each animal is thought to have a proper pleasure, as it has a proper

function; viz. that which corresponds to its activity. If we survey

them species by species, too, this will be evident; horse, dog, and

man have different pleasures, as Heraclitus says 'asses would prefer

sweepings to gold'; for food is pleasanter than gold to asses. So

the pleasures of creatures different in kind differ in kind, and it

is plausible to suppose that those of a single species do not differ.

But they vary to no small extent, in the case of men at least; the

same things delight some people and pain others, and are painful and

odious to some, and pleasant to and liked by others. This happens,

too, in the case of sweet things; the same things do not seem sweet

to a man in a fever and a healthy man-nor hot to a weak man and one

in good condition. The same happens in other cases. But in all such

matters that which appears to the good man is thought to be really

so. If this is correct, as it seems to be, and virtue and the good

man as such are the measure of each thing, those also will be pleasures

which appear so to him, and those things pleasant which he enjoys.

If the things he finds tiresome seem pleasant to some one, that is

nothing surprising; for men may be ruined and spoilt in many ways;

but the things are not pleasant, but only pleasant to these people

and to people in this condition. Those which are admittedly disgraceful

plainly should not be said to be pleasures, except to a perverted

taste; but of those that are thought to be good what kind of pleasure

or what pleasure should be said to be that proper to man? Is it not

plain from the corresponding activities? The pleasures follow these.

Whether, then, the perfect and supremely happy man has one or more

activities, the pleasures that perfect these will be said in the strict

sense to be pleasures proper to man, and the rest will be so in a

secondary and fractional way, as are the activities.
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Now that we have spoken of the virtues, the forms of friendship, and

the varieties of pleasure, what remains is to discuss in outline the

nature of happiness, since this is what we state the end of human

nature to be. Our discussion will be the more concise if we first

sum up what we have said already. We said, then, that it is not a

disposition; for if it were it might belong to some one who was asleep

throughout his life, living the life of a plant, or, again, to some

one who was suffering the greatest misfortunes. If these implications

are unacceptable, and we must rather class happiness as an activity,

as we have said before, and if some activities are necessary, and

desirable for the sake of something else, while others are so in themselves,

evidently happiness must be placed among those desirable in themselves,

not among those desirable for the sake of something else; for happiness

does not lack anything, but is self-sufficient. Now those activities

are desirable in themselves from which nothing is sought beyond the

activity. And of this nature virtuous actions are thought to be; for

to do noble and good deeds is a thing desirable for its own sake.

Pleasant amusements also are thought to be of this nature; we choose

them not for the sake of other things; for we are injured rather than

benefited by them, since we are led to neglect our bodies and our

property. But most of the people who are deemed happy take refuge

in such pastimes, which is the reason why those who are ready-witted

at them are highly esteemed at the courts of tyrants; they make themselves

pleasant companions in the tyrants' favourite pursuits, and that is

the sort of man they want. Now these things are thought to be of the

nature of happiness because people in despotic positions spend their

leisure in them, but perhaps such people prove nothing; for virtue

and reason, from which good activities flow, do not depend on despotic

position; nor, if these people, who have never tasted pure and generous

pleasure, take refuge in the bodily pleasures, should these for that

reason be thought more desirable; for boys, too, think the things

that are valued among themselves are the best. It is to be expected,

then, that, as different things seem valuable to boys and to men,

so they should to bad men and to good. Now, as we have often maintained,

those things are both valuable and pleasant which are such to the

good man; and to each man the activity in accordance with his own

disposition is most desirable, and, therefore, to the good man that

which is in accordance with virtue. Happiness, therefore, does not

lie in amusement; it would, indeed, be strange if the end were amusement,

and one were to take trouble and suffer hardship all one's life in

order to amuse oneself. For, in a word, everything that we choose

we choose for the sake of something else-except happiness, which is

an end. Now to exert oneself and work for the sake of amusement seems

silly and utterly childish. But to amuse oneself in order that one

may exert oneself, as Anacharsis puts it, seems right; for amusement

is a sort of relaxation, and we need relaxation because we cannot

work continuously. Relaxation, then, is not an end; for it is taken

for the sake of activity.

The happy life is thought to be virtuous; now a virtuous life requires

exertion, and does not consist in amusement. And we say that serious

things are better than laughable things and those connected with amusement,

and that the activity of the better of any two things-whether it be

two elements of our being or two men-is the more serious; but the

activity of the better is ipso facto superior and more of the nature

of happiness. And any chance person-even a slave-can enjoy the bodily

pleasures no less than the best man; but no one assigns to a slave

a share in happiness-unless he assigns to him also a share in human

life. For happiness does not lie in such occupations, but, as we have

said before, in virtuous activities.
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If happiness is activity in accordance with virtue, it is reasonable

that it should be in accordance with the highest virtue; and this

will be that of the best thing in us. Whether it be reason or something

else that is this element which is thought to be our natural ruler

and guide and to take thought of things noble and divine, whether

it be itself also divine or only the most divine element in us, the

activity of this in accordance with its proper virtue will be perfect

happiness. That this activity is contemplative we have already said.

Now this would seem to be in agreement both with what we said before

and with the truth. For, firstly, this activity is the best (since

not only is reason the best thing in us, but the objects of reason

are the best of knowable objects); and secondly, it is the most continuous,

since we can contemplate truth more continuously than we can do anything.

And we think happiness has pleasure mingled with it, but the activity

of philosophic wisdom is admittedly the pleasantest of virtuous activities;

at all events the pursuit of it is thought to offer pleasures marvellous

for their purity and their enduringness, and it is to be expected

that those who know will pass their time more pleasantly than those

who inquire. And the self-sufficiency that is spoken of must belong

most to the contemplative activity. For while a philosopher, as well

as a just man or one possessing any other virtue, needs the necessaries

of life, when they are sufficiently equipped with things of that sort

the just man needs people towards whom and with whom he shall act

justly, and the temperate man, the brave man, and each of the others

is in the same case, but the philosopher, even when by himself, can

contemplate truth, and the better the wiser he is; he can perhaps

do so better if he has fellow-workers, but still he is the most self-sufficient.

And this activity alone would seem to be loved for its own sake; for

nothing arises from it apart from the contemplating, while from practical

activities we gain more or less apart from the action. And happiness

is thought to depend on leisure; for we are busy that we may have

leisure, and make war that we may live in peace. Now the activity

of the practical virtues is exhibited in political or military affairs,

but the actions concerned with these seem to be unleisurely. Warlike

actions are completely so (for no one chooses to be at war, or provokes

war, for the sake of being at war; any one would seem absolutely murderous

if he were to make enemies of his friends in order to bring about

battle and slaughter); but the action of the statesman is also unleisurely,

and-apart from the political action itself-aims at despotic power

and honours, or at all events happiness, for him and his fellow citizens-a

happiness different from political action, and evidently sought as

being different. So if among virtuous actions political and military

actions are distinguished by nobility and greatness, and these are

unleisurely and aim at an end and are not desirable for their own

sake, but the activity of reason, which is contemplative, seems both

to be superior in serious worth and to aim at no end beyond itself,

and to have its pleasure proper to itself (and this augments the activity),

and the self-sufficiency, leisureliness, unweariedness (so far as

this is possible for man), and all the other attributes ascribed to

the supremely happy man are evidently those connected with this activity,

it follows that this will be the complete happiness of man, if it

be allowed a complete term of life (for none of the attributes of

happiness is incomplete).

But such a life would be too high for man; for it is not in so far

as he is man that he will live so, but in so far as something divine

is present in him; and by so much as this is superior to our composite

nature is its activity superior to that which is the exercise of the

other kind of virtue. If reason is divine, then, in comparison with

man, the life according to it is divine in comparison with human life.

But we must not follow those who advise us, being men, to think of

human things, and, being mortal, of mortal things, but must, so far

as we can, make ourselves immortal, and strain every nerve to live

in accordance with the best thing in us; for even if it be small in

bulk, much more does it in power and worth surpass everything. This

would seem, too, to be each man himself, since it is the authoritative

and better part of him. It would be strange, then, if he were to choose

not the life of his self but that of something else. And what we said

before' will apply now; that which is proper to each thing is by nature

best and most pleasant for each thing; for man, therefore, the life

according to reason is best and pleasantest, since reason more than

anything else is man. This life therefore is also the happiest.
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But in a secondary degree the life in accordance with the other kind

of virtue is happy; for the activities in accordance with this befit

our human estate. Just and brave acts, and other virtuous acts, we

do in relation to each other, observing our respective duties with

regard to contracts and services and all manner of actions and with

regard to passions; and all of these seem to be typically human. Some

of them seem even to arise from the body, and virtue of character

to be in many ways bound up with the passions. Practical wisdom, too,

is linked to virtue of character, and this to practical wisdom, since

the principles of practical wisdom are in accordance with the moral

virtues and rightness in morals is in accordance with practical wisdom.

Being connected with the passions also, the moral virtues must belong

to our composite nature; and the virtues of our composite nature are

human; so, therefore, are the life and the happiness which correspond

to these. The excellence of the reason is a thing apart; we must be

content to say this much about it, for to describe it precisely is

a task greater than our purpose requires. It would seem, however,

also to need external equipment but little, or less than moral virtue

does. Grant that both need the necessaries, and do so equally, even

if the statesman's work is the more concerned with the body and things

of that sort; for there will be little difference there; but in what

they need for the exercise of their activities there will be much

difference. The liberal man will need money for the doing of his liberal

deeds, and the just man too will need it for the returning of services

(for wishes are hard to discern, and even people who are not just

pretend to wish to act justly); and the brave man will need power

if he is to accomplish any of the acts that correspond to his virtue,

and the temperate man will need opportunity; for how else is either

he or any of the others to be recognized? It is debated, too, whether

the will or the deed is more essential to virtue, which is assumed

to involve both; it is surely clear that its perfection involves both;

but for deeds many things are needed, and more, the greater and nobler

the deeds are. But the man who is contemplating the truth needs no

such thing, at least with a view to the exercise of his activity;

indeed they are, one may say, even hindrances, at all events to his

contemplation; but in so far as he is a man and lives with a number

of people, he chooses to do virtuous acts; he will therefore need

such aids to living a human life.

But that perfect happiness is a contemplative activity will appear

from the following consideration as well. We assume the gods to be

above all other beings blessed and happy; but what sort of actions

must we assign to them? Acts of justice? Will not the gods seem absurd

if they make contracts and return deposits, and so on? Acts of a brave

man, then, confronting dangers and running risks because it is noble

to do so? Or liberal acts? To whom will they give? It will be strange

if they are really to have money or anything of the kind. And what

would their temperate acts be? Is not such praise tasteless, since

they have no bad appetites? If we were to run through them all, the

circumstances of action would be found trivial and unworthy of gods.

Still, every one supposes that they live and therefore that they are

active; we cannot suppose them to sleep like Endymion. Now if you

take away from a living being action, and still more production, what

is left but contemplation? Therefore the activity of God, which surpasses

all others in blessedness, must be contemplative; and of human activities,

therefore, that which is most akin to this must be most of the nature

of happiness.

This is indicated, too, by the fact that the other animals have no

share in happiness, being completely deprived of such activity. For

while the whole life of the gods is blessed, and that of men too in

so far as some likeness of such activity belongs to them, none of

the other animals is happy, since they in no way share in contemplation.

Happiness extends, then, just so far as contemplation does, and those

to whom contemplation more fully belongs are more truly happy, not

as a mere concomitant but in virtue of the contemplation; for this

is in itself precious. Happiness, therefore, must be some form of

contemplation.

But, being a man, one will also need external prosperity; for our

nature is not self-sufficient for the purpose of contemplation, but

our body also must be healthy and must have food and other attention.

Still, we must not think that the man who is to be happy will need

many things or great things, merely because he cannot be supremely

happy without external goods; for self-sufficiency and action do not

involve excess, and we can do noble acts without ruling earth and

sea; for even with moderate advantages one can act virtuously (this

is manifest enough; for private persons are thought to do worthy acts

no less than despots-indeed even more); and it is enough that we should

have so much as that; for the life of the man who is active in accordance

with virtue will be happy. Solon, too, was perhaps sketching well

the happy man when he described him as moderately furnished with externals

but as having done (as Solon thought) the noblest acts, and lived

temperately; for one can with but moderate possessions do what one

ought. Anaxagoras also seems to have supposed the happy man not to

be rich nor a despot, when he said that he would not be surprised

if the happy man were to seem to most people a strange person; for

they judge by externals, since these are all they perceive. The opinions

of the wise seem, then, to harmonize with our arguments. But while

even such things carry some conviction, the truth in practical matters

is discerned from the facts of life; for these are the decisive factor.

We must therefore survey what we have already said, bringing it to

the test of the facts of life, and if it harmonizes with the facts

we must accept it, but if it clashes with them we must suppose it

to be mere theory. Now he who exercises his reason and cultivates

it seems to be both in the best state of mind and most dear to the

gods. For if the gods have any care for human affairs, as they are

thought to have, it would be reasonable both that they should delight

in that which was best and most akin to them (i.e. reason) and that

they should reward those who love and honour this most, as caring

for the things that are dear to them and acting both rightly and nobly.

And that all these attributes belong most of all to the philosopher

is manifest. He, therefore, is the dearest to the gods. And he who

is that will presumably be also the happiest; so that in this way

too the philosopher will more than any other be happy.
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If these matters and the virtues, and also friendship and pleasure,

have been dealt with sufficiently in outline, are we to suppose that

our programme has reached its end? Surely, as the saying goes, where

there are things to be done the end is not to survey and recognize

the various things, but rather to do them; with regard to virtue,

then, it is not enough to know, but we must try to have and use it,

or try any other way there may be of becoming good. Now if arguments

were in themselves enough to make men good, they would justly, as

Theognis says, have won very great rewards, and such rewards should

have been provided; but as things are, while they seem to have power

to encourage and stimulate the generous-minded among our youth, and

to make a character which is gently born, and a true lover of what

is noble, ready to be possessed by virtue, they are not able to encourage

the many to nobility and goodness. For these do not by nature obey

the sense of shame, but only fear, and do not abstain from bad acts

because of their baseness but through fear of punishment; living by

passion they pursue their own pleasures and the means to them, and

and the opposite pains, and have not even a conception of what is

noble and truly pleasant, since they have never tasted it. What argument

would remould such people? It is hard, if not impossible, to remove

by argument the traits that have long since been incorporated in the

character; and perhaps we must be content if, when all the influences

by which we are thought to become good are present, we get some tincture

of virtue.

Now some think that we are made good by nature, others by habituation,

others by teaching. Nature's part evidently does not depend on us,

but as a result of some divine causes is present in those who are

truly fortunate; while argument and teaching, we may suspect, are

not powerful with all men, but the soul of the student must first

have been cultivated by means of habits for noble joy and noble hatred,

like earth which is to nourish the seed. For he who lives as passion

directs will not hear argument that dissuades him, nor understand

it if he does; and how can we persuade one in such a state to change

his ways? And in general passion seems to yield not to argument but

to force. The character, then, must somehow be there already with

a kinship to virtue, loving what is noble and hating what is base.

But it is difficult to get from youth up a right training for virtue

if one has not been brought up under right laws; for to live temperately

and hardily is not pleasant to most people, especially when they are

young. For this reason their nurture and occupations should be fixed

by law; for they will not be painful when they have become customary.

But it is surely not enough that when they are young they should get

the right nurture and attention; since they must, even when they are

grown up, practise and be habituated to them, we shall need laws for

this as well, and generally speaking to cover the whole of life; for

most people obey necessity rather than argument, and punishments rather

than the sense of what is noble.

This is why some think that legislators ought to stimulate men to

virtue and urge them forward by the motive of the noble, on the assumption

that those who have been well advanced by the formation of habits

will attend to such influences; and that punishments and penalties

should be imposed on those who disobey and are of inferior nature,

while the incurably bad should be completely banished. A good man

(they think), since he lives with his mind fixed on what is noble,

will submit to argument, while a bad man, whose desire is for pleasure,

is corrected by pain like a beast of burden. This is, too, why they

say the pains inflicted should be those that are most opposed to the

pleasures such men love.

However that may be, if (as we have said) the man who is to be good

must be well trained and habituated, and go on to spend his time in

worthy occupations and neither willingly nor unwillingly do bad actions,

and if this can be brought about if men live in accordance with a

sort of reason and right order, provided this has force,-if this be

so, the paternal command indeed has not the required force or compulsive

power (nor in general has the command of one man, unless he be a king

or something similar), but the law has compulsive power, while it

is at the same time a rule proceeding from a sort of practical wisdom

and reason. And while people hate men who oppose their impulses, even

if they oppose them rightly, the law in its ordaining of what is good

is not burdensome.

In the Spartan state alone, or almost alone, the legislator seems

to have paid attention to questions of nurture and occupations; in

most states such matters have been neglected, and each man lives as

he pleases, Cyclops-fashion, 'to his own wife and children dealing

law'. Now it is best that there should be a public and proper care

for such matters; but if they are neglected by the community it would

seem right for each man to help his children and friends towards virtue,

and that they should have the power, or at least the will, to do this.

It would seem from what has been said that he can do this better if

he makes himself capable of legislating. For public control is plainly

effected by laws, and good control by good laws; whether written or

unwritten would seem to make no difference, nor whether they are laws

providing for the education of individuals or of groups-any more than

it does in the case of music or gymnastics and other such pursuits.

For as in cities laws and prevailing types of character have force,

so in households do the injunctions and the habits of the father,

and these have even more because of the tie of blood and the benefits

he confers; for the children start with a natural affection and disposition

to obey. Further, private education has an advantage over public,

as private medical treatment has; for while in general rest and abstinence

from food are good for a man in a fever, for a particular man they

may not be; and a boxer presumably does not prescribe the same style

of fighting to all his pupils. It would seem, then, that the detail

is worked out with more precision if the control is private; for each

person is more likely to get what suits his case.

But the details can be best looked after, one by one, by a doctor

or gymnastic instructor or any one else who has the general knowledge

of what is good for every one or for people of a certain kind (for

the sciences both are said to be, and are, concerned with what is

universal); not but what some particular detail may perhaps be well

looked after by an unscientific person, if he has studied accurately

in the light of experience what happens in each case, just as some

people seem to be their own best doctors, though they could give no

help to any one else. None the less, it will perhaps be agreed that

if a man does wish to become master of an art or science he must go

to the universal, and come to know it as well as possible; for, as

we have said, it is with this that the sciences are concerned.

And surely he who wants to make men, whether many or few, better by

his care must try to become capable of legislating, if it is through

laws that we can become good. For to get any one whatever-any one

who is put before us-into the right condition is not for the first

chance comer; if any one can do it, it is the man who knows, just

as in medicine and all other matters which give scope for care and

prudence.

Must we not, then, next examine whence or how one can learn how to

legislate? Is it, as in all other cases, from statesmen? Certainly

it was thought to be a part of statesmanship. Or is a difference apparent

between statesmanship and the other sciences and arts? In the others

the same people are found offering to teach the arts and practising

them, e.g. doctors or painters; but while the sophists profess to

teach politics, it is practised not by any of them but by the politicians,

who would seem to do so by dint of a certain skill and experience

rather than of thought; for they are not found either writing or speaking

about such matters (though it were a nobler occupation perhaps than

composing speeches for the law-courts and the assembly), nor again

are they found to have made statesmen of their own sons or any other

of their friends. But it was to be expected that they should if they

could; for there is nothing better than such a skill that they could

have left to their cities, or could prefer to have for themselves,

or, therefore, for those dearest to them. Still, experience seems

to contribute not a little; else they could not have become politicians

by familiarity with politics; and so it seems that those who aim at

knowing about the art of politics need experience as well.

But those of the sophists who profess the art seem to be very far

from teaching it. For, to put the matter generally, they do not even

know what kind of thing it is nor what kinds of things it is about;

otherwise they would not have classed it as identical with rhetoric

or even inferior to it, nor have thought it easy to legislate by collecting

the laws that are thought well of; they say it is possible to select

the best laws, as though even the selection did not demand intelligence

and as though right judgement were not the greatest thing, as in matters

of music. For while people experienced in any department judge rightly

the works produced in it, and understand by what means or how they

are achieved, and what harmonizes with what, the inexperienced must

be content if they do not fail to see whether the work has been well

or ill made-as in the case of painting. Now laws are as it were the'

works' of the political art; how then can one learn from them to be

a legislator, or judge which are best? Even medical men do not seem

to be made by a study of text-books. Yet people try, at any rate,

to state not only the treatments, but also how particular classes

of people can be cured and should be treated-distinguishing the various

habits of body; but while this seems useful to experienced people,

to the inexperienced it is valueless. Surely, then, while collections

of laws, and of constitutions also, may be serviceable to those who

can study them and judge what is good or bad and what enactments suit

what circumstances, those who go through such collections without

a practised faculty will not have right judgement (unless it be as

a spontaneous gift of nature), though they may perhaps become more

intelligent in such matters.

Now our predecessors have left the subject of legislation to us unexamined;

it is perhaps best, therefore, that we should ourselves study it,

and in general study the question of the constitution, in order to

complete to the best of our ability our philosophy of human nature.

First, then, if anything has been said well in detail by earlier thinkers,

let us try to review it; then in the light of the constitutions we

have collected let us study what sorts of influence preserve and destroy

states, and what sorts preserve or destroy the particular kinds of

constitution, and to what causes it is due that some are well and

others ill administered. When these have been studied we shall perhaps

be more likely to see with a comprehensive view, which constitution

is best, and how each must be ordered, and what laws and customs it

must use, if it is to be at its best. Let us make a beginning of our

discussion.

THE END
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