Nicomachean Ethics

ARISTOTLE
384–322 BC

Nicomachean Ethics

Ἠθικὰ Νικομάχεια

Translated from the Greek with AI (Claude) and edited

FORAGE
forage.com

Nicomachean Ethics · Aristotle (384–322 BC)

Translated from the Greek with AI (Claude) and edited. Parallel-text edition, Forage, October 2026. forage.com/aristotle/nicomachean-ethics

Greek text: Ingram Bywater, *Ethica Nicomachea* (Oxford, 1894), via the Perseus Digital Library (github.com/PerseusDL/canonical-greekLit), CC BY-SA 4.0. English: translated from the Greek with AI (Claude), then edited for accuracy and consistency. Not reviewed by a human specialist. Free to reuse under CC BY-SA 4.0. Margin numbers are the standard Bekker page references.

The original text is in the public domain. This translation is free to share and adapt under the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International license (CC BY-SA 4.0): creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0

Set in Source Serif 4, with Gentium Book Plus.

CONTENTS

Introduction vii

Book I 1
- What people say happiness is 3
- Plato's form of the good 5
- Happiness as the complete end 8
- The human function 9
- Happiness and fortune 14
- Happiness is honored, not praised 17
- The parts of the soul 18

Book II 21
- Pleasure and pain as signs of character 23
- Doing just acts and being just 25
- Excellence is a state 26
- The mean relative to us 28
- The mean in each excellence 30
- How the extremes are opposed 32
- Hitting the mean 34

Book III 37
- Acting through ignorance 39
- Decision 41
- Deliberation and wish 42
- Excellence and vice are up to us 45
- Courage 48
- Things that resemble courage 51
- Moderation 55

Book IV 61
- Magnificence 66
- Greatness of soul 69
- Ambition and its nameless mean 74
- Gentleness 75
- Friendliness and flattery 76
- Truthfulness and boastfulness 78
- Wit and tact 80

Book V 83
- Particular justice 85
- Distributive justice 87
- Corrective justice 89
- Reciprocity and money 91
- Political justice 94

Voluntary and involuntary wrongdoing 97
Equity 102

Book VI 107
The parts of the soul that have reason 107
Scientific knowledge and craft 109
Practical wisdom 110
Intellect and wisdom 112
Good deliberation, comprehension and judgement 115
What wisdom and practical wisdom are for 119

Book VII 123
Puzzles about self-control 123
How someone who knows can lack self-control 127
What self-control is concerned with 129
Brutish and diseased states 132
Anger and appetite 133
Why lack of self-control is not vice 137
Pleasure 141

Book VIII 149
What is lovable 150
Three kinds of friendship 151
Friendship between unequals 157
Friendship, justice and community 160
Constitutions and households 161
Friendship among kin 164
Complaints between friends 166

Book IX 171
Conflicting obligations 173
Friendship and one's relation to oneself 176
Goodwill and concord 178
Self-love 181
Does the happy person need friends? 184
How many friends 187
Friends in good and bad fortune 188

Book X 191
Arguments for and against pleasure 192
What pleasure is 195
Pleasure completes activity 197
Happiness is not amusement 200
The life of contemplation 202
The life of the other excellences 205
From ethics to lawgiving 208

INTRODUCTION

What is the best life for a human being? Aristotle's answer, in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, is happiness, *eudaimonia*: not a feeling but a whole life lived well, in activity that expresses excellence.

The book works through what that takes: good character formed by habit, the idea that each excellence is a mean between excess and deficiency, practical wisdom, justice, self-control, and friendship, which gets two full books. It ends by asking whether the happiest life is the life of contemplation.

The text comes down to us as Aristotle's lecture notes, probably edited by or dedicated to his son Nicomachus. Each of the ten books is on its own page.

Book I

Happiness, the highest good
Aristotle argues that the highest human good is happiness, activity of the soul in accordance with excellence.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
1094a	πᾶσα τέχνη καὶ πᾶσα μέθοδος, ὁμοίως δὲ πρᾶξίς τε καὶ προαίρεσις, ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ἐφίεσθαι δοκεῖ· διὸ καλῶς ἀπεφήναντο τἀγαθόν, οὗ πάντ' ἐφίεται. διαφορὰ δέ τις φαίνεται τῶν τελῶν· τὰ μὲν γάρ εἰσιν ἐνέργειαι, τὰ δὲ παρ' αὐτὰς ἔργα τινά. ὧν δ' εἰσὶ τέλη τινὰ παρὰ τὰς πράξεις, ἐν τούτοις βελτίω πέφυκε τῶν ἐνεργειῶν τὰ ἔργα. πολλῶν δὲ πράξεων οὐσῶν καὶ τεχνῶν καὶ ἐπιστημῶν πολλὰ γίνεται καὶ τὰ τέλη· ἰατρικῆς μὲν γὰρ ὑγίεια, ναυπηγικῆς δὲ πλοῖον, στρατηγικῆς δὲ νίκη, οἰκονομικῆς δὲ πλοῦτος.	Every craft and every inquiry, and likewise every action and decision, seems to aim at some good. That is why people have rightly declared that the good is that at which all things aim. But there appears to be a difference among ends: some are activities, while others are products of some kind over and above the activities. And where there are ends beyond the actions, the products are by nature better than the activities. Since there are many actions, crafts and sciences, their ends turn out to be many as well: the end of medicine is health, of shipbuilding a ship, of generalship victory, of household management wealth.
	ὅσαι δ' εἰσὶ τῶν τοιούτων ὑπὸ μίαν τινὰ δύναμιν, καθάπερ ὑπὸ τὴν ἱππικὴν χαλινοποιικὴ καὶ ὅσαι ἄλλαι τῶν ἱππικῶν ὀργάνων εἰσίν, αὕτη δὲ καὶ πᾶσα πολεμικὴ πρᾶξις ὑπὸ τὴν στρατηγικήν, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον ἄλλαι ὑφ' ἑτέρας· ἐν ἁπάσαις δὲ τὰ τῶν ἀρχιτεκτονικῶν τέλη πάντων ἐστὶν αἱρετώτερα τῶν ὑπ' αὐτά· τούτων γὰρ χάριν κἀκεῖνα διώκεται. διαφέρει δ' οὐδὲν τὰς ἐνεργείας αὐτὰς εἶναι τὰ τέλη τῶν πράξεων ἢ παρὰ ταύτας ἄλλο τι, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν λεχθεισῶν ἐπιστημῶν.	Wherever such pursuits fall under a single capacity—as bridle-making and all the other crafts concerned with a horse's equipment fall under horsemanship, and horsemanship and every action in war fall under generalship, and in the same way others fall under still others—in all of them the ends of the master crafts are more choiceworthy than all the ends subordinate to them, since it is for the sake of the former that the latter too are pursued. And it makes no difference whether the ends of the actions are the activities themselves or something else beyond them, as with the sciences just mentioned.
	εἰ δή τι τέλος ἐστὶ τῶν πρακτῶν ὃ δι' αὐτὸ βουλόμεθα, τἆλλα δὲ διὰ τοῦτο, καὶ μὴ πάντα δι' ἕτερον αἱρούμεθα (πρόεισι γὰρ οὕτω γ' εἰς ἄπειρον, ὥστ' εἶναι κενὴν καὶ ματαίαν τὴν ὄρεξιν), δῆλον ὡς τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη τἀγαθὸν καὶ τὸ ἄριστον. ἆρ' οὖν καὶ πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡ γνῶσις αὐτοῦ μεγάλην ἔχει ῥοπήν, καὶ καθάπερ τοξόται σκοπὸν ἔχοντες μᾶλλον ἂν τυγχάνοιμεν τοῦ δέοντος; εἰ δ' οὕτω, πειρατέον τύπῳ γε περιλαβεῖν αὐτὸ τί ποτ' ἐστὶ καὶ τίνος τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἢ δυνάμεων. δόξειε δ' ἂν τῆς κυριωτάτης καὶ μάλιστα ἀρχιτεκτονικῆς.	Suppose, then, that there is some end of the things we do that we wish for on account of itself, wishing for everything else on account of it, and that we do not choose everything for the sake of something else (for in that way the process would go on without limit, so that our desire would be empty and futile). Clearly this end would be the good—the best good. Won't knowledge of it, then, carry great weight for how we live? Like archers who have a target, wouldn't we be more likely to hit what we should? If so, we must try to grasp, in outline at least, what it is and which of the sciences or

GREEK

ENGLISH

capacities it belongs to. It would seem to belong to the most authoritative one, the one that is most of all a master craft.

τοιαύτη δ' ἡ πολιτικὴ φαίνεται· τίνας γὰρ εἶναι χρεὼν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι, [1094b] καὶ ποίας ἑκάστους μανθάνειν καὶ μέχρι τίνος, αὕτη διατάσσει· ὁρῶμεν δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐντιμοτάτας τῶν δυνάμεων ὑπὸ ταύτην οὔσας, οἷον στρατηγικὴν οἰκονομικὴν ῥητορικήν· χρωμένης δὲ ταύτης ταῖς λοιπαῖς πρακτικαῖς τῶν ἐπιστημῶν, ἔτι δὲ νομοθετούσης τί δεῖ πράττειν καὶ τίνων ἀπέχεσθαι, τὸ ταύτης τέλος περιέχοι ἂν τὰ τῶν ἄλλων, ὥστε τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη τἀνθρώπινον ἀγαθόν. εἰ γὰρ καὶ ταὐτόν ἐστιν ἑνὶ καὶ πόλει, μεῖζόν γε καὶ τελειότερον τὸ τῆς πόλεως φαίνεται καὶ λαβεῖν καὶ σῴζειν· ἀγαπητὸν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἑνὶ μόνῳ, κάλλιον δὲ καὶ θειότερον ἔθνει καὶ πόλεσιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν μέθοδος τούτων ἐφίεται, πολιτική τις οὖσα.

Political science appears to be of this kind. For it is political science that lays down which of the sciences there must be in cities, [1094b] and which ones each group of citizens must learn, and up to what point. We see, too, that even the most honored capacities fall under it—generalship, for example, household management and rhetoric. And since it uses the rest of the practical sciences, and also legislates what people must do and what they must refrain from, its end would include the ends of the others, so that this end would be the human good. For even if the good is the same for an individual and for a city, the good of the city is evidently a greater and more complete thing both to attain and to preserve. It is welcome enough to secure it for one person alone, but finer and more divine to secure it for a people and for cities. This, then, is what our inquiry aims at, since it is a kind of political science.[1]

1094b λέγοιτο δ' ἂν ἱκανῶς, εἰ κατὰ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην διασαφηθείη· τὸ γὰρ ἀκριβὲς οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς λόγοις ἐπιζητητέον, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς δημιουργουμένοις. τὰ δὲ καλὰ καὶ τὰ δίκαια, περὶ ὧν ἡ πολιτικὴ σκοπεῖται, πολλὴν ἔχει διαφορὰν καὶ πλάνην, ὥστε δοκεῖν νόμῳ μόνον εἶναι, φύσει δὲ μή. τοιαύτην δέ τινα πλάνην ἔχει καὶ τἀγαθὰ διὰ τὸ πολλοῖς συμβαίνειν βλάβας ἀπ' αὐτῶν· ἤδη γάρ τινες ἀπώλοντο διὰ πλοῦτον, ἕτεροι δὲ δι' ἀνδρείαν. ἀγαπητὸν οὖν περὶ τοιούτων καὶ ἐκ τοιούτων λέγοντας παχυλῶς καὶ τύπῳ τἀληθὲς ἐνδείκνυσθαι, καὶ περὶ τῶν ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ καὶ ἐκ τοιούτων λέγοντας τοιαῦτα καὶ συμπεραίνεσθαι.

Our account will be adequate if it is made as clear as its subject matter allows. Precision should not be sought equally in all discussions, any more than in all the things craftsmen make. Fine and just things, which political science examines, involve a great deal of disagreement and variability, so much so that they are thought to exist only by convention and not by nature. Good things too involve variability of this kind, because they bring harm to many people: before now some have been ruined by their wealth, and others by their courage. So when we speak about such things, and from such premises, we must be content to indicate the truth roughly and in outline; and when we speak about what holds for the most part, and from premises of that kind, we must be content to reach conclusions of the same kind.

τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ ἀποδέχεσθαι χρεὼν ἕκαστα τῶν λεγομένων· πεπαιδευμένου γάρ ἐστιν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον τἀκριβὲς ἐπιζητεῖν καθ' ἕκαστον γένος, ἐφ' ὅσον ἡ τοῦ πράγματος φύσις ἐπιδέχεται· παραπλήσιον γὰρ φαίνεται μαθηματικοῦ τε πιθανολογοῦντος ἀποδέχεσθαι καὶ ῥητορικὸν ἀποδείξεις ἀπαιτεῖν. ἕκαστος δὲ κρίνει καλῶς ἃ γινώσκει, καὶ τούτων ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς κριτής. [1095a] καθ' ἕκαστον μὲν ἄρα ὁ πεπαιδευμένος, ἁπλῶς δ' ὁ περὶ πᾶν

Each of the things we say should be received in the same way. For it is the mark of an educated person to look for precision in each kind of thing just so far as the nature of the subject admits. Accepting merely plausible arguments from a mathematician seems much the same as demanding demonstrations from an orator. Each person

1 Greek politikē: the expertise concerned with the polis, the city-state; for Aristotle it includes ethics as well as legislation.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πεπαιδευμένος. διὸ τῆς πολιτικῆς οὐκ ἔστιν οἰκεῖος ἀκροατὴς ὁ νέος· ἄπειρος γὰρ τῶν κατὰ τὸν βίον πράξεων, οἱ λόγοι δ' ἐκ τούτων καὶ περὶ τούτων· ἔτι δὲ τοῖς πάθεσιν ἀκολουθητικὸς ὢν ματαίως ἀκούσεται καὶ ἀνωφελῶς, ἐπειδὴ τὸ τέλος ἐστὶν οὐ γνῶσις ἀλλὰ πρᾶξις.	judges well the things he knows, and of these he is a good judge. [1095a] So in a given field the person educated in that field judges well, and without qualification the person educated in everything. That is why a young person is not a suitable student of political science. He has no experience of the actions of life, and our discussions start from these and are about these. Besides, since he tends to follow his feelings, he will listen to no purpose and without benefit, because the end here is not knowledge but action.
1095a διαφέρει δ' οὐδὲν νέος τὴν ἡλικίαν ἢ τὸ ἦθος νεαρός· οὐ γὰρ παρὰ τὸν χρόνον ἡ ἔλλειψις, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ κατὰ πάθος ζῆν καὶ διώκειν ἕκαστα. τοῖς γὰρ τοιούτοις ἀνόνητος ἡ γνῶσις γίνεται, καθάπερ τοῖς ἀκρατέσιν· τοῖς δὲ κατὰ λόγον τὰς ὀρέξεις ποιουμένοις καὶ πράττουσι πολυωφελὲς ἂν εἴη τὸ περὶ τούτων εἰδέναι. καὶ περὶ μὲν ἀκροατοῦ, καὶ πῶς ἀποδεκτέον, καὶ τί προτιθέμεθα, πεφροιμιάσθω ταῦτα.	It makes no difference whether he is young in years or youthful in character. The deficiency is not a matter of time; it comes from living, and pursuing each thing, according to feeling. For such people knowledge proves useless, just as it does for those who lack self-control. But for those who form their desires and act in accordance with reason, knowing about these matters would be of great benefit. So much, then, by way of preface, about the student, about how our claims should be received, and about what we are setting out to do.

WHAT PEOPLE SAY HAPPINESS IS

Aristotle notes that all call the highest good happiness but disagree about pleasure, honor and wealth.

GREEK	ENGLISH
λέγωμεν δ' ἀναλαβόντες, ἐπειδὴ πᾶσα γνῶσις καὶ προαίρεσις ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ὀρέγεται, τί ἐστὶν οὗ λέγομεν τὴν πολιτικὴν ἐφίεσθαι καὶ τί τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθῶν. ὀνόματι μὲν οὖν σχεδὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πλείστων ὁμολογεῖται· τὴν γὰρ εὐδαιμονίαν καὶ οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ οἱ χαρίεντες λέγουσιν, τὸ δ' εὖ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εὖ πράττειν ταὐτὸν ὑπολαμβάνουσι τῷ εὐδαιμονεῖν· περὶ δὲ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, τί ἐστιν, ἀμφισβητοῦσι καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίως οἱ πολλοὶ τοῖς σοφοῖς ἀποδιδόασιν. οἳ μὲν γὰρ τῶν ἐναργῶν τι καὶ φανερῶν, οἷον ἡδονὴν ἢ πλοῦτον ἢ τιμήν, ἄλλοι δ' ἄλλο—πολλάκις δὲ καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἕτερον· νοσήσας μὲν γὰρ ὑγίειαν, πενόμενος δὲ πλοῦτον· συνειδότες δ' ἑαυτοῖς ἄγνοιαν τοὺς μέγα τι καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτοὺς λέγοντας θαυμάζουσιν.	Let us take up the question again. Since all knowledge and every decision reaches for some good, let us say what it is that we say political science aims at, and what is the highest of all the goods achievable in action. As to its name, most people pretty much agree: both ordinary people and the refined call it happiness, and they take living well and doing well to be the same as being happy. But about what happiness is they disagree, and the many do not give the same account as the wise. Some take it to be something plain and obvious, like pleasure or wealth or honor; others take it to be something else—and often the same person takes it to be different things: health when he is ill, wealth when he is poor. And when people are conscious of their own ignorance, they admire those who talk of something grand and above their heads.[2]
ἔνιοι δ' ᾠοντο παρὰ τὰ πολλὰ ταῦτα ἀγαθὰ ἄλλο τι καθ' αὐτὸ εἶναι, ὃ καὶ τούτοις πᾶσιν αἴτιόν ἐστι τοῦ εἶναι	Some, however, used to think that besides these many goods there is something else that is good

2 Happiness (eudaimonia) means flourishing: a whole life going well, not a passing mood.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀγαθά. ἁπάσας μὲν οὖν ἐξετάζειν τὰς δόξας ματαιότερον ἴσως ἐστίν, ἱκανὸν δὲ τὰς μάλιστα ἐπιπολαζούσας ἢ δοκούσας ἔχειν τινὰ λόγον. μὴ λανθανέτω δ' ἡμᾶς ὅτι διαφέρουσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν λόγοι καὶ οἱ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχάς. εὖ γὰρ καὶ ὁ Πλάτων ἠπόρει τοῦτο καὶ ἐζήτει, πότερον ἀπὸ τῶν ἀρχῶν ἢ ἐπὶ τὰς ἀρχάς ἐστιν ἡ ὁδός, 1095b ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθλοθετῶν ἐπὶ τὸ πέρας ἢ ἀνάπαλιν. ἀρκτέον μὲν γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν γνωρίμων, ταῦτα δὲ διττῶς· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἡμῖν τὰ δ' ἁπλῶς. ἴσως οὖν ἡμῖν γε ἀρκτέον ἀπὸ τῶν ἡμῖν γνωρίμων.

by itself, which is also the cause of all these being good. Examining all the opinions would perhaps be rather futile; it is enough to examine those that are most widespread or that seem to have some reason in their favor. But let us not overlook the difference between arguments from first principles and arguments toward first principles. Plato too was right to raise this problem and to ask whether the path runs from the first principles or toward them, 1095b as on a racecourse it may run from the judges to the far end or back again. We must begin from what is known; but this has two senses, since some things are known to us, others known without qualification. Perhaps, then, we at any rate must begin from what is known to us.

1095b διὸ δεῖ τοῖς ἔθεσιν ἦχθαι καλῶς τὸν περὶ καλῶν καὶ δικαίων καὶ ὅλως τῶν πολιτικῶν ἀκουσόμενον ἱκανῶς. ἀρχὴ γὰρ τὸ ὅτι, καὶ εἰ τοῦτο φαίνοιτο ἀρκούντως, οὐδὲν προσδεήσει τοῦ διότι· ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ἔχει ἢ λάβοι ἂν ἀρχὰς ῥᾳδίως. ᾧ δὲ μηδέτερον ὑπάρχει τούτων, ἀκουσάτω τῶν Ἡσιόδου· οὗτος μὲν πανάριστος ὃς αὐτὸς πάντα νοήσῃ, ἐσθλὸς δ' αὖ κἀκεῖνος ὃς εὖ εἰπόντι πίθηται. ὃς δέ κε μήτ' αὐτὸς νοέῃ μήτ' ἄλλου ἀκούων ἐν θυμῷ βάλληται, ὃ δ' αὖτ' ἀχρήιος ἀνήρ.

That is why anyone who is going to be an adequate student of what is fine and just, and of political matters generally, must have been well brought up in his habits. For the starting point is the fact that something is so, and if this is sufficiently clear, there will be no further need of the reason why. Such a person either has the starting points or can easily get them. As for someone who has neither, let him hear the words of Hesiod: "Best of all is he who understands all things himself;
good, too, is he who listens to one who speaks well.
But he who neither understands himself nor, hearing another,
takes it to heart—that man is useless."[3]

ἡμεῖς δὲ λέγωμεν ὅθεν παρεξέβημεν. τὸ γὰρ ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οὐκ ἀλόγως ἐοίκασιν ἐκ τῶν βίων ὑπολαμβάνειν οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ φορτικώτατοι τὴν ἡδονήν· διὸ καὶ τὸν βίον ἀγαπῶσι τὸν ἀπολαυστικόν. τρεῖς γάρ εἰσι μάλιστα οἱ προύχοντες, ὅ τε νῦν εἰρημένος καὶ ὁ πολιτικὸς καὶ τρίτος ὁ θεωρητικός. οἱ μὲν οὖν πολλοὶ παντελῶς ἀνδραποδώδεις φαίνονται βοσκημάτων βίον προαιρούμενοι, τυγχάνουσι δὲ λόγου διὰ τὸ πολλοὺς τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις ὁμοιοπαθεῖν Σαρδαναπάλλῳ. οἱ δὲ χαρίεντες καὶ πρακτικοὶ τιμήν· τοῦ γὰρ πολιτικοῦ βίου σχεδὸν τοῦτο τέλος. φαίνεται δ' ἐπιπολαιότερον εἶναι τοῦ ζητουμένου· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τιμῶσι μᾶλλον εἶναι ἢ ἐν τῷ τιμωμένῳ, τἀγαθὸν δὲ οἰκεῖόν τι καὶ δυσαφαίρετον εἶναι μαντευόμεθα.

But let us return to where we digressed. To judge from the lives they lead, the many and most vulgar seem—not unreasonably—to take the good, that is, happiness, to be pleasure; that is why they are content with the life of enjoyment. For there are three lives that stand out most: the one just mentioned, the political life, and third the contemplative life. The many appear quite slavish, choosing a life fit for grazing cattle; yet they get a hearing because many of those in positions of power share the tastes of Sardanapallus. Refined people and people of action, on the other hand, take the good to be honor, since this is roughly the end of the political life. But honor appears more superficial than what we are looking for. It seems to depend on those who confer it more than on the one who receives it, whereas we have a hunch that

3 From Hesiod's *Works and Days*, a poem of moral and practical advice composed around 700 BC.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	the good is something of one's own and hard to take away.[4]
ἔτι δ' ἐοίκασι τὴν τιμὴν διώκειν ἵνα πιστεύσωσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι· ζητοῦσι γοῦν ὑπὸ τῶν φρονίμων τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ παρ' οἷς γινώσκονται, καὶ ἐπ' ἀρετῇ· δῆλον οὖν ὅτι κατά γε τούτους ἡ ἀρετὴ κρείττων. τάχα δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον ἄν τις τέλος τοῦ πολιτικοῦ βίου ταύτην ὑπολάβοι. φαίνεται δὲ ἀτελεστέρα καὶ αὕτη· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐνδέχεσθαι καὶ καθεύδειν ἔχοντα τὴν ἀρετὴν ἢ ἀπρακτεῖν διὰ βίου, καὶ πρὸς τούτοις κακοπαθεῖν καὶ ἀτυχεῖν τὰ μέγιστα· 1096a τὸν δ' οὕτω ζῶντα οὐδεὶς ἂν εὐδαιμονίσειεν, εἰ μὴ θέσιν διαφυλάττων. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἅλις· ἱκανῶς γὰρ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐγκυκλίοις εἴρηται περὶ αὐτῶν. τρίτος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ θεωρητικός, ὑπὲρ οὗ τὴν ἐπίσκεψιν ἐν τοῖς ἑπομένοις ποιησόμεθα.	Further, people seem to pursue honor in order to convince themselves that they are good. At any rate they seek to be honored by the practically wise, by people who know them, and for their excellence. Clearly, then, on their own view at least, excellence is better. Perhaps one might even suppose that excellence, rather than honor, is the end of the political life. But this too appears incomplete. For it seems possible to have excellence and yet be asleep, or inactive throughout one's life, and on top of this to suffer terribly and meet with the greatest misfortunes; 1096a and no one would call a person living that way happy, unless he were defending a thesis. But enough of this; these matters have been discussed adequately in our popular works as well. The third life is the contemplative, which we shall examine in what follows.[5]
1096a ὁ δὲ χρηματιστὴς βίαιός τις ἐστίν, καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος δῆλον ὅτι οὐ τὸ ζητούμενον ἀγαθόν· χρήσιμον γὰρ καὶ ἄλλου χάριν. διὸ μᾶλλον τὰ πρότερον λεχθέντα τέλη τις ἂν ὑπολάβοι· δι' αὐτὰ γὰρ ἀγαπᾶται. φαίνεται δ' οὐδ' ἐκεῖνα· καίτοι πολλοὶ λόγοι πρὸς αὐτὰ καταβέβληνται. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀφείσθω.	The life of money-making is a life of constraint, and wealth is clearly not the good we are looking for, since it is useful and for the sake of something else. So one might rather suppose the ends mentioned earlier to be the good, since they are liked for their own sake. But evidently they are not either, even though many arguments have been laid down in their support. So let us leave these aside.

PLATO'S FORM OF THE GOOD

Aristotle criticizes Plato's idea of a single universal Form of the good.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τὸ δὲ καθόλου βέλτιον ἴσως ἐπισκέψασθαι καὶ διαπορῆσαι πῶς λέγεται, καίπερ προσάντους τῆς τοιαύτης ζητήσεως γινομένης διὰ τὸ φίλους ἄνδρας εἰσαγαγεῖν τὰ εἴδη. δόξειε δ' ἂν ἴσως βέλτιον εἶναι καὶ δεῖν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ γε τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἀναιρεῖν, ἄλλως τε καὶ φιλοσόφους ὄντας· ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν φίλοιν ὅσιον προτιμᾶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν. οἱ δὴ κομίσαντες τὴν δόξαν ταύτην οὐκ ἐποίουν ἰδέας ἐν οἷς τὸ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον ἔλεγον, διόπερ οὐδὲ τῶν ἀριθμῶν ἰδέαν κατεσκεύαζον· τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν λέγεται καὶ ἐν τῷ τί ἐστι καὶ ἐν τῷ ποιῷ καὶ ἐν τῷ πρός τι, τὸ δὲ καθ' αὐτὸ καὶ ἡ οὐσία πρότερον τῇ φύσει τοῦ πρός τι (παραφυάδι γὰρ τοῦτ' ἔοικε καὶ συμβεβηκότι τοῦ ὄντος)· ὥστ' οὐκ ἂν εἴη κοινή τις ἐπὶ τούτοις ἰδέα.	It is perhaps better to examine the universal good and to work through the difficulties about how it is meant, even though such an inquiry is an uphill task, because the forms were introduced by friends of ours. Yet it would perhaps seem better—indeed our duty—to do away even with what is our own for the sake of preserving the truth, especially since we are philosophers. For while both are dear to us, piety requires us to honor the truth first. Those who introduced this view did not posit forms of things in which they spoke of a prior and a posterior, which is why they did not set up a form of numbers either. But the good is spoken of

4 Sardanapallus: a legendary Assyrian king, proverbial for luxurious self-indulgence.
5 "Popular works": probably Aristotle's writings for a general audience, now lost.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	in the category of what a thing is, in that of quality, and in that of relation; and what exists by itself, substance, is prior by nature to what is relative (the relative is like an offshoot, an accident, of being). So there could not be a common form over these.[6]
ἔτι δ' ἐπεὶ τἀγαθὸν ἰσαχῶς λέγεται τῷ ὄντι (καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ τί λέγεται, οἷον ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ νοῦς, καὶ ἐν τῷ ποιῷ αἱ ἀρεταί, καὶ ἐν τῷ ποσῷ τὸ μέτριον, καὶ ἐν τῷ πρός τι τὸ χρήσιμον, καὶ ἐν χρόνῳ καιρός, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ δίαιτα καὶ ἕτερα τοιαῦτα), δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη κοινόν τι καθόλου καὶ ἕν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἐλέγετ' ἐν πάσαις ταῖς κατηγορίαις, ἀλλ' ἐν μιᾷ μόνῃ. ἔτι δ' ἐπεὶ τῶν κατὰ μίαν ἰδέαν μία καὶ ἐπιστήμη, καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων ἦν ἂν μία τις ἐπιστήμη· νῦν δ' εἰσὶ πολλαὶ καὶ τῶν ὑπὸ μίαν κατηγορίαν, οἷον καιροῦ, ἐν πολέμῳ μὲν γὰρ στρατηγικὴ ἐν νόσῳ δ' ἰατρική, καὶ τοῦ μετρίου ἐν τροφῇ μὲν ἰατρικὴ ἐν πόνοις δὲ γυμναστική.	Further, the good is spoken of in as many ways as being is: in the category of what a thing is, as god and intellect; in quality, as the excellences; in quantity, as the moderate amount; in relation, as the useful; in time, as the right moment; in place, as a suitable habitat; and so on. Clearly, then, it could not be something common, universal and one; for then it would not be spoken of in all the categories, but in one only. Further, since there is one science of the things that fall under one form, there would also have been one science of all goods. But in fact there are many sciences even of the goods that fall under a single category: of the right moment, for example—in war it is generalship, in disease medicine; and of the moderate amount—in diet it is medicine, in exercise gymnastics.
ἀπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις τί ποτε καὶ βούλονται λέγειν αὐτοέκαστον, εἴπερ ἕν τε αὐτοανθρώπῳ 1096b καὶ ἐν ἀνθρώπῳ εἷς καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ᾗ γὰρ ἄνθρωποι, οὐδὲν διοίσουσιν· εἰ δ' οὕτως, οὐδ' ᾗ ἀγαθόν. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ τῷ ἀίδιον εἶναι μᾶλλον ἀγαθὸν ἔσται, εἴπερ μηδὲ λευκότερον τὸ πολυχρόνιον τοῦ ἐφημέρου. πιθανώτερον δ' ἐοίκασιν οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ, τιθέντες ἐν τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν συστοιχίᾳ τὸ ἕν· οἷς δὴ καὶ Σπεύσιππος ἐπακολουθῆσαι δοκεῖ.	One might also be puzzled about what on earth they mean by "the thing itself," if the account of man is one and the same in man-itself 1096b and in a man. For insofar as they are man, they will not differ at all; and if so, neither will they differ insofar as they are good. Nor, again, will the good be any more good by being eternal, if a white thing that lasts a long time is no whiter than one that lasts a day. The Pythagoreans seem to give a more plausible account of the good, placing the One in their column of goods; and Speusippus seems to have followed them.[7]
1096b ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἄλλος ἔστω λόγος· τοῖς δὲ λεχθεῖσιν ἀμφισβήτησίς τις ὑποφαίνεται διὰ τὸ μὴ περὶ παντὸς ἀγαθοῦ τοὺς λόγους εἰρῆσθαι, λέγεσθαι δὲ καθ' ἓν εἶδος τὰ καθ' αὑτὰ διωκόμενα καὶ ἀγαπώμενα, τὰ δὲ ποιητικὰ τούτων ἢ φυλακτικά πως ἢ τῶν ἐναντίων κωλυτικὰ διὰ ταῦτα λέγεσθαι καὶ τρόπον ἄλλον. δῆλον οὖν ὅτι διττῶς λέγοιτ' ἂν τἀγαθά, καὶ τὰ μὲν καθ' αὑτά, θάτερα δὲ διὰ ταῦτα. χωρίσαντες οὖν ἀπὸ τῶν ὠφελίμων τὰ καθ' αὑτὰ σκεψώμεθα εἰ λέγεται κατὰ μίαν ἰδέαν. καθ' αὑτὰ δὲ ποῖα θείη τις ἄν; ἢ ὅσα καὶ μονούμενα διώκεται, οἷον τὸ φρονεῖν καὶ ὁρᾶν καὶ ἡδοναί τινες καὶ τιμαί;	But let us leave these matters for another discussion. An objection to what we have said suggests itself: that the arguments were not meant to cover every good. Things pursued and liked for their own sake are called good by reference to a single form, while the things that produce these, or in some way preserve them, or prevent their opposites, are called good because of these, and in another way. Clearly, then, goods would be spoken of in two ways: some by themselves, the others be-

6 The "friends" are Plato and his circle in the Academy, where Aristotle studied for some twenty years.
7 The Pythagoreans arranged pairs of opposites in two columns, the One heading the column of goods. Speusippus, Plato's nephew, succeeded him as head of the Academy.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ταῦτα γὰρ εἰ καὶ δι' ἄλλο τι διώκομεν, ὅμως τῶν καθ' αὐτὰ ἀγαθῶν θείη τις ἄν. ἢ οὐδ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν πλὴν τῆς ἰδέας;

cause of these. So let us separate the things good by themselves from the useful ones and consider whether they are called good by reference to a single form. What sort of things would one class as good by themselves? Those that are pursued even on their own, such as being practically wise, seeing, and certain pleasures and honors? For even if we also pursue these for the sake of something else, one would still class them among things good by themselves. Or is nothing good by itself except the form?

ὥστε μάταιον ἔσται τὸ εἶδος. εἰ δὲ καὶ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τῶν καθ' αὐτά, τὸν τἀγαθοῦ λόγον ἐν ἅπασιν αὐτοῖς τὸν αὐτὸν ἐμφαίνεσθαι δεήσει, καθάπερ ἐν χιόνι καὶ ψιμυθίῳ τὸν τῆς λευκότητος. τιμῆς δὲ καὶ φρονήσεως καὶ ἡδονῆς ἕτεροι καὶ διαφέροντες οἱ λόγοι ταύτῃ ᾗ ἀγαθά. οὐκ ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ ἀγαθὸν κοινόν τι κατὰ μίαν ἰδέαν. ἀλλὰ πῶς δὴ λέγεται; οὐ γὰρ ἔοικε τοῖς γε ἀπὸ τύχης ὁμωνύμοις. ἀλλ' ἆρά γε τῷ ἀφ' ἑνὸς εἶναι ἢ πρὸς ἓν ἅπαντα συντελεῖν, ἢ μᾶλλον κατ' ἀναλογίαν; ὡς γὰρ ἐν σώματι ὄψις, ἐν ψυχῇ νοῦς, καὶ ἄλλο δὴ ἐν ἄλλῳ. ἀλλ' ἴσως ταῦτα μὲν ἀφετέον τὸ νῦν· ἐξακριβοῦν γὰρ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἄλλης ἂν εἴη φιλοσοφίας οἰκειότερον.

In that case the form will be pointless. But if these things too are among the things good by themselves, the account of the good will have to show up as the same in all of them, just as the account of whiteness is the same in snow and in white lead. But the accounts of honor, practical wisdom and pleasure are distinct and different precisely insofar as they are goods. So the good is not something common answering to a single form. How, then, is it spoken of? It does not seem to be like things that merely happen to share a name. Is it by all goods deriving from one thing, or all contributing to one thing? Or is it rather by analogy? For as sight is in the body, so intellect is in the soul, and so on, one thing in another. But perhaps we should leave these questions for now, since going into them precisely would belong more properly to another branch of philosophy.

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῆς ἰδέας· εἰ γὰρ καὶ ἔστιν ἕν τι τὸ κοινῇ κατηγορούμενον ἀγαθὸν ἢ χωριστὸν αὐτό τι καθ' αὐτό, δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἂν εἴη πρακτὸν οὐδὲ κτητὸν ἀνθρώπῳ· νῦν δὲ τοιοῦτόν τι ζητεῖται. τάχα δέ τῳ δόξειεν ἂν βέλτιον εἶναι γνωρίζειν αὐτὸ [1097a] πρὸς τὰ κτητὰ καὶ πρακτὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν· οἷον γὰρ παράδειγμα τοῦτ' ἔχοντες μᾶλλον εἰσόμεθα καὶ τὰ ἡμῖν ἀγαθά, κἂν εἰδῶμεν, ἐπιτευξόμεθα αὐτῶν. πιθανότητα μὲν οὖν τινα ἔχει ὁ λόγος, ἔοικε δὲ ταῖς ἐπιστήμαις διαφωνεῖν· πᾶσαι γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ τινὸς ἐφιέμεναι καὶ τὸ ἐνδεὲς ἐπιζητοῦσαι παραλείπουσι τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτοῦ. καίτοι βοήθημα τηλικοῦτον τοὺς τεχνίτας ἅπαντας ἀγνοεῖν καὶ μηδ' ἐπιζητεῖν οὐκ εὔλογον.

The same goes for the form. For even if there is some one good that is predicated in common, or something separate, itself by itself, clearly it could not be done or acquired by a human being; and it is something of that kind that we are now looking for. Perhaps someone might think it better to know the form [1097a] with a view to the goods that can be acquired and done: with it as a kind of model, we shall know better the things that are good for us, and if we know them, we shall attain them. The argument has a certain plausibility, but it seems to clash with the sciences. All of them aim at some good and seek to supply what is lacking, yet they pass over knowledge of this good. And it is not reasonable that all craftsmen should be ignorant of so great an aid and not even look for it.

1097a ἄπορον δὲ καὶ τί ὠφεληθήσεται ὑφάντης ἢ τέκτων πρὸς τὴν αὐτοῦ τέχνην εἰδὼς τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο ἀγαθόν, ἢ πῶς ἰατρικώτερος ἢ στρατηγικώτερος ἔσται ὁ τὴν ἰδέαν αὐτὴν τεθεαμένος. φαίνεται μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲ τὴν ὑγίειαν οὕτως

It is also hard to see how a weaver or a carpenter will be helped in his own craft by knowing this good itself, or how someone who has beheld the form itself will be a better doctor or general. For

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἐπισκοπεῖν ὁ ἰατρός, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἀνθρώπου, μᾶλλον δ' ἴσως τὴν τοῦδε· καθ' ἕκαστον γὰρ ἰατρεύει. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω.	the doctor does not even seem to consider health in this way, but human health—or rather, perhaps, the health of this particular person, since he treats patients one by one. So much for these matters.

HAPPINESS AS THE COMPLETE END

Aristotle argues that happiness is the most complete end, chosen for itself and self-sufficient.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πάλιν δ' ἐπανέλθωμεν ἐπὶ τὸ ζητούμενον ἀγαθόν, τί ποτ' ἂν εἴη. φαίνεται μὲν γὰρ ἄλλο ἐν ἄλλῃ πράξει καὶ τέχνῃ· ἄλλο γὰρ ἐν ἰατρικῇ καὶ στρατηγικῇ καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς ὁμοίως. τί οὖν ἑκάστης τἀγαθόν; ἢ οὗ χάριν τὰ λοιπὰ πράττεται; τοῦτο δ' ἐν ἰατρικῇ μὲν ὑγίεια, ἐν στρατηγικῇ δὲ νίκη, ἐν οἰκοδομικῇ δ' οἰκία, ἐν ἄλλῳ δ' ἄλλο, ἐν ἁπάσῃ δὲ πράξει καὶ προαιρέσει τὸ τέλος· τούτου γὰρ ἕνεκα τὰ λοιπὰ πράττουσι πάντες. ὥστ' εἴ τι τῶν πρακτῶν ἁπάντων ἐστὶ τέλος, τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη τὸ πρακτὸν ἀγαθόν, εἰ δὲ πλείω, ταῦτα. μεταβαίνων δὴ ὁ λόγος εἰς ταὐτὸν ἀφῖκται· τοῦτο δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον διασαφῆσαι πειρατέον.	Let us return once more to the good we are looking for and ask what it might be. It appears to be different in different actions and crafts: one thing in medicine, another in generalship, and likewise in the rest. What, then, is the good of each? Isn't it that for the sake of which everything else is done? In medicine this is health, in generalship victory, in housebuilding a house, in another field something else, and in every action and decision it is the end, since it is for the sake of the end that everyone does everything else. So if there is some one end of everything done in action, this would be the good achievable in action; and if there are several, it would be these. So our argument, taking a different route, has arrived at the same point; but we must try to make this still clearer.
ἐπεὶ δὲ πλείω φαίνεται τὰ τέλη, τούτων δ' αἱρούμεθά τινα δι' ἕτερον, οἷον πλοῦτον αὐλοὺς καὶ ὅλως τὰ ὄργανα, δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἔστι πάντα τέλεια· τὸ δ' ἄριστον τέλειόν τι φαίνεται. ὥστ' εἰ μέν ἐστιν ἕν τι μόνον τέλειον, τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη τὸ ζητούμενον, εἰ δὲ πλείω, τὸ τελειότατον τούτων. τελειότερον δὲ λέγομεν τὸ καθ' αὑτὸ διωκτὸν τοῦ δι' ἕτερον καὶ τὸ μηδέποτε δι' ἄλλο αἱρετὸν τῶν καὶ καθ' αὑτὰ καὶ δι' αὐτὸ αἱρετῶν, καὶ ἁπλῶς δὴ τέλειον τὸ καθ' αὑτὸ αἱρετὸν ἀεὶ καὶ μηδέποτε δι' ἄλλο.	Since there are evidently several ends, and we choose some of them for the sake of something else—wealth, for example, pipes, and instruments in general—clearly not all ends are complete; but the best good appears to be something complete. So if there is just one thing that is complete, this would be what we are looking for; and if there are several, the most complete of them. We call what is pursued for its own sake more complete than what is pursued for the sake of something else, and what is never chosen for the sake of something else more complete than things chosen both for their own sake and for the sake of that; and what is always chosen for its own sake and never for the sake of something else we call complete without qualification.
τοιοῦτον δ' ἡ εὐδαιμονία μάλιστ' εἶναι δοκεῖ· [1097b] ταύτην γὰρ αἱρούμεθα ἀεὶ δι' αὐτὴν καὶ οὐδέποτε δι' ἄλλο, τιμὴν δὲ καὶ ἡδονὴν καὶ νοῦν καὶ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν αἱρούμεθα μὲν καὶ δι' αὐτά (μηθενὸς γὰρ ἀποβαίνοντος ἑλοίμεθ' ἂν ἕκαστον αὐτῶν), αἱρούμεθα δὲ καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας χάριν, διὰ τούτων ὑπολαμβάνοντες εὐδαιμονήσειν. τὴν δ' εὐδαιμονίαν οὐδεὶς αἱρεῖται τούτων χάριν, οὐδ' ὅλως δι' ἄλλο. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς αὐταρκείας τὸ αὐτὸ	Happiness above all seems to be like this. [1097b] We always choose it for its own sake and never for the sake of anything else. Honor, pleasure, intellect and every excellence we do choose for their own sake (since we would choose each of them even if nothing came of it), but we also choose them for the sake of happiness, supposing that through them we shall be happy. Happiness, on the other

GREEK	ENGLISH
συμβαίνειν· τὸ γὰρ τέλειον ἀγαθὸν αὔταρκες εἶναι δοκεῖ. τὸ δ' αὔταρκες λέγομεν οὐκ αὐτῷ μόνῳ, τῷ ζῶντι βίον μονώτην, ἀλλὰ καὶ γονεῦσι καὶ τέκνοις καὶ γυναικὶ καὶ ὅλως τοῖς φίλοις καὶ πολίταις, ἐπειδὴ φύσει πολιτικὸν ὁ ἄνθρωπος.	hand, no one chooses for the sake of these, or for the sake of anything else at all. The same conclusion appears to follow from self-sufficiency too, since the complete good seems to be self-sufficient. By self-sufficient we mean not sufficient for oneself alone, living a solitary life, but also for parents, children and wife, and in general for friends and fellow citizens, since a human being is by nature a political creature.
1097b τούτων δὲ ληπτέος ὅρος τις· ἐπεκτείνοντι γὰρ ἐπὶ τοὺς γονεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἀπογόνους καὶ τῶν φίλων τοὺς φίλους εἰς ἄπειρον πρόεισιν. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν εἰσαῦθις ἐπισκεπτέον· τὸ δ' αὔταρκες τίθεμεν ὃ μονούμενον αἱρετὸν ποιεῖ τὸν βίον καὶ μηδενὸς ἐνδεᾶ· τοιοῦτον δὲ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οἰόμεθα εἶναι· ἔτι δὲ πάντων αἱρετωτάτην μὴ συναριθμουμένην—συναριθμουμένην δὲ δῆλον ὡς αἱρετωτέραν μετὰ τοῦ ἐλαχίστου τῶν ἀγαθῶν· ὑπεροχὴ γὰρ ἀγαθῶν γίνεται τὸ προστιθέμενον, ἀγαθῶν δὲ τὸ μεῖζον αἱρετώτερον ἀεί. τέλειον δή τι φαίνεται καὶ αὔταρκες ἡ εὐδαιμονία, τῶν πρακτῶν οὖσα τέλος.	But some limit must be set here, since if we extend it to parents and descendants and friends' friends, it goes on without limit. That, however, must be examined another time. We take the self-sufficient to be what on its own makes life choiceworthy and lacking in nothing; and this is what we think happiness is. Further, we think it the most choiceworthy of all things, not counted as one good among others. If it were so counted, it would clearly be more choiceworthy with the addition of even the smallest of goods; for what is added makes an excess of goods, and of goods the greater is always more choiceworthy. Happiness, then, appears to be something complete and self-sufficient, since it is the end of what is done in action.

THE HUMAN FUNCTION

Aristotle defines happiness as activity of the soul in accordance with excellence, based on the human function.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀλλ' ἴσως τὴν μὲν εὐδαιμονίαν τὸ ἄριστον λέγειν ὁμολογούμενόν τι φαίνεται, ποθεῖται δ' ἐναργέστερον τί ἐστιν ἔτι λεχθῆναι. τάχα δὴ γένοιτ' ἂν τοῦτ', εἰ ληφθείη τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ὥσπερ γὰρ αὐλητῇ καὶ ἀγαλματοποιῷ καὶ παντὶ τεχνίτῃ, καὶ ὅλως ὧν ἔστιν ἔργον τι καὶ πρᾶξις, ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ δοκεῖ τἀγαθὸν εἶναι καὶ τὸ εὖ, οὕτω δόξειεν ἂν καὶ ἀνθρώπῳ, εἴπερ ἔστι τι ἔργον αὐτοῦ. πότερον οὖν τέκτονος μὲν καὶ σκυτέως ἔστιν ἔργα τινὰ καὶ πράξεις, ἀνθρώπου δ' οὐδέν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ἀργὸν πέφυκεν; ἢ καθάπερ ὀφθαλμοῦ καὶ χειρὸς καὶ ποδὸς καὶ ὅλως ἑκάστου τῶν μορίων φαίνεταί τι ἔργον, οὕτω καὶ ἀνθρώπου παρὰ πάντα ταῦτα θείη τις ἂν ἔργον τι; τί οὖν δὴ τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη ποτέ;	But perhaps saying that happiness is the best good seems a commonplace, and what is wanted is a clearer statement of what it is. This might perhaps be achieved if we grasped the function of a human being. For just as for a pipe-player, a sculptor and every craftsman, and in general for all things that have a function and an action, the good—the doing well—seems to lie in the function, so it would seem to be for a human being too, if he has a function. Do the carpenter and the shoemaker, then, have certain functions and actions, while a human being has none and is by nature idle? Or, just as the eye, the hand, the foot and in general each of the parts evidently has a function, may one likewise posit a function for a human being over and above all these? What, then, could this be?
τὸ μὲν γὰρ ζῆν κοινὸν εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ τοῖς φυτοῖς, ζητεῖται δὲ τὸ ἴδιον. 1098a ἀφοριστέον ἄρα τήν τε θρεπτικὴν καὶ τὴν αὐξητικὴν ζωήν. ἑπομένη δὲ αἰσθητική τις ἂν εἴη, φαίνεται δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ κοινὴ καὶ ἵππῳ	Living is evidently shared even with plants, but we are looking for what is distinctive. 1098a So we must set aside the life of nutrition and growth. Next would be some sort of life of perception, but

GREEK

καὶ βοΐ καὶ παντὶ ζῴῳ. λείπεται δὴ πρακτική τις τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος· τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ὡς ἐπιπειθὲς λόγῳ, τὸ δ' ὡς ἔχον καὶ διανοούμενον. διττῶς δὲ καὶ ταύτης λεγομένης τὴν κατ' ἐνέργειαν θετέον· κυριώτερον γὰρ αὕτη δοκεῖ λέγεσθαι.

1098a εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἔργον ἀνθρώπου ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια κατὰ λόγον ἢ μὴ ἄνευ λόγου, τὸ δ' αὐτό φαμεν ἔργον εἶναι τῷ γένει τοῦδε καὶ τοῦδε σπουδαίου, ὥσπερ κιθαριστοῦ καὶ σπουδαίου κιθαριστοῦ, καὶ ἁπλῶς δὴ τοῦτ' ἐπὶ πάντων, προστιθεμένης τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὑπεροχῆς πρὸς τὸ ἔργον· κιθαριστοῦ μὲν γὰρ κιθαρίζειν, σπουδαίου δὲ τὸ εὖ· εἰ δ' οὕτως, ἀνθρώπου δὲ τίθεμεν ἔργον ζωήν τινα, ταύτην δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνέργειαν καὶ πράξεις μετὰ λόγου, σπουδαίου δ' ἀνδρὸς εὖ ταῦτα καὶ καλῶς, ἕκαστον δ' εὖ κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν ἀποτελεῖται· εἰ δ' οὕτω, τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ἀγαθὸν ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια γίνεται κατ' ἀρετήν, εἰ δὲ πλείους αἱ ἀρεταί, κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην καὶ τελειοτάτην. ἔτι δ' ἐν βίῳ τελείῳ.

μία γὰρ χελιδὼν ἔαρ οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐδὲ μία ἡμέρα· οὕτω δὲ οὐδὲ μακάριον καὶ εὐδαίμονα μία ἡμέρα οὐδ' ὀλίγος χρόνος. περιγεγράφθω μὲν οὖν τἀγαθὸν ταύτῃ· δεῖ γὰρ ἴσως ὑποτυπῶσαι πρῶτον, εἶθ' ὕστερον ἀναγράψαι. δόξειε δ' ἂν παντὸς εἶναι προαγαγεῖν καὶ διαρθρῶσαι τὰ καλῶς ἔχοντα τῇ περιγραφῇ, καὶ ὁ χρόνος τῶν τοιούτων εὑρετὴς ἢ συνεργὸς ἀγαθὸς εἶναι· ὅθεν καὶ τῶν τεχνῶν γεγόνασιν αἱ ἐπιδόσεις· παντὸς γὰρ προσθεῖναι τὸ ἐλλεῖπον. μεμνῆσθαι δὲ καὶ τῶν προειρημένων χρή, καὶ τὴν ἀκρίβειαν μὴ ὁμοίως ἐν ἅπασιν ἐπιζητεῖν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκάστοις κατὰ τὴν ὑποκειμένην ὕλην καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἐφ' ὅσον οἰκεῖον τῇ μεθόδῳ. καὶ γὰρ τέκτων καὶ γεωμέτρης διαφερόντως ἐπιζητοῦσι τὴν ὀρθήν· ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐφ' ὅσον χρησίμη πρὸς τὸ ἔργον, ὃ δὲ τί ἐστιν ἢ ποῖόν τι· θεατὴς γὰρ τἀληθοῦς.

ENGLISH

this too is evidently shared, with the horse, the ox and every animal. What remains, then, is some sort of practical life of the part that has reason. Of this, one part has reason in the sense that it obeys reason, the other in the sense that it has reason and thinks. And since this life too is spoken of in two ways, we must take the life in activity, since this seems to be the more authoritative sense.

Suppose the function of a human being is activity of the soul in accordance with reason, or not without reason. We say that the function of a thing of a given kind and of an excellent thing of that kind are the same in kind—of a lyre-player and an excellent lyre-player, for example, and so without qualification in every case, superiority in excellence being added to the function: a lyre-player's function is to play the lyre, an excellent one's is to play it well. If so, and if we take the function of a human being to be a certain kind of life, and this to be activity of the soul and actions involving reason, and the function of an excellent man to be to do these things well and finely, and each thing is accomplished well when it is accomplished in accordance with its proper excellence—if all this is so, the human good turns out to be activity of the soul in accordance with excellence, and if there are several excellences, in accordance with the best and most complete. And further, in a complete life.

For one swallow does not make a spring, nor does one day; and in the same way one day, or a short time, does not make someone blessed and happy. Let this, then, serve as an outline of the good; for perhaps we must first sketch it roughly and fill it in later. It would seem that anyone can carry forward and articulate what has been well outlined, and that time is a good discoverer of such things, or a good helper. That is also how advances in the crafts have come about, since anyone can add what is missing. We must also remember what was said before, and not seek precision equally in all things, but in each case in keeping with the subject matter and only so far as suits the inquiry. A carpenter and a geometer both look for the right angle, but in different ways: the carpenter as far as it is useful for his work, while the geometer looks for what it is or what sort of thing it is, since he is a contemplator of the truth.

GREEK

τὸν αὐτὸν δὴ τρόπον καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ποιητέον, ὅπως μὴ τὰ πάρεργα τῶν ἔργων πλείω γίνηται. [1098b] οὐκ ἀπαιτητέον δ' οὐδὲ τὴν αἰτίαν ἐν ἅπασιν ὁμοίως, ἀλλ' ἱκανὸν ἔν τισι τὸ ὅτι δειχθῆναι καλῶς, οἷον καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀρχάς· τὸ δ' ὅτι πρῶτον καὶ ἀρχή. τῶν ἀρχῶν δ' αἱ μὲν ἐπαγωγῇ θεωροῦνται, αἱ δ' αἰσθήσει, αἱ δ' ἐθισμῷ τινί, καὶ ἄλλαι δ' ἄλλως. μετιέναι δὲ πειρατέον ἑκάστας ᾗ πεφύκασιν, καὶ σπουδαστέον ὅπως διορισθῶσι καλῶς· μεγάλην γὰρ ἔχουσι ῥοπὴν πρὸς τὰ ἑπόμενα. δοκεῖ γὰρ πλεῖον ἢ ἥμισυ τοῦ παντὸς εἶναι ἡ ἀρχή, καὶ πολλὰ συμφανῆ γίνεσθαι δι' αὐτῆς τῶν ζητουμένων.

ENGLISH

We must proceed in the same way in other matters too, so that side issues do not outweigh the main work. [1098b] Nor should we demand the cause equally in all cases; in some it is enough that the fact be properly shown, as with first principles, where the fact is primary and is itself a starting point. Of first principles, some are grasped by induction, some by perception, some by a kind of habituation, and others in other ways. We must try to pursue each kind in the way natural to it, and take pains to define them well, since they carry great weight for what follows. For the starting point seems to be more than half of the whole, and through it many of the things we are inquiring into become clear.

1098b σκεπτέον δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς οὐ μόνον ἐκ τοῦ συμπεράσματος καὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων περὶ αὐτῆς· τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἀληθεῖ πάντα συνᾴδει τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, τῷ δὲ ψευδεῖ ταχὺ διαφωνεῖ τἀληθές. νενεμημένων δὴ τῶν ἀγαθῶν τριχῇ, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐκτὸς λεγομένων τῶν δὲ περὶ ψυχὴν καὶ σῶμα, τὰ περὶ ψυχὴν κυριώτατα λέγομεν καὶ μάλιστα ἀγαθά, τὰς δὲ πράξεις καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας τὰς ψυχικὰς περὶ ψυχὴν τίθεμεν. ὥστε καλῶς ἂν λέγοιτο κατά γε ταύτην τὴν δόξαν παλαιὰν οὖσαν καὶ ὁμολογουμένην ὑπὸ τῶν φιλοσοφούντων. ὀρθῶς δὲ καὶ ὅτι πράξεις τινὲς λέγονται καὶ ἐνέργειαι τὸ τέλος· οὕτω γὰρ τῶν περὶ ψυχὴν ἀγαθῶν γίνεται καὶ οὐ τῶν ἐκτός.

We must examine this starting point not only on the basis of our conclusion and the premises of our argument, but also on the basis of what is said about it. For with what is true all the facts harmonize, whereas with what is false the truth soon clashes. Now goods have been divided into three kinds: some are called external, others goods of the soul, and others goods of the body. We say that the goods of the soul are goods in the most authoritative sense and to the highest degree, and we class actions and activities of the soul as belonging to the soul. So our account would be right, at least by this view, which is ancient and agreed on by philosophers. It is also right in saying that the end consists in certain actions and activities; for in this way it turns out to be among the goods of the soul and not among the external ones.

συνᾴδει δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ εὖ ζῆν καὶ τὸ εὖ πράττειν τὸν εὐδαίμονα· σχεδὸν γὰρ εὐζωία τις εἴρηται καὶ εὐπραξία. φαίνεται δὲ καὶ τὰ ἐπιζητούμενα τὰ περὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἅπανθ' ὑπάρχειν τῷ λεχθέντι. τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴ τοῖς δὲ φρόνησις ἄλλοις δὲ σοφία τις εἶναι δοκεῖ, τοῖς δὲ ταῦτα ἢ τούτων τι μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἢ οὐκ ἄνευ ἡδονῆς· ἕτεροι δὲ καὶ τὴν ἐκτὸς εὐετηρίαν συμπαραλαμβάνουσιν. τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν πολλοὶ καὶ παλαιοὶ λέγουσιν, τὰ δὲ ὀλίγοι καὶ ἔνδοξοι ἄνδρες· οὐδετέρους δὲ τούτων εὔλογον διαμαρτάνειν τοῖς ὅλοις, ἀλλ' ἔν γέ τι ἢ καὶ τὰ πλεῖστα κατορθοῦν. τοῖς μὲν οὖν λέγουσι τὴν ἀρετὴν ἢ ἀρετήν τινα συνῳδός ἐστιν ὁ λόγος· ταύτης γάρ ἐστιν ἡ κατ' αὐτὴν ἐνέργεια.

Also in harmony with our account is the idea that the happy person lives well and does well, since we have practically described happiness as a sort of living well and doing well. And the things people look for in happiness all appear to be present in what we have described. For some think happiness is excellence, others practical wisdom, others a kind of wisdom, others all these or one of them, with pleasure or not without pleasure; and others include external prosperity as well. Some of these views are held by many people and have come down from long ago, others by a few distinguished men; and it is not reasonable that either group should be wholly mistaken, but rather that they are right in at least one respect, or even in most. Now our account agrees with those

GREEK

ENGLISH

who say happiness is excellence or some particular excellence, since activity in accordance with excellence belongs to excellence.

διαφέρει δὲ ἴσως οὐ μικρὸν ἐν κτήσει ἢ χρήσει τὸ ἄριστον ὑπολαμβάνειν, καὶ ἐν ἕξει ἢ ἐνεργείᾳ. τὴν μὲν γὰρ ἕξιν ἐνδέχεται μηδὲν ἀγαθὸν ἀποτελεῖν ὑπάρχουσαν, [1099a] οἷον τῷ καθεύδοντι ἢ καὶ ἄλλως πως ἐξηργηκότι, τὴν δ' ἐνέργειαν οὐχ οἷόν τε· πράξει γὰρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης, καὶ εὖ πράξει. ὥσπερ δ' Ὀλυμπίασιν οὐχ οἱ κάλλιστοι καὶ ἰσχυρότατοι στεφανοῦνται ἀλλ' οἱ ἀγωνιζόμενοι (τούτων γάρ τινες νικῶσιν), οὕτω καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ καλῶν κἀγαθῶν οἱ πράττοντες ὀρθῶς ἐπήβολοι γίνονται. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὁ βίος αὐτῶν καθ' αὑτὸν ἡδύς. τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἥδεσθαι τῶν ψυχικῶν, ἑκάστῳ δ' ἐστὶν ἡδὺ πρὸς ὃ λέγεται φιλοτοιοῦτος, οἷον ἵππος μὲν τῷ φιλίππῳ, θέαμα δὲ τῷ φιλοθεώρῳ· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ τὰ δίκαια τῷ φιλοδικαίῳ καὶ ὅλως τὰ κατ' ἀρετὴν τῷ φιλαρέτῳ.

But perhaps it makes no small difference whether we take the best good to lie in possessing or in using, in a state or in an activity. For a state can be present without producing any good, [1099a] as in someone who is asleep or inactive in some other way; but the activity cannot, since it will necessarily act, and act well. And just as at the Olympic Games it is not the finest and strongest who are crowned but those who compete (since it is some of these who win), so too it is those who act rightly who win the fine and good things in life. Their life is also pleasant in itself. For being pleased belongs to the soul, and to each person that is pleasant of which he is called a lover: a horse to the horse-lover, a spectacle to the lover of spectacles; and in the same way just things to the lover of justice, and in general things in accordance with excellence to the lover of excellence.

1099a τοῖς μὲν οὖν πολλοῖς τὰ ἡδέα μάχεται διὰ τὸ μὴ φύσει τοιαῦτ' εἶναι, τοῖς δὲ φιλοκάλοις ἐστὶν ἡδέα τὰ φύσει ἡδέα· τοιαῦται δ' αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις, ὥστε καὶ τούτοις εἰσὶν ἡδεῖαι καὶ καθ' αὑτάς. οὐδὲν δὴ προσδεῖται τῆς ἡδονῆς ὁ βίος αὐτῶν ὥσπερ περιάπτου τινός, ἀλλ' ἔχει τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐν ἑαυτῷ. πρὸς τοῖς εἰρημένοις γὰρ οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἀγαθὸς ὁ μὴ χαίρων ταῖς καλαῖς πράξεσιν· οὔτε γὰρ δίκαιον οὐθεὶς ἂν εἴποι τὸν μὴ χαίροντα τῷ δικαιοπραγεῖν, οὔτ' ἐλευθέριον τὸν μὴ χαίροντα ταῖς ἐλευθερίοις πράξεσιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων. εἰ δ' οὕτω, καθ' αὑτὰς ἂν εἶεν αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις ἡδεῖαι. ἀλλὰ μὴν καὶ ἀγαθαί γε καὶ καλαί, καὶ μάλιστα τούτων ἕκαστον, εἴπερ καλῶς κρίνει περὶ αὐτῶν ὁ σπουδαῖος· κρίνει δ' ὡς εἴπομεν.

Now for most people the things they find pleasant are at war with one another, because these things are not pleasant by nature; but to lovers of what is fine, the things that are pleasant by nature are pleasant. Actions in accordance with excellence are like this, so they are pleasant both to these people and in themselves. Their life, then, has no further need of pleasure as a kind of amulet hung around its neck, but has its pleasure in itself. For in addition to what has been said, a person who does not enjoy fine actions is not even good: no one would call someone just who does not enjoy acting justly, or generous who does not enjoy generous actions, and similarly in the other cases. If so, actions in accordance with excellence must be pleasant in themselves. And they are also good and fine, and each of these to the highest degree, if the excellent person judges well about them; and he judges as we have said.

ἄριστον ἄρα καὶ κάλλιστον καὶ ἥδιστον ἡ εὐδαιμονία, καὶ οὐ διώρισται ταῦτα κατὰ τὸ Δηλιακὸν ἐπίγραμμα· κάλλιστον τὸ δικαιότατον, λῷστον δ' ὑγιαίνειν· ἥδιστον δὲ πέφυχ' οὗ τις ἐρᾷ τὸ τυχεῖν. ἅπαντα γὰρ ὑπάρχει ταῦτα ταῖς ἀρίσταις ἐνεργείαις· ταύτας δέ, ἢ μίαν τούτων τὴν ἀρίστην, φαμὲν εἶναι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν. φαίνεται δ' ὅμως καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν προσδεομένη, καθάπερ εἴπομεν· ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἢ οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὰ καλὰ πράττειν ἀχορήγητον ὄντα. πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ πράττεται, [1099b] καθάπερ δι'

Happiness, then, is the best, finest and most pleasant thing, and these qualities are not separated as the inscription at Delos has it: "Finest is what is most just, best is health; / but most pleasant is to win what one desires." For all of them belong to the best activities; and it is these, or the one that is best among them, that we say happiness is. All the same, as we said, happiness evidently needs external goods as well, since it is impossible, or not

GREEK	ENGLISH
ὀργάνων, διὰ φίλων καὶ πλούτου καὶ πολιτικῆς δυνάμεως· ἐνίων δὲ τητώμενοι ῥυπαίνουσι τὸ μακάριον, οἷον εὐγενείας εὐτεκνίας κάλλους· οὐ πάνυ γὰρ εὐδαιμονικὸς ὁ τὴν ἰδέαν παναίσχης ἢ δυσγενὴς ἢ μονώτης καὶ ἄτεκνος, ἔτι δ' ἴσως ἧττον, εἴ τῳ πάγκακοι παῖδες εἶεν ἢ φίλοι, ἢ ἀγαθοὶ ὄντες τεθνᾶσιν.	easy, to do fine things without resources. Many things are done 1099b by means of friends, wealth and political power, as if by instruments; and the lack of certain things spoils blessedness—good birth, for example, good children, beauty. For someone who is utterly ugly in appearance, or low-born, or solitary and childless, is not quite the happy type; still less, perhaps, someone whose children or friends are thoroughly bad, or were good but have died.[8]
1099b καθάπερ οὖν εἴπομεν, ἔοικε προσδεῖσθαι καὶ τῆς τοιαύτης εὐημερίας· ὅθεν εἰς ταὐτὸ τάττουσιν ἔνιοι τὴν εὐτυχίαν τῇ εὐδαιμονίᾳ, ἕτεροι δὲ τὴν ἀρετήν.	As we said, then, happiness seems to need this sort of prosperity as well. That is why some identify good fortune with happiness, while others identify excellence with it.
ὅθεν καὶ ἀπορεῖται πότερόν ἐστι μαθητὸν ἢ ἐθιστὸν ἢ καὶ ἄλλως πως ἀσκητόν, ἢ κατά τινα θείαν μοῖραν ἢ καὶ διὰ τύχην παραγίνεται. εἰ μὲν οὖν καὶ ἄλλο τί ἐστι θεῶν δώρημα ἀνθρώποις, εὔλογον καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν θεόσδοτον εἶναι, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὅσῳ βέλτιστον. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν ἴσως ἄλλης ἂν εἴη σκέψεως οἰκειότερον, φαίνεται δὲ κἂν εἰ μὴ θεόπεμπτός ἐστιν ἀλλὰ δι' ἀρετὴν καί τινα μάθησιν ἢ ἄσκησιν παραγίνεται, τῶν θειοτάτων εἶναι· τὸ γὰρ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἆθλον καὶ τέλος ἄριστον εἶναι φαίνεται καὶ θεῖόν τι καὶ μακάριον. εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ πολύκοινον· δυνατὸν γὰρ ὑπάρξαι πᾶσι τοῖς μὴ πεπηρωμένοις πρὸς ἀρετὴν διά τινος μαθήσεως καὶ ἐπιμελείας.	This is also why there is a puzzle whether happiness can be learned, or acquired by habituation or some other kind of training, or whether it comes by some divine dispensation or even by chance. Now if anything at all is a gift of the gods to human beings, it is reasonable that happiness too should be god-given, and more so than any other human good, inasmuch as it is the best. But this question perhaps belongs more properly to another inquiry. Even if happiness is not sent by the gods but comes through excellence and some kind of learning or training, it appears to be among the most divine things; for the prize and end of excellence appears to be the best thing, something divine and blessed. It would also be widely shared, since it can belong, through some kind of learning and care, to everyone who is not incapacitated for excellence.
εἰ δ' ἐστὶν οὕτω βέλτιον ἢ τὸ διὰ τύχην εὐδαιμονεῖν, εὔλογον ἔχειν οὕτως, εἴπερ τὰ κατὰ φύσιν, ὡς οἷόν τε κάλλιστα ἔχειν, οὕτω πέφυκεν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ κατὰ τέχνην καὶ πᾶσαν αἰτίαν, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρίστην. τὸ δὲ μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον ἐπιτρέψαι τύχῃ λίαν πλημμελὲς ἂν εἴη. συμφανὲς δ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ λόγου τὸ ζητούμενον· εἴρηται γὰρ ψυχῆς ἐνέργεια κατ' ἀρετὴν ποιά τις. τῶν δὲ λοιπῶν ἀγαθῶν τὰ μὲν ὑπάρχειν ἀναγκαῖον, τὰ δὲ συνεργὰ καὶ χρήσιμα πέφυκεν ὀργανικῶς. ὁμολογούμενα δὲ ταῦτ' ἂν εἴη καὶ τοῖς ἐν ἀρχῇ· τὸ γὰρ τῆς πολιτικῆς τέλος ἄριστον ἐτίθεμεν, αὕτη δὲ πλείστην ἐπιμέλειαν ποιεῖται τοῦ ποιούς τινας καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τοὺς πολίτας ποιῆσαι καὶ πρακτικοὺς τῶν καλῶν.	And if it is better to be happy this way than through chance, it is reasonable that this is how things are. For things that come about by nature are naturally as fine as they can be, and likewise things that come about by craft or by any cause, and most of all those that come about by the best cause. To leave what is greatest and finest to chance would be a grave discord. What we are looking for is also evident from our account, since happiness has been said to be a certain kind of activity of the soul in accordance with excellence. Of the remaining goods, some must be present as prerequisites, while others are by nature helpful and useful as instruments. This would also agree

8 Delos, an Aegean island sacred to Apollo; the couplet was inscribed there, reportedly at his temple.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	with what we said at the beginning. We took the end of political science to be the best end, and political science takes the greatest care to make the citizens of a certain kind—good, and able to do fine things.

HAPPINESS AND FORTUNE

Aristotle asks whether misfortune, or the fortunes of one's descendants after death, can undo happiness.

GREEK	ENGLISH
εἰκότως οὖν οὔτε βοῦν οὔτε ἵππον οὔτε ἄλλο τῶν ζῴων οὐδὲν εὔδαιμον λέγομεν· 1100a οὐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν οἷόν τε κοινωνῆσαι τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας. διὰ ταύτην δὲ τὴν αἰτίαν οὐδὲ παῖς εὐδαίμων ἐστίν· οὔπω γὰρ πρακτικὸς τῶν τοιούτων διὰ τὴν ἡλικίαν· οἱ δὲ λεγόμενοι διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα μακαρίζονται. δεῖ γάρ, ὥσπερ εἴπομεν, καὶ ἀρετῆς τελείας καὶ βίου τελείου. πολλαὶ γὰρ μεταβολαὶ γίνονται καὶ παντοῖαι τύχαι κατὰ τὸν βίον, καὶ ἐνδέχεται τὸν μάλιστ' εὐθηνοῦντα μεγάλαις συμφοραῖς περιπεσεῖν ἐπὶ γήρως, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς Τρωικοῖς περὶ Πριάμου μυθεύεται· τὸν δὲ τοιαύταις χρησάμενον τύχαις καὶ τελευτήσαντα ἀθλίως οὐδεὶς εὐδαιμονίζει.	It is reasonable, then, that we do not call an ox or a horse or any other animal happy, 1100a since none of them can share in activity of this kind. For the same reason a child is not happy either, since his age does not yet allow him to do such things; children who are called blessed are called so because of the hope they hold out. For happiness requires, as we said, both complete excellence and a complete life. Many changes and all kinds of fortune occur in the course of a life, and even the most prosperous person may meet with great disasters in old age, as the Trojan stories tell of Priam; and no one calls happy someone who has met with such fortunes and come to a wretched end.[9]
1100a πότερον οὖν οὐδ' ἄλλον οὐδένα ἀνθρώπων εὐδαιμονιστέον ἕως ἂν ζῇ, κατὰ Σόλωνα δὲ χρεὼν τέλος ὁρᾶν; εἰ δὲ δὴ καὶ θετέον οὕτως, ἆρά γε καὶ ἔστιν εὐδαίμων τότε ἐπειδὰν ἀποθάνῃ; ἢ τοῦτό γε παντελῶς ἄτοπον, ἄλλως τε καὶ τοῖς λέγουσιν ἡμῖν ἐνέργειάν τινα τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν; εἰ δὲ μὴ λέγομεν τὸν τεθνεῶτα εὐδαίμονα, μηδὲ Σόλων τοῦτο βούλεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι τηνικαῦτα ἄν τις ἀσφαλῶς μακαρίσειεν ἄνθρωπον ὡς ἐκτὸς ἤδη τῶν κακῶν ὄντα καὶ τῶν δυστυχημάτων, ἔχει μὲν καὶ τοῦτ' ἀμφισβήτησίν τινα· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τι τῷ τεθνεῶτι καὶ κακὸν καὶ ἀγαθόν, εἴπερ καὶ τῷ ζῶντι μὴ αἰσθανομένῳ δέ, οἷον τιμαὶ καὶ ἀτιμίαι καὶ τέκνων καὶ ὅλως ἀπογόνων εὐπραξίαι τε καὶ δυστυχίαι.	Must we, then, call no other human being happy either as long as he is alive, but, as Solon says, look to the end? And if we are indeed to lay this down, is a person actually happy at the time when he has died? Or isn't that altogether absurd, especially for us, who say that happiness is a kind of activity? But if we do not call the dead person happy, and Solon does not mean this either, but rather that only then can one safely call a human being blessed, as being at last beyond evils and misfortunes, even this is open to some dispute. For something seems to be both bad and good for a dead person, if indeed it is for a living person who is not aware of it: honors and dishonors, for example, and the successes and misfortunes of his children and of his descendants in general.[10]
ἀπορίαν δὲ καὶ ταῦτα παρέχει· τῷ γὰρ μακαρίως βεβιωκότι μέχρι γήρως καὶ τελευτήσαντι κατὰ λόγον ἐνδέχεται πολλὰς μεταβολὰς συμβαίνειν περὶ τοὺς ἐκγόνους, καὶ τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι καὶ τυχεῖν βίου τοῦ κατ' ἀξίαν, τοὺς δ' ἐξ ἐναντίας· δῆλον δ' ὅτι καὶ	But this too raises a difficulty. Someone may have lived blessedly into old age and died in a manner to match, and yet many changes may befall his descendants: some of them may be good and get the life they deserve, others the opposite. And

9 Priam, king of Troy, lost most of his sons and was killed when the city fell.
10 Solon, Athenian statesman and poet of the early sixth century BC; in Herodotus he tells King Croesus to call no one happy until he sees how his life ends.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τοῖς ἀποστήμασι πρὸς τοὺς γονεῖς παντοδαπῶς ἔχειν αὐτοὺς ἐνδέχεται. ἄτοπον δὴ γίνοιτ' ἄν, εἰ συμμεταβάλλοι καὶ ὁ τεθνεὼς καὶ γίνοιτο ὁτὲ μὲν εὐδαίμων πάλιν δ' ἄθλιος· ἄτοπον δὲ καὶ τὸ μηδὲν μηδ' ἐπί τινα χρόνον συνικνεῖσθαι τὰ τῶν ἐκγόνων τοῖς γονεῦσιν. ἀλλ' ἐπανιτέον ἐπὶ τὸ πρότερον ἀπορηθέν· τάχα γὰρ ἂν θεωρηθείη καὶ τὸ νῦν ἐπιζητούμενον ἐξ ἐκείνου.	clearly they can stand at every sort of remove from their ancestors. It would be absurd, then, if the dead man changed along with them, becoming happy at one time and wretched again at another; but it would also be absurd if what happens to descendants did not reach their ancestors at all, not even for a time. But we must go back to the difficulty raised earlier; perhaps from it we will also see the answer to what we are now asking.
εἰ δὴ τὸ τέλος ὁρᾶν δεῖ καὶ τότε μακαρίζειν ἕκαστον οὐχ ὡς ὄντα μακάριον ἀλλ' ὅτι πρότερον ἦν, πῶς οὐκ ἄτοπον, εἰ ὅτ' ἔστιν εὐδαίμων, μὴ ἀληθεύσεται κατ' αὐτοῦ τὸ ὑπάρχον [1100b] διὰ τὸ μὴ βούλεσθαι τοὺς ζῶντας εὐδαιμονίζειν διὰ τὰς μεταβολάς, καὶ διὰ τὸ μόνιμόν τι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ὑπειληφέναι καὶ μηδαμῶς εὐμετάβολον, τὰς δὲ τύχας πολλάκις ἀνακυκλεῖσθαι περὶ τοὺς αὐτούς; δῆλον γὰρ ὡς εἰ συνακολουθοίημεν ταῖς τύχαις, τὸν αὐτὸν εὐδαίμονα καὶ πάλιν ἄθλιον ἐροῦμεν πολλάκις, χαμαιλέοντά τινα τὸν εὐδαίμονα ἀποφαίνοντες καὶ σαθρῶς ἱδρυμένον. ἢ τὸ μὲν ταῖς τύχαις ἐπακολουθεῖν οὐδαμῶς ὀρθόν; οὐ γὰρ ἐν ταύταις τὸ εὖ ἢ κακῶς, ἀλλὰ προσδεῖται τούτων ὁ ἀνθρώπινος βίος, καθάπερ εἴπομεν, κύριαι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργειαι τῆς εὐδαιμονίας, αἱ δ' ἐναντίαι τοῦ ἐναντίου.	If, then, we must look to the end and only then call each person blessed—not as being blessed but because he was so before—surely it is absurd that, at the time when he is happy, what is true of him will not be truly said of him, [1100b] because we are unwilling to call the living happy on account of life's changes, and because we have taken happiness to be something stable and not easily changed, while fortunes often turn full circle for the same people. For clearly, if we followed people's fortunes, we would often call the same person happy and then wretched again, making the happy person out to be a kind of chameleon, standing on rotten foundations. Or is following fortunes not right at all? For doing well or badly does not lie in them; human life needs them in addition, as we said, but what controls happiness is activity in accordance with excellence, and the opposite activities control its opposite.
1100b μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τὸ νῦν διαπορηθέν. περὶ οὐδὲν γὰρ οὕτως ὑπάρχει τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἔργων βεβαιότης ὡς περὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας τὰς κατ' ἀρετήν· μονιμώτεραι γὰρ καὶ τῶν ἐπιστημῶν αὗται δοκοῦσιν εἶναι· τούτων δ' αὐτῶν αἱ τιμιώταται μονιμώτεραι διὰ τὸ μάλιστα καὶ συνεχέστατα καταζῆν ἐν αὐταῖς τοὺς μακαρίους· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔοικεν αἰτίῳ τοῦ μὴ γίνεσθαι περὶ αὐτὰς λήθην. ὑπάρξει δὴ τὸ ζητούμενον τῷ εὐδαίμονι, καὶ ἔσται διὰ βίου τοιοῦτος· ἀεὶ γὰρ ἢ μάλιστα πάντων πράξει καὶ θεωρήσει τὰ κατ' ἀρετήν, καὶ τὰς τύχας οἴσει κάλλιστα καὶ πάντῃ πάντως ἐμμελῶς ὅ γ' ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀγαθὸς καὶ τετράγωνος ἄνευ ψόγου.	What we have just puzzled over also bears witness to our account. For no human function has as much stability as activities in accordance with excellence; these seem to be more lasting even than the branches of scientific knowledge. And among them, the most honorable are the most lasting, because the blessed spend their lives in them most fully and most continuously; this seems to be why we do not forget them. The happy person, then, will have what we are looking for, and will be happy throughout his life. For always, or more than anyone, he will do and contemplate what accords with excellence, and he will bear his fortunes most finely and with complete good grace in every way—he who is truly good, "foursquare, without blame."[11]
πολλῶν δὲ γινομένων κατὰ τύχην καὶ διαφερόντων μεγέθει καὶ μικρότητι, τὰ μὲν μικρὰ τῶν εὐτυχημάτων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀντικειμένων, δῆλον ὡς οὐ ποιεῖ	Many things happen by chance, and they differ in greatness and smallness. Small pieces of good fortune, and likewise of the opposite, clearly do not

11 The phrase comes from a poem of Simonides (sixth–fifth century BC) on how hard it is to be truly good.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ῥοπὴν τῆς ζωῆς, τὰ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ πολλὰ γινόμενα μὲν εὖ μακαριώτερον τὸν βίον ποιήσει (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὰ συνεπικοσμεῖν πέφυκεν, καὶ ἡ χρῆσις αὐτῶν καλὴ καὶ σπουδαία γίνεται), ἀνάπαλιν δὲ συμβαίνοντα θλίβει καὶ λυμαίνεται τὸ μακάριον· λύπας τε γὰρ ἐπιφέρει καὶ ἐμποδίζει πολλαῖς ἐνεργείαις. ὅμως δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις διαλάμπει τὸ καλόν, ἐπειδὰν φέρῃ τις εὐκόλως πολλὰς καὶ μεγάλας ἀτυχίας, μὴ δι' ἀναλγησίαν, ἀλλὰ γεννάδας ὢν καὶ μεγαλόψυχος. εἰ δ' εἰσὶν αἱ ἐνέργειαι κύριαι τῆς ζωῆς, καθάπερ εἴπομεν, οὐδεὶς ἂν γένοιτο τῶν μακαρίων ἄθλιος· οὐδέποτε γὰρ πράξει τὰ μισητὰ καὶ τὰ φαῦλα.

tip the scales of a life. But great and numerous ones, if they turn out well, will make life more blessed (for by nature they help to adorn it, and the use of them becomes fine and excellent), while if they turn out the other way they crush and spoil blessedness, since they bring pains and impede many activities. Yet even in these the fine shines through, when someone bears many great misfortunes calmly, not through insensitivity to pain but because he is noble and great-souled. And if activities are what control life, as we said, no blessed person could ever become wretched; for he will never do what is hateful and base.

1101a τὸν γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἔμφρονα πάσας οἰόμεθα τὰς τύχας εὐσχημόνως φέρειν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων ἀεὶ τὰ κάλλιστα πράττειν, καθάπερ καὶ στρατηγὸν ἀγαθὸν τῷ παρόντι στρατοπέδῳ χρῆσθαι πολεμικώτατα καὶ σκυτοτόμον ἐκ τῶν δοθέντων σκυτῶν κάλλιστον ὑπόδημα ποιεῖν· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους τεχνίτας ἅπαντας. εἰ δ' οὕτως, ἄθλιος μὲν οὐδέποτε γένοιτ' ἂν ὁ εὐδαίμων, οὐ μὴν μακάριός γε, ἂν Πριαμικαῖς τύχαις περιπέσῃ. οὐδὲ δὴ ποικίλος γε καὶ εὐμετάβολος· οὔτε γὰρ ἐκ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας κινηθήσεται ῥᾳδίως, οὐδ' ὑπὸ τῶν τυχόντων ἀτυχημάτων ἀλλ' ὑπὸ μεγάλων καὶ πολλῶν, ἔκ τε τῶν τοιούτων οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο πάλιν εὐδαίμων ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, ἐν πολλῷ τινὶ καὶ τελείῳ, μεγάλων καὶ καλῶν ἐν αὐτῷ γενόμενος ἐπήβολος.

For we think that the truly good and sensible person bears all his fortunes gracefully and always does the finest things possible with what he has, just as a good general makes the most effective military use of the army he has, and a shoemaker makes the finest shoe out of the hides he is given, and so with all other craftsmen too. If so, the happy person could never become wretched—though he would not be blessed either, if he met with the fortunes of Priam. Nor, then, is he variable and easily changed. He will not be moved from his happiness easily, nor by ordinary misfortunes but only by great and numerous ones; and after such things he would not become happy again in a short time, but, if at all, only in a long and complete one, in which he has achieved great and fine things.

τί οὖν κωλύει λέγειν εὐδαίμονα τὸν κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν ἐνεργοῦντα καὶ τοῖς ἐκτὸς ἀγαθοῖς ἱκανῶς κεχορηγημένον μὴ τὸν τυχόντα χρόνον ἀλλὰ τέλειον βίον; ἢ προσθετέον καὶ βιωσόμενον οὕτω καὶ τελευτήσοντα κατὰ λόγον; ἐπειδὴ τὸ μέλλον ἀφανὲς ἡμῖν ἐστίν, τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν δὲ τέλος καὶ τέλειον τίθεμεν πάντῃ πάντως. εἰ δ' οὕτω, μακαρίους ἐροῦμεν τῶν ζώντων οἷς ὑπάρχει καὶ ὑπάρξει τὰ λεχθέντα, μακαρίους δ' ἀνθρώπους. καὶ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον διωρίσθω.

What, then, prevents us from calling happy the person who is active in accordance with complete excellence and is adequately equipped with external goods, not for some chance period but for a complete life? Or must we add that he will also go on living this way and die accordingly, since the future is obscure to us, and we take happiness to be an end and complete in every way? If so, we will call blessed those among the living who have, and will have, the things we have described—but blessed as human beings. On these matters, let this much be settled.

τὰς δὲ τῶν ἀπογόνων τύχας καὶ τῶν φίλων ἁπάντων τὸ μὲν μηδοτιοῦν συμβάλλεσθαι λίαν ἄφιλον φαίνεται καὶ ταῖς δόξαις ἐναντίον· πολλῶν δὲ καὶ παντοίας ἐχόντων διαφορὰς τῶν συμβαινόντων, καὶ τῶν μὲν μᾶλλον συνικνουμένων τῶν δ' ἧττον, καθ' ἕκαστον μὲν διαιρεῖν μακρὸν καὶ ἀπέραντον φαίνεται, καθόλου δὲ λεχθὲν καὶ τύπῳ τάχ' ἂν ἱκανῶς ἔχοι.

That the fortunes of one's descendants and of all one's friends should contribute nothing at all seems a very unfriendly view, and contrary to what people believe. But since what happens is so various and differs in all sorts of ways, some things touching us more closely and others less, to

GREEK	ENGLISH
	distinguish each case would evidently be a long, indeed endless, task; a general account in outline may perhaps be enough.
εἰ δή, καθάπερ καὶ τῶν περὶ αὐτὸν ἀτυχημάτων τὰ μὲν ἔχει τι βρῖθος καὶ ῥοπὴν πρὸς τὸν βίον τὰ δ' ἐλαφροτέροις ἔοικεν, οὕτω καὶ τὰ περὶ τοὺς φίλους ὁμοίως ἅπαντας, διαφέρει δὲ τῶν παθῶν ἕκαστον περὶ ζῶντας ἢ τελευτήσαντας συμβαίνειν πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ παράνομα καὶ δεινὰ προϋπάρχειν ἐν ταῖς τραγῳδίαις ἢ πράττεσθαι, συλλογιστέον δὴ καὶ ταύτην τὴν διαφοράν, μᾶλλον δ' ἴσως τὸ διαπορεῖσθαι περὶ τοὺς κεκμηκότας εἴ τινος ἀγαθοῦ κοινωνοῦσιν ἢ τῶν ἀντικειμένων. [1101b] ἔοικε γὰρ ἐκ τούτων εἰ καὶ διικνεῖται πρὸς αὐτοὺς ὁτιοῦν, εἴτ' ἀγαθὸν εἴτε τοὐναντίον, ἀφαυρόν τι καὶ μικρὸν ἢ ἁπλῶς ἢ ἐκείνοις εἶναι, εἰ δὲ μή, τοσοῦτόν γε καὶ τοιοῦτον ὥστε μὴ ποιεῖν εὐδαίμονας τοὺς μὴ ὄντας μηδὲ τοὺς ὄντας ἀφαιρεῖσθαι τὸ μακάριον.	Among one's own misfortunes, some have a certain weight and influence on one's life, while others seem lighter; suppose it is the same with those that befall one's friends in general. Suppose, too, that it makes much more difference whether a given misfortune befalls the living or the dead than whether the lawless and terrible deeds in tragedies are presupposed or actually performed on stage. Then we must take this difference into account as well—or rather, perhaps, the puzzle whether the departed share in any good or its opposite. [1101b] For it seems from these considerations that even if anything, good or the opposite, does get through to them, it is something faint and small, either in itself or to them; or if not, then at least of such a size and kind as not to make happy those who are not, nor to take away blessedness from those who are.
1101b συμβάλλεσθαι μὲν οὖν τι φαίνονται τοῖς κεκμηκόσιν αἱ εὐπραξίαι τῶν φίλων, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ αἱ δυσπραξίαι, τοιαῦτα δὲ καὶ τηλικαῦτα ὥστε μήτε τοὺς εὐδαίμονας μὴ εὐδαίμονας ποιεῖν μήτ' ἄλλο τῶν τοιούτων μηδέν.	The good fortunes of friends, then, and likewise their misfortunes, do seem to contribute something to the dead, but of such a kind and size as neither to make the happy unhappy nor to do anything else of that sort.

HAPPINESS IS HONORED, NOT PRAISED

Aristotle argues that happiness is honored as something divine rather than praised.

GREEK	ENGLISH
διωρισμένων δὲ τούτων ἐπισκεψώμεθα περὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας πότερα τῶν ἐπαινετῶν ἐστὶν ἢ μᾶλλον τῶν τιμίων· δῆλον γὰρ ὅτι τῶν γε δυνάμεων οὐκ ἔστιν. φαίνεται δὴ πᾶν τὸ ἐπαινετὸν τῷ ποιόν τι εἶναι καὶ πρός τι πῶς ἔχειν ἐπαινεῖσθαι· τὸν γὰρ δίκαιον καὶ τὸν ἀνδρεῖον καὶ ὅλως τὸν ἀγαθόν τε καὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐπαινοῦμεν διὰ τὰς πράξεις καὶ τὰ ἔργα, καὶ τὸν ἰσχυρὸν δὲ καὶ τὸν δρομικὸν καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον τῷ ποιόν τινα πεφυκέναι καὶ ἔχειν πως πρὸς ἀγαθόν τι καὶ σπουδαῖον. δῆλον δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς ἐπαίνων· γελοῖοι γὰρ φαίνονται πρὸς ἡμᾶς ἀναφερόμενοι, τοῦτο δὲ συμβαίνει διὰ τὸ γίνεσθαι τοὺς ἐπαίνους δι' ἀναφορᾶς, ὥσπερ εἴπομεν.	With these points settled, let us consider whether happiness is among the things that are praised or rather among those that are honored; for clearly it is not among capacities. Everything praised seems to be praised for being of a certain quality and standing in some relation to something. We praise the just person, the brave person, and in general the good person and excellence, because of their actions and deeds; and we praise the strong person, the good runner and each of the rest for being naturally of a certain kind and standing in some relation to something good and excellent. This is clear also from praises of the gods: they look ridiculous when measured against us, and this happens because praise involves reference to something else, as we said.

GREEK

εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἔπαινος τῶν τοιούτων, δῆλον ὅτι τῶν ἀρίστων οὐκ ἔστιν ἔπαινος, ἀλλὰ μεῖζόν τι καὶ βέλτιον, καθάπερ καὶ φαίνεται· τούς τε γὰρ θεοὺς μακαρίζομεν καὶ εὐδαιμονίζομεν καὶ τῶν ἀνδρῶν τοὺς θειοτάτους μακαρίζομεν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἐπαινεῖ καθάπερ τὸ δίκαιον, ἀλλ' ὡς θειότερόν τι καὶ βέλτιον μακαρίζει. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ Εὔδοξος καλῶς συνηγορῆσαι περὶ τῶν ἀριστείων τῇ ἡδονῇ· τὸ γὰρ μὴ ἐπαινεῖσθαι τῶν ἀγαθῶν οὖσαν μηνύειν ᾤετο ὅτι κρεῖττόν ἐστι τῶν ἐπαινετῶν, τοιοῦτον δ' εἶναι τὸν θεὸν καὶ τἀγαθόν· πρὸς ταῦτα γὰρ καὶ τἆλλα ἀναφέρεσθαι. ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἔπαινος τῆς ἀρετῆς· πρακτικοὶ γὰρ τῶν καλῶν ἀπὸ ταύτης· τὰ δ' ἐγκώμια τῶν ἔργων ὁμοίως καὶ τῶν σωματικῶν καὶ τῶν ψυχικῶν.

ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ἴσως οἰκειότερον ἐξακριβοῦν τοῖς περὶ τὰ ἐγκώμια πεπονημένοις· ἡμῖν δὲ δῆλον ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων
1102a ὅτι ἐστὶν ἡ εὐδαιμονία τῶν τιμίων καὶ τελείων. ἔοικε δ' οὕτως ἔχειν καὶ διὰ τὸ εἶναι ἀρχή· ταύτης γὰρ χάριν τὰ λοιπὰ πάντα πάντες πράττομεν, τὴν ἀρχὴν δὲ καὶ τὸ αἴτιον τῶν ἀγαθῶν τίμιόν τι καὶ θεῖον τίθεμεν.

ENGLISH

If praise belongs to things like these, then clearly there is no praise of the best things, but something greater and better—as indeed appears to be the case. For we call the gods blessed and happy, and we call the most godlike of men blessed. So too with goods: no one praises happiness as he praises justice; he calls it blessed, as something more divine and better. Eudoxus, too, seems to have pleaded well for pleasure's claim to first prize: he thought that the fact that it is not praised, though it is a good, shows that it is superior to the things that are praised, and that the god and the good are like this, since everything else is referred to them. For praise belongs to excellence, since it is from excellence that people do fine things, while encomia are for deeds, of body and soul alike.[12]

But perhaps working these points out precisely belongs more to those who have made a study of encomia. For us it is clear from what has been said
1102a that happiness is among the things that are honored and complete. It seems to be so also because it is a first principle: it is for its sake that all of us do everything else, and we take the principle and cause of goods to be something honored and divine.

THE PARTS OF THE SOUL

Aristotle divides the soul into rational and non-rational parts, yielding intellectual and character excellences.

GREEK

1102a ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ εὐδαιμονία ψυχῆς ἐνέργειά τις κατ' ἀρετὴν τελείαν, περὶ ἀρετῆς ἐπισκεπτέον ἂν εἴη· τάχα γὰρ οὕτως ἂν βέλτιον καὶ περὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας θεωρήσαιμεν. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ κατ' ἀλήθειαν πολιτικὸς περὶ ταύτην μάλιστα πεπονῆσθαι· βούλεται γὰρ τοὺς πολίτας ἀγαθοὺς ποιεῖν καὶ τῶν νόμων ὑπηκόους. παράδειγμα δὲ τούτων ἔχομεν τοὺς Κρητῶν καὶ Λακεδαιμονίων νομοθέτας, καὶ εἴ τινες ἕτεροι τοιοῦτοι γεγένηνται. εἰ δὲ τῆς πολιτικῆς ἐστὶν ἡ σκέψις αὕτη, δῆλον ὅτι γίνοιτ' ἂν ἡ ζήτησις κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς προαίρεσιν. περὶ ἀρετῆς δὲ ἐπισκεπτέον ἀνθρωπίνης δῆλον ὅτι· καὶ γὰρ τἀγαθὸν ἀνθρώπινον ἐζητοῦμεν καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ἀνθρωπίνην. ἀρετὴν δὲ λέγομεν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ἀλλὰ τὴν τῆς ψυχῆς· καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν δὲ ψυχῆς ἐνέργειαν λέγομεν.

ENGLISH

Since happiness is a certain activity of soul in accordance with complete excellence, we should examine excellence; perhaps in this way we will also get a better view of happiness. The true statesman, too, seems to have worked hardest at this, since he wants to make the citizens good and obedient to the laws. As examples of this we have the lawgivers of the Cretans and the Spartans, and any others of that kind there have been. And if this inquiry belongs to political science, clearly our investigation will be in keeping with our original plan. It is clear that the excellence we must examine is human excellence; for it was the human good we were seeking, and human happiness. By human excellence we mean not that of the body but that of the soul; and happiness too we call an activity of the soul.[13]

12 Eudoxus of Cnidus (fourth century BC), mathematician and astronomer, who held that pleasure is the good.

GREEK

εἰ δὲ ταῦθ' οὕτως ἔχει, δῆλον ὅτι δεῖ τὸν πολιτικὸν εἰδέναι πως τὰ περὶ ψυχῆς, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸν ὀφθαλμοὺς θεραπεύσοντα καὶ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα, καὶ μᾶλλον ὅσῳ τιμιωτέρα καὶ βελτίων ἡ πολιτικὴ τῆς ἰατρικῆς· τῶν δ' ἰατρῶν οἱ χαρίεντες πολλὰ πραγματεύονται περὶ τὴν τοῦ σώματος γνῶσιν. θεωρητέον δὴ καὶ τῷ πολιτικῷ περὶ ψυχῆς, θεωρητέον δὲ τούτων χάριν, καὶ ἐφ' ὅσον ἱκανῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὰ ζητούμενα· τὸ γὰρ ἐπὶ πλεῖον ἐξακριβοῦν ἐργωδέστερον ἴσως ἐστὶ τῶν προκειμένων. λέγεται δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις ἀρκούντως ἔνια, καὶ χρηστέον αὐτοῖς· οἷον τὸ μὲν ἄλογον αὐτῆς εἶναι, τὸ δὲ λόγον ἔχον.

ENGLISH

If this is so, clearly the statesman must know in some way about the soul, just as someone who is going to treat eyes, or the body as a whole, must know about them—and all the more so since political science is more honorable and better than medicine; and the more accomplished doctors take a great deal of trouble to know about the body. So the statesman must study the soul, but study it for the sake of these ends, and only as far as is sufficient for what we are seeking; to go into more precise detail is perhaps more laborious than our present purposes require. Some things are said adequately about the soul in our external discussions as well, and we should make use of them: for instance, that one part of it is non-rational and another has reason.[14]

ταῦτα δὲ πότερον διώρισται καθάπερ τὰ τοῦ σώματος μόρια καὶ πᾶν τὸ μεριστόν, ἢ τῷ λόγῳ δύο ἐστὶν ἀχώριστα πεφυκότα καθάπερ ἐν τῇ περιφερείᾳ τὸ κυρτὸν καὶ τὸ κοῖλον, οὐθὲν διαφέρει πρὸς τὸ παρόν. τοῦ ἀλόγου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἔοικε κοινῷ καὶ φυτικῷ, λέγω δὲ τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ τρέφεσθαι καὶ αὔξεσθαι· τὴν τοιαύτην γὰρ δύναμιν τῆς ψυχῆς ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς τρεφομένοις θείη τις ἂν [1102b] καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐμβρύοις, τὴν αὐτὴν δὲ ταύτην καὶ ἐν τοῖς τελείοις· εὐλογώτερον γὰρ ἢ ἄλλην τινά.

Whether these are distinct like the parts of the body and everything divisible, or are two in definition but by nature inseparable, like the convex and the concave in the circumference of a circle, makes no difference for present purposes. Of the non-rational part, one division seems to be common to all living things and vegetative—I mean what causes nourishment and growth. For one would posit this sort of capacity of the soul in everything that takes nourishment, [1102b] including embryos, and this same one in fully grown creatures; that is more reasonable than positing some other.

1102b ταύτης μὲν οὖν κοινή τις ἀρετὴ καὶ οὐκ ἀνθρωπίνη φαίνεται· δοκεῖ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὕπνοις ἐνεργεῖν μάλιστα τὸ μόριον τοῦτο καὶ ἡ δύναμις αὕτη, ὁ δ' ἀγαθὸς καὶ κακὸς ἥκιστα διάδηλοι καθ' ὕπνον (ὅθεν φασὶν οὐδὲν διαφέρειν τὸ ἥμισυ τοῦ βίου τοὺς εὐδαίμονας τῶν ἀθλίων· συμβαίνει δὲ τοῦτο εἰκότως· ἀργία γάρ ἐστιν ὁ ὕπνος τῆς ψυχῆς ᾗ λέγεται σπουδαία καὶ φαύλη), πλὴν εἰ μὴ κατὰ μικρὸν καὶ διικνοῦνταί τινες τῶν κινήσεων, καὶ ταύτῃ βελτίω γίνεται τὰ φαντάσματα τῶν ἐπιεικῶν ἢ τῶν τυχόντων. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων ἅλις, καὶ τὸ θρεπτικὸν ἐατέον, ἐπειδὴ τῆς ἀνθρωπικῆς ἀρετῆς ἄμοιρον πέφυκεν. ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἄλλη τις φύσις τῆς ψυχῆς ἄλογος εἶναι, μετέχουσα μέντοι πῃ λόγου.

The excellence of this part, then, appears to be common to all and not specifically human. For this part and this capacity seem to be most active in sleep, while the good and the bad person are least distinguishable in sleep (hence the saying that for half their lives the happy are no different from the wretched; and this is to be expected, since sleep is an inactivity of the soul in the respect in which it is called excellent or bad)—unless some movements do to a small extent get through, and in this way the dreams of decent people become better than those of ordinary people. But enough of this; we should leave the nutritive part aside, since by nature it has no share in human excellence. There seems also to be another nature in the soul that is non-rational, though it shares in reason in a way.

13 Crete and Sparta were famous for ancient law codes designed to train citizens in excellence.
14 Probably discussions meant for a wider audience than Aristotle's school, perhaps his own published works.

GREEK

τοῦ γὰρ ἐγκρατοῦς καὶ ἀκρατοῦς τὸν λόγον καὶ τῆς ψυχῆς τὸ λόγον ἔχον ἐπαινοῦμεν· ὀρθῶς γὰρ καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ βέλτιστα παρακαλεῖ· φαίνεται δ' ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἄλλο τι παρὰ τὸν λόγον πεφυκός, ὃ μάχεται καὶ ἀντιτείνει τῷ λόγῳ. ἀτεχνῶς γὰρ καθάπερ τὰ παραλελυμένα τοῦ σώματος μόρια εἰς τὰ δεξιὰ προαιρουμένων κινῆσαι τοὐναντίον εἰς τὰ ἀριστερὰ παραφέρεται, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ψυχῆς οὕτως· ἐπὶ τἀναντία γὰρ αἱ ὁρμαὶ τῶν ἀκρατῶν. ἀλλ' ἐν τοῖς σώμασι μὲν ὁρῶμεν τὸ παραφερόμενον, ἐπὶ δὲ τῆς ψυχῆς οὐχ ὁρῶμεν. ἴσως δ' οὐδὲν ἧττον καὶ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ νομιστέον εἶναί τι παρὰ τὸν λόγον, ἐναντιούμενον τούτῳ καὶ ἀντιβαῖνον. πῶς δ' ἕτερον, οὐδὲν διαφέρει.

ENGLISH

For in the self-controlled and the uncontrolled person we praise their reason, the part of the soul that has reason, since it urges them rightly and toward what is best. But there also appears in them something else that is by nature contrary to reason, which fights and strains against reason. Just as paralyzed limbs, when we decide to move them to the right, swing the opposite way, to the left, so it is in the soul: the impulses of uncontrolled people go in contrary directions. But in bodies we see what swings away, whereas in the soul we do not. Still, perhaps we should think no less that in the soul too there is something contrary to reason, opposing and resisting it. In what way it is distinct makes no difference.

λόγου δὲ καὶ τοῦτο φαίνεται μετέχειν, ὥσπερ εἴπομεν· πειθαρχεῖ γοῦν τῷ λόγῳ τὸ τοῦ ἐγκρατοῦς—ἔτι δ' ἴσως εὐηκοώτερόν ἐστι τὸ τοῦ σώφρονος καὶ ἀνδρείου· πάντα γὰρ ὁμοφωνεῖ τῷ λόγῳ. φαίνεται δὴ καὶ τὸ ἄλογον διττόν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ φυτικὸν οὐδαμῶς κοινωνεῖ λόγου, τὸ δ' ἐπιθυμητικὸν καὶ ὅλως ὀρεκτικὸν μετέχει πως, ᾗ κατήκοόν ἐστιν αὐτοῦ καὶ πειθαρχικόν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ τῶν φίλων φαμὲν ἔχειν λόγον, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ τῶν μαθηματικῶν. ὅτι δὲ πείθεταί πως ὑπὸ λόγου τὸ ἄλογον, μηνύει καὶ ἡ νουθέτησις καὶ πᾶσα ἐπιτίμησίς τε καὶ παράκλησις. 1103a εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ τοῦτο φάναι λόγον ἔχειν, διττὸν ἔσται καὶ τὸ λόγον ἔχον, τὸ μὲν κυρίως καὶ ἐν αὑτῷ, τὸ δ' ὥσπερ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκουστικόν τι.

But this part too appears to share in reason, as we said. At any rate, in the self-controlled person it obeys reason—and in the moderate and brave person it is perhaps still more ready to listen, since there it agrees with reason in everything. So the non-rational part too appears to be twofold. The vegetative part has no share in reason at all, while the appetitive, and in general the desiring, part shares in it in a way, insofar as it listens to it and obeys it. This is the sense in which we say we "heed the reason" of our father or our friends, not the sense in which we grasp the reasoning of mathematics. That the non-rational part is in some way persuaded by reason is shown also by admonition and by every sort of rebuke and encouragement. 1103a And if we should say that this part too has reason, then the part that has reason will also be twofold: one having it in the strict sense and in itself, the other as something that listens to it, as one listens to a father.

1103a διορίζεται δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀρετὴ κατὰ τὴν διαφορὰν ταύτην· λέγομεν γὰρ αὐτῶν τὰς μὲν διανοητικὰς τὰς δὲ ἠθικάς, σοφίαν μὲν καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν διανοητικάς, ἐλευθεριότητα δὲ καὶ σωφροσύνην ἠθικάς. λέγοντες γὰρ περὶ τοῦ ἤθους οὐ λέγομεν ὅτι σοφὸς ἢ συνετὸς ἀλλ' ὅτι πρᾶος ἢ σώφρων· ἐπαινοῦμεν δὲ καὶ τὸν σοφὸν κατὰ τὴν ἕξιν· τῶν ἕξεων δὲ τὰς ἐπαινετὰς ἀρετὰς λέγομεν.

Excellence too is divided according to this difference. We call some excellences intellectual and others excellences of character: wisdom, comprehension and practical wisdom are intellectual, while generosity and moderation are excellences of character. For when we speak of someone's character we do not say that he is wise or has comprehension, but that he is gentle or moderate. Yet we praise the wise person too for his state; and the praiseworthy states are the ones we call excellences.

Book II

Excellence of character and the mean
Aristotle argues that character comes from habit and that each excellence is a mean between two vices.

GREEK

διττῆς δὴ τῆς ἀρετῆς οὔσης, τῆς μὲν διανοητικῆς τῆς δὲ ἠθικῆς, ἡ μὲν διανοητικὴ τὸ πλεῖον ἐκ διδασκαλίας ἔχει καὶ τὴν γένεσιν καὶ τὴν αὔξησιν, διόπερ ἐμπειρίας δεῖται καὶ χρόνου, ἡ δ' ἠθικὴ ἐξ ἔθους περιγίνεται, ὅθεν καὶ τοὔνομα ἔσχηκε μικρὸν παρεκκλῖνον ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔθους. ἐξ οὗ καὶ δῆλον ὅτι οὐδεμία τῶν ἠθικῶν ἀρετῶν φύσει ἡμῖν ἐγγίνεται· οὐθὲν γὰρ τῶν φύσει ὄντων ἄλλως ἐθίζεται, οἷον ὁ λίθος φύσει κάτω φερόμενος οὐκ ἂν ἐθισθείη ἄνω φέρεσθαι, οὐδ' ἂν μυριάκις αὐτὸν ἐθίζῃ τις ἄνω ῥιπτῶν, οὐδὲ τὸ πῦρ κάτω, οὐδ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν τῶν ἄλλως πεφυκότων ἄλλως ἂν ἐθισθείη. οὔτ' ἄρα φύσει οὔτε παρὰ φύσιν ἐγγίνονται αἱ ἀρεταί, ἀλλὰ πεφυκόσι μὲν ἡμῖν δέξασθαι αὐτάς, τελειουμένοις δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἔθους.

ἔτι ὅσα μὲν φύσει ἡμῖν παραγίνεται, τὰς δυνάμεις τούτων πρότερον κομιζόμεθα, ὕστερον δὲ τὰς ἐνεργείας ἀποδίδομεν (ὅπερ ἐπὶ τῶν αἰσθήσεων δῆλον· οὐ γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πολλάκις ἰδεῖν ἢ πολλάκις ἀκοῦσαι τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἐλάβομεν, ἀλλ' ἀνάπαλιν ἔχοντες ἐχρησάμεθα, οὐ χρησάμενοι ἔσχομεν)· τὰς δ' ἀρετὰς λαμβάνομεν ἐνεργήσαντες πρότερον, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν· ἃ γὰρ δεῖ μαθόντας ποιεῖν, ταῦτα ποιοῦντες μανθάνομεν, οἷον οἰκοδομοῦντες οἰκοδόμοι γίνονται καὶ κιθαρίζοντες κιθαρισταί· [1103b] οὕτω δὴ καὶ τὰ μὲν δίκαια πράττοντες δίκαιοι γινόμεθα, τὰ δὲ σώφρονα σώφρονες, τὰ δ' ἀνδρεῖα ἀνδρεῖοι. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ καὶ τὸ γινόμενον ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν· οἱ γὰρ νομοθέται τοὺς πολίτας ἐθίζοντες ποιοῦσιν ἀγαθούς, καὶ τὸ μὲν βούλημα παντὸς νομοθέτου τοῦτ' ἐστίν, ὅσοι δὲ μὴ εὖ αὐτὸ ποιοῦσιν ἁμαρτάνουσιν, καὶ διαφέρει τούτῳ πολιτεία πολιτείας ἀγαθὴ φαύλης.

ENGLISH

Excellence, then, is of two kinds, intellectual and of character. Intellectual excellence owes both its origin and its growth mostly to teaching, which is why it needs experience and time; excellence of character comes about from habit, which is also where it got its name, a slight variation on the word for habit. From this it is also clear that none of the excellences of character arises in us by nature. For nothing that is by nature one way can be habituated to be another: a stone, which by nature moves downward, could not be habituated to move upward, not even if someone tried to habituate it by throwing it up ten thousand times; nor could fire be habituated to move downward, nor anything else that is naturally one way be habituated to be another. So the excellences arise in us neither by nature nor against nature: we are naturally able to receive them, and are brought to completion through habit.[1]

Again, with the things that come to us by nature, we first acquire the capacities and later exercise the activities (this is clear with the senses: we did not get our senses from seeing often or hearing often; on the contrary, we had them and then used them, rather than getting them by using them). But the excellences we acquire by first exercising them, as happens with the crafts too. For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them: people become builders by building, for instance, and lyre players by playing the lyre. [1103b] In the same way we become just by doing just things, moderate by doing moderate things, and brave by doing brave things. What happens in cities bears this out too: lawgivers make the citizens good by habituating them. This is what every lawgiver wants, and those who do not do it well miss the mark; this is what distinguishes a good constitution from a bad one.

1 In Greek, *ēthos*, "character", differs from *ethos*, "habit", only in the length of its first vowel.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
1103b	ἔτι ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ διὰ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ γίνεται πᾶσα ἀρετὴ καὶ φθείρεται, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τέχνη· ἐκ γὰρ τοῦ κιθαρίζειν καὶ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ κακοὶ γίνονται κιθαρισταί. ἀνάλογον δὲ καὶ οἰκοδόμοι καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ πάντες· ἐκ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ εὖ οἰκοδομεῖν ἀγαθοὶ οἰκοδόμοι ἔσονται, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ κακῶς κακοί. εἰ γὰρ μὴ οὕτως εἶχεν, οὐδὲν ἂν ἔδει τοῦ διδάξοντος, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἂν ἐγίνοντο ἀγαθοὶ ἢ κακοί. οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἔχει· πράττοντες γὰρ τὰ ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι τοῖς πρὸς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους γινόμεθα οἱ μὲν δίκαιοι οἱ δὲ ἄδικοι, πράττοντες δὲ τὰ ἐν τοῖς δεινοῖς καὶ ἐθιζόμενοι φοβεῖσθαι ἢ θαρρεῖν οἱ μὲν ἀνδρεῖοι οἱ δὲ δειλοί.	Again, every excellence both comes about and is destroyed from the same things and through the same things, and likewise every craft. For it is from playing the lyre that both good and bad lyre players come to be. The same goes for builders and all the rest: from building well people will become good builders, from building badly bad ones. If this were not so, there would be no need for anyone to teach; everyone would simply turn out good or bad. So it is with the excellences too. By doing what we do in our dealings with other people, some of us become just and others unjust; by doing what we do in the face of danger, and being habituated to feel fear or confidence, some become brave and others cowardly.
	ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς ἐπιθυμίας ἔχει καὶ τὰ περὶ τὰς ὀργάς· οἱ μὲν γὰρ σώφρονες καὶ πρᾶοι γίνονται, οἱ δ' ἀκόλαστοι καὶ ὀργίλοι, οἱ μὲν ἐκ τοῦ οὑτωσὶ ἐν αὐτοῖς ἀναστρέφεσθαι, οἱ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ οὑτωσί. καὶ ἑνὶ δὴ λόγῳ ἐκ τῶν ὁμοίων ἐνεργειῶν αἱ ἕξεις γίνονται. διὸ δεῖ τὰς ἐνεργείας ποιὰς ἀποδιδόναι· κατὰ γὰρ τὰς τούτων διαφορὰς ἀκολουθοῦσιν αἱ ἕξεις. οὐ μικρὸν οὖν διαφέρει τὸ οὕτως ἢ οὕτως εὐθὺς ἐκ νέων ἐθίζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ πάμπολυ, μᾶλλον δὲ τὸ πᾶν.	The same holds for appetites and for anger. Some people become moderate and gentle, others self-indulgent and irascible, the one group from behaving one way in these situations, the other from behaving another way. In a word, states come about from activities like them. That is why we must make our activities of a certain quality, since the states follow the differences among them. So it makes no small difference whether we are habituated one way or another right from childhood; it makes a very great difference—or rather, all the difference.
	ἐπεὶ οὖν ἡ παροῦσα πραγματεία οὐ θεωρίας ἕνεκά ἐστιν ὥσπερ αἱ ἄλλαι (οὐ γὰρ ἵνα εἰδῶμεν τί ἐστιν ἡ ἀρετὴ σκεπτόμεθα, ἀλλ' ἵν' ἀγαθοὶ γενώμεθα, ἐπεὶ οὐδὲν ἂν ἦν ὄφελος αὐτῆς), ἀναγκαῖον ἐπισκέψασθαι τὰ περὶ τὰς πράξεις, πῶς πρακτέον αὐτάς· αὗται γάρ εἰσι κύριαι καὶ τοῦ ποιὰς γενέσθαι τὰς ἕξεις, καθάπερ εἰρήκαμεν. τὸ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον πράττειν κοινὸν καὶ ὑποκείσθω—ῥηθήσεται δ' ὕστερον περὶ αὐτοῦ, καὶ τί ἐστιν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος, καὶ πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετάς. 1104a ἐκεῖνο δὲ προδιομολογείσθω, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ περὶ τῶν πρακτῶν λόγος τύπῳ καὶ οὐκ ἀκριβῶς ὀφείλει λέγεσθαι, ὥσπερ καὶ κατ' ἀρχὰς εἴπομεν ὅτι κατὰ τὴν ὕλην οἱ λόγοι ἀπαιτητέοι· τὰ δ' ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα οὐδὲν ἑστηκὸς ἔχει, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ ὑγιεινά.	The present inquiry, then, is not undertaken for the sake of contemplation, as the others are (for we are investigating not in order to know what excellence is, but in order to become good, since otherwise there would be no benefit in it). So we must examine matters concerning actions, and how they should be done; for actions are what determine the quality of our states, as we have said. Now, that we should act in accordance with correct reason is commonly agreed, and let it be assumed —we will discuss it later, both what correct reason is and how it is related to the other excellences. 1104a But let this be agreed beforehand: every account of matters of action has to be given in outline and not precisely, just as we said at the start that accounts must be demanded in keeping with their subject matter. And matters of action and of what is beneficial have nothing fixed about them, any more than matters of health do.
1104a	τοιούτου δ' ὄντος τοῦ καθόλου λόγου, ἔτι μᾶλλον ὁ περὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα λόγος οὐκ ἔχει τἀκριβές· οὔτε γὰρ ὑπὸ	And since the general account is like this, the account of particular cases is still less precise. For

GREEK	ENGLISH
τέχνην οὔθ' ὑπὸ παραγγελίαν οὐδεμίαν πίπτει, δεῖ δ' αὐτοὺς ἀεὶ τοὺς πράττοντας τὰ πρὸς τὸν καιρὸν σκοπεῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἰατρικῆς ἔχει καὶ τῆς κυβερνητικῆς. ἀλλὰ καίπερ ὄντος τοιούτου τοῦ παρόντος λόγου πειρατέον βοηθεῖν. πρῶτον οὖν τοῦτο θεωρητέον, ὅτι τὰ τοιαῦτα πέφυκεν ὑπ' ἐνδείας καὶ ὑπερβολῆς φθείρεσθαι, (δεῖ γὰρ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀφανῶν τοῖς φανεροῖς μαρτυρίοις χρῆσθαι) ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἰσχύος καὶ τῆς ὑγιείας ὁρῶμεν· τά τε γὰρ ὑπερβάλλοντα γυμνάσια καὶ τὰ ἐλλείποντα φθείρει τὴν ἰσχύν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ ποτὰ καὶ τὰ σιτία πλείω καὶ ἐλάττω γινόμενα φθείρει τὴν ὑγίειαν, τὰ δὲ σύμμετρα καὶ ποιεῖ καὶ αὔξει καὶ σῴζει.	these do not fall under any craft or set of precepts; the agents themselves must always consider what suits the occasion, as happens in medicine and navigation too. But even though our present account is of this kind, we must try to be of help. First, then, we should observe that things of this sort are naturally destroyed by deficiency and excess (for we must use evident cases as evidence for what is not evident), as we see with strength and health. Exercise that is excessive or deficient destroys strength, and likewise food and drink, when too much or too little, destroy health, while the proportionate amount produces, increases and preserves it.
οὕτως οὖν καὶ ἐπὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας ἔχει καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν. ὅ τε γὰρ πάντα φεύγων καὶ φοβούμενος καὶ μηδὲν ὑπομένων δειλὸς γίνεται, ὅ τε μηδὲν ὅλως φοβούμενος ἀλλὰ πρὸς πάντα βαδίζων θρασύς· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ μὲν πάσης ἡδονῆς ἀπολαύων καὶ μηδεμιᾶς ἀπεχόμενος ἀκόλαστος, ὁ δὲ πᾶσαν φεύγων, ὥσπερ οἱ ἄγροικοι, ἀναίσθητός τις· φθείρεται δὴ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἡ ἀνδρεία ὑπὸ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῆς ἐλλείψεως, ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς μεσότητος σῴζεται.	So it is with moderation and courage and the other excellences. The person who runs from everything, fears everything and stands firm against nothing becomes a coward, while the one who fears nothing at all and walks into everything becomes rash. Likewise, the person who indulges in every pleasure and abstains from none becomes self-indulgent, while the one who shuns every pleasure, as boorish people do, becomes a sort of insensible person. Moderation and courage, then, are destroyed by excess and deficiency, and preserved by the mean.
ἀλλ' οὐ μόνον αἱ γενέσεις καὶ αὐξήσεις καὶ αἱ φθοραὶ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν γίνονται, ἀλλὰ καὶ αἱ ἐνέργειαι ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἔσονται· καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τῶν φανερωτέρων οὕτως ἔχει, οἷον ἐπὶ τῆς ἰσχύος· γίνεται γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ πολλὴν τροφὴν λαμβάνειν καὶ πολλοὺς πόνους ὑπομένειν, καὶ μάλιστα ἂν δύναιτ' αὐτὰ ποιεῖν ὁ ἰσχυρός. οὕτω δ' ἔχει καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν· ἔκ τε γὰρ τοῦ ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν ἡδονῶν γινόμεθα σώφρονες, καὶ γενόμενοι μάλιστα δυνάμεθα ἀπέχεσθαι αὐτῶν· 1104b ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας· ἐθιζόμενοι γὰρ καταφρονεῖν τῶν φοβερῶν καὶ ὑπομένειν αὐτὰ γινόμεθα ἀνδρεῖοι, καὶ γενόμενοι μάλιστα δυνησόμεθα ὑπομένειν τὰ φοβερά.	But not only do their origin, growth and destruction come from the same things and through the same things; their activities too will be exercised in the same things. This is so with other, more evident things as well, such as strength: it comes from taking a lot of food and enduring a lot of exertion, and it is the strong person who is most able to do these things. So too with the excellences: by abstaining from pleasures we become moderate, and once we have become moderate we are most able to abstain from them. 1104b Likewise with courage: by being habituated to despise what is frightening and to stand firm against it we become brave, and once we have become brave we will be most able to stand firm against what is frightening.

PLEASURE AND PAIN AS SIGNS OF CHARACTER

Aristotle argues that how a person feels about his actions reveals his character.

GREEK	ENGLISH
1104b σημεῖον δὲ δεῖ ποιεῖσθαι τῶν ἕξεων τὴν ἐπιγινομένην ἡδονὴν ἢ λύπην τοῖς ἔργοις· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεχόμενος τῶν	We must take the pleasure or pain that accompanies people's deeds as a sign of their states. The per-

GREEK

σωματικῶν ἡδονῶν καὶ αὐτῷ τούτῳ χαίρων σώφρων, ὁ δ' ἀχθόμενος ἀκόλαστος, καὶ ὁ μὲν ὑπομένων τὰ δεινὰ καὶ χαίρων ἢ μὴ λυπούμενός γε ἀνδρεῖος, ὁ δὲ λυπούμενος δειλός. περὶ ἡδονὰς γὰρ καὶ λύπας ἐστὶν ἡ ἠθικὴ ἀρετή· διὰ μὲν γὰρ τὴν ἡδονὴν τὰ φαῦλα πράττομεν, διὰ δὲ τὴν λύπην τῶν καλῶν ἀπεχόμεθα. διὸ δεῖ ἦχθαί πως εὐθὺς ἐκ νέων, ὡς ὁ Πλάτων φησίν, ὥστε χαίρειν τε καὶ λυπεῖσθαι οἷς δεῖ· ἡ γὰρ ὀρθὴ παιδεία αὕτη ἐστίν. ἔτι δ' εἰ αἱ ἀρεταί εἰσι περὶ πράξεις καὶ πάθη, παντὶ δὲ πάθει καὶ πάσῃ πράξει ἕπεται ἡδονὴ καὶ λύπη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' ἂν εἴη ἡ ἀρετὴ περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας.

μηνύουσι δὲ καὶ αἱ κολάσεις γινόμεναι διὰ τούτων· ἰατρεῖαι γάρ τινές εἰσιν, αἱ δὲ ἰατρεῖαι διὰ τῶν ἐναντίων πεφύκασι γίνεσθαι. ἔτι, ὡς καὶ πρῴην εἴπομεν, πᾶσα ψυχῆς ἕξις, ὑφ' οἵων πέφυκε γίνεσθαι χείρων καὶ βελτίων, πρὸς ταῦτα καὶ περὶ ταῦτα τὴν φύσιν ἔχει· δι' ἡδονὰς δὲ καὶ λύπας φαῦλοι γίνονται, τῷ διώκειν ταύτας καὶ φεύγειν, ἢ ἃς μὴ δεῖ ἢ ὅτε οὐ δεῖ ἢ ὡς οὐ δεῖ ἢ ὁσαχῶς ἄλλως ὑπὸ τοῦ λόγου διορίζεται τὰ τοιαῦτα. διὸ καὶ ὁρίζονται τὰς ἀρετὰς ἀπαθείας τινὰς καὶ ἠρεμίας· οὐκ εὖ δέ, ὅτι ἁπλῶς λέγουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς δεῖ καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ καὶ ὅτε, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα προστίθεται. ὑπόκειται ἄρα ἡ ἀρετὴ εἶναι ἡ τοιαύτη περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας τῶν βελτίστων πρακτική, ἡ δὲ κακία τοὐναντίον.

γένοιτο δ' ἂν ἡμῖν καὶ ἐκ τούτων φανερὸν ὅτι περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν. τριῶν γὰρ ὄντων τῶν εἰς τὰς αἱρέσεις καὶ τριῶν τῶν εἰς τὰς φυγάς, καλοῦ συμφέροντος ἡδέος, καὶ τριῶν τῶν ἐναντίων, αἰσχροῦ βλαβεροῦ λυπηροῦ, περὶ ταῦτα μὲν πάντα ὁ ἀγαθὸς κατορθωτικός ἐστιν ὁ δὲ κακὸς ἁμαρτητικός, μάλιστα δὲ περὶ τὴν ἡδονήν· κοινή τε γὰρ αὕτη τοῖς ζῴοις, καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ὑπὸ τὴν αἵρεσιν παρακολουθεῖ· [1105a] καὶ γὰρ τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ συμφέρον ἡδὺ φαίνεται. ἔτι δ' ἐκ νηπίου πᾶσιν ἡμῖν συντέθραπται· διὸ χαλεπὸν ἀποτρίψασθαι τοῦτο τὸ πάθος ἐγκεχρωσμένον τῷ βίῳ. κανονίζομεν δὲ καὶ τὰς πράξεις, οἳ μὲν μᾶλλον οἳ δ' ἧττον, ἡδονῇ καὶ λύπῃ.

ENGLISH

son who abstains from bodily pleasures and enjoys doing just that is moderate, while the one who finds it irksome is self-indulgent; and the one who stands firm against dangers and enjoys it, or at least is not pained by it, is brave, while the one who is pained is a coward. For excellence of character is concerned with pleasures and pains: it is because of pleasure that we do bad things, and because of pain that we hold back from fine ones. That is why we need to have been brought up in a certain way right from childhood, as Plato says, so as to enjoy and be pained by the things we should; for that is correct education. Again, if the excellences are concerned with actions and feelings, and every feeling and every action is accompanied by pleasure and pain, this too would make excellence concerned with pleasures and pains.

Punishments, too, which are inflicted by means of these, point the same way: they are a kind of cure, and cures naturally work by means of opposites. Again, as we said just now, every state of soul has its nature in relation to, and concerned with, the things by which it naturally becomes worse or better. And it is through pleasures and pains that people become bad, by pursuing and avoiding them—either the ones they should not, or when they should not, or as they should not, or in any of the other ways that such distinctions are drawn by reason. That is why some people even define the excellences as states of impassivity and calm. But they do not do so well, because they speak without qualification, not adding "as one should" and "as one should not" and "when", and the other qualifications. It is assumed, then, that excellence is the sort of state that does what is best in matters of pleasure and pain, and vice the opposite.

It may also become clear to us from the following that they are concerned with the same things. There are three objects of choice and three of avoidance: the fine, the beneficial and the pleasant, and their three opposites, the shameful, the harmful and the painful. With respect to all of these the good person tends to get things right and the bad person to go wrong, but especially with respect to pleasure. For pleasure is shared with the animals, and it accompanies all objects of choice: [1105a] the fine and the beneficial also appear pleasant. Again, it has grown up with all of us from infancy, which is why it is hard to rub off this feel-

GREEK	ENGLISH
	ing, ingrained as it is in our life. And we also measure our actions, some of us more and some less, by pleasure and pain.
1105a διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι περὶ ταῦτα τὴν πᾶσαν πραγματείαν· οὐ γὰρ μικρὸν εἰς τὰς πράξεις εὖ ἢ κακῶς χαίρειν καὶ λυπεῖσθαι. ἔτι δὲ χαλεπώτερον ἡδονῇ μάχεσθαι ἢ θυμῷ, καθάπερ φησὶν Ἡράκλειτος, περὶ δὲ τὸ χαλεπώτερον ἀεὶ καὶ τέχνη γίνεται καὶ ἀρετή· καὶ γὰρ τὸ εὖ βέλτιον ἐν τούτῳ. ὥστε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας πᾶσα ἡ πραγματεία καὶ τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ πολιτικῇ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὖ τούτοις χρώμενος ἀγαθὸς ἔσται, ὁ δὲ κακῶς κακός. ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετὴ περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ ὧν γίνεται, ὑπὸ τούτων καὶ αὔξεται καὶ φθείρεται μὴ ὡσαύτως γινομένων, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ ὧν ἐγένετο, περὶ ταῦτα καὶ ἐνεργεῖ, εἰρήσθω.	For this reason, then, the whole of our inquiry must be concerned with these; for it makes no small difference to our actions whether we feel pleasure and pain well or badly. Again, it is harder to fight pleasure than anger, as Heraclitus says, and both craft and excellence are always concerned with what is harder, since succeeding is better there. So for this reason too the whole concern, both of excellence and of political science, is with pleasures and pains: the person who uses them well will be good, and the one who uses them badly will be bad. Let it be taken as stated, then, that excellence is concerned with pleasures and pains; that the things from which it arises also increase it, and destroy it when they occur differently; and that it is active in the same things from which it arose.[2]

DOING JUST ACTS AND BEING JUST

Aristotle explains how doing just acts differs from acting as a just person does.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις πῶς λέγομεν ὅτι δεῖ τὰ μὲν δίκαια πράττοντας δικαίους γίνεσθαι, τὰ δὲ σώφρονα σώφρονας· εἰ γὰρ πράττουσι τὰ δίκαια καὶ σώφρονα, ἤδη εἰσὶ δίκαιοι καὶ σώφρονες, ὥσπερ εἰ τὰ γραμματικὰ καὶ τὰ μουσικά, γραμματικοὶ καὶ μουσικοί. ἢ οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνῶν οὕτως ἔχει; ἐνδέχεται γὰρ γραμματικόν τι ποιῆσαι καὶ ἀπὸ τύχης καὶ ἄλλου ὑποθεμένου. τότε οὖν ἔσται γραμματικός, ἐὰν καὶ γραμματικόν τι ποιήσῃ καὶ γραμματικῶς· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐν αὑτῷ γραμματικήν.	But someone might raise the difficulty of what we mean when we say that people must become just by doing just things and moderate by doing moderate things. For if they do just and moderate things, they are already just and moderate, just as, if they do grammatical and musical things, they are already grammarians and musicians. Or is this not so even with the crafts? For it is possible to produce something grammatical by chance, or at someone else's prompting. So a person will be a grammarian only if he both produces something grammatical and does so grammatically—that is, in accordance with the grammatical knowledge in himself.
ἔτι οὐδ' ὅμοιόν ἐστιν ἐπί τε τῶν τεχνῶν καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν τεχνῶν γινόμενα τὸ εὖ ἔχει ἐν αὑτοῖς· ἀρκεῖ οὖν ταῦτά πως ἔχοντα γενέσθαι· τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς γινόμενα οὐκ ἐὰν αὐτά πως ἔχῃ, δικαίως ἢ σωφρόνως πράττεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐὰν ὁ πράττων πῶς ἔχων πράττῃ, πρῶτον μὲν ἐὰν εἰδώς, ἔπειτ' ἐὰν προαιρούμενος, καὶ προαιρούμενος δι' αὐτά, τὸ δὲ τρίτον ἐὰν καὶ βεβαίως	Besides, the case of the crafts is not even similar to that of the excellences. The things produced by crafts have their goodness in themselves, so it is enough that they come out in a certain condition. But things done in accordance with the excellences are not done justly or moderately merely if they themselves are in a certain condition; the

2 Heraclitus of Ephesus, philosopher of around 500 BC; his surviving saying is that it is hard to fight anger, which buys what it wants at the price of the soul.

GREEK

καὶ ἀμετακινήτως ἔχων πράττῃ. 1105b ταῦτα δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὸ τὰς ἄλλας τέχνας ἔχειν οὐ συναριθμεῖται, πλὴν αὐτὸ τὸ εἰδέναι· πρὸς δὲ τὸ τὰς ἀρετὰς τὸ μὲν εἰδέναι οὐδὲν ἢ μικρὸν ἰσχύει, τὰ δ' ἄλλα οὐ μικρὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ πᾶν δύναται, ἅπερ ἐκ τοῦ πολλάκις πράττειν τὰ δίκαια καὶ σώφρονα περιγίνεται.

1105b τὰ μὲν οὖν πράγματα δίκαια καὶ σώφρονα λέγεται, ὅταν ᾖ τοιαῦτα οἷα ἂν ὁ δίκαιος ἢ ὁ σώφρων πράξειεν· δίκαιος δὲ καὶ σώφρων ἐστὶν οὐχ ὁ ταῦτα πράττων, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ οὕτω πράττων ὡς οἱ δίκαιοι καὶ σώφρονες πράττουσιν. εὖ οὖν λέγεται ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ τὰ δίκαια πράττειν ὁ δίκαιος γίνεται καὶ ἐκ τοῦ τὰ σώφρονα ὁ σώφρων· ἐκ δὲ τοῦ μὴ πράττειν ταῦτα οὐδεὶς ἂν οὐδὲ μελλήσειε γίνεσθαι ἀγαθός. ἀλλ' οἱ πολλοὶ ταῦτα μὲν οὐ πράττουσιν, ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν λόγον καταφεύγοντες οἴονται φιλοσοφεῖν καὶ οὕτως ἔσεσθαι σπουδαῖοι, ὅμοιόν τι ποιοῦντες τοῖς κάμνουσιν, οἳ τῶν ἰατρῶν ἀκούουσι μὲν ἐπιμελῶς, ποιοῦσι δ' οὐδὲν τῶν προσταττομένων. ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδ' ἐκεῖνοι εὖ ἕξουσι τὸ σῶμα οὕτω θεραπευόμενοι, οὐδ' οὗτοι τὴν ψυχὴν οὕτω φιλοσοφοῦντες.

ENGLISH

agent too must be in a certain condition when he does them: first, he must know what he is doing; second, he must decide on the actions, and decide on them for their own sake; and third, he must act from a firm and unchangeable state. 1105b For having the other crafts these conditions do not count, except knowledge itself; but for having the excellences knowledge has little or no weight, while the others count not for a little but for everything—and they are just what results from often doing just and moderate things.

Actions, then, are called just and moderate when they are such as the just or moderate person would do; but the just and moderate person is not the one who does these things, but the one who also does them in the way just and moderate people do. So it is rightly said that the just person comes to be from doing just things, and the moderate person from doing moderate things; and without doing them no one would have even a prospect of becoming good. But most people do not do them; instead they take refuge in argument, and think they are doing philosophy and that this is how they will become excellent. They behave rather like sick people who listen attentively to their doctors but do none of the things they are told. Just as those people will not be in good bodily condition if they are treated like that, neither will these be in good condition of soul if they do philosophy like that.

EXCELLENCE IS A STATE

Aristotle argues that excellence is a state, not a feeling or a capacity.

GREEK

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα τί ἐστιν ἡ ἀρετὴ σκεπτέον. ἐπεὶ οὖν τὰ ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ γινόμενα τρία ἐστί, πάθη δυνάμεις ἕξεις, τούτων ἄν τι εἴη ἡ ἀρετή. λέγω δὲ πάθη μὲν ἐπιθυμίαν ὀργὴν φόβον θάρσος φθόνον χαρὰν φιλίαν μῖσος πόθον ζῆλον ἔλεον, ὅλως οἷς ἕπεται ἡδονὴ ἢ λύπη· δυνάμεις δὲ καθ' ἃς παθητικοὶ τούτων λεγόμεθα, οἷον καθ' ἃς δυνατοὶ ὀργισθῆναι ἢ λυπηθῆναι ἢ ἐλεῆσαι· ἕξεις δὲ καθ' ἃς πρὸς τὰ πάθη ἔχομεν εὖ ἢ κακῶς, οἷον πρὸς τὸ ὀργισθῆναι, εἰ μὲν σφοδρῶς ἢ ἀνειμένως, κακῶς ἔχομεν, εἰ δὲ μέσως, εὖ· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πρὸς τἆλλα.

ENGLISH

Next we must consider what excellence is. Since the things that arise in the soul are of three kinds—feelings, capacities and states—excellence would be one of these. By feelings I mean appetite, anger, fear, confidence, envy, joy, friendly feeling, hatred, longing, emulation, pity—in general, whatever is accompanied by pleasure or pain. By capacities I mean what makes us said to be capable of these feelings, for instance, capable of getting angry or being pained or feeling pity. By states I mean what makes us well or badly disposed in relation to the feelings: in relation to getting angry, for example, if we are disposed to it vi-

GREEK

ENGLISH

olently or too slackly we are badly disposed, and if moderately, well; and likewise with the others.

πάθη μὲν οὖν οὐκ εἰσὶν οὔθ' αἱ ἀρεταὶ οὔθ' αἱ κακίαι, ὅτι οὐ λεγόμεθα κατὰ τὰ πάθη σπουδαῖοι ἢ φαῦλοι, κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰς κακίας λεγόμεθα, καὶ ὅτι κατὰ μὲν τὰ πάθη οὔτ' ἐπαινούμεθα οὔτε ψεγόμεθα (οὐ γὰρ ἐπαινεῖται ὁ φοβούμενος οὐδὲ ὁ ὀργιζόμενος, οὐδὲ ψέγεται ὁ ἁπλῶς ὀργιζόμενος ἀλλ' ὁ πῶς), [1106a] κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰς κακίας ἐπαινούμεθα ἢ ψεγόμεθα. ἔτι ὀργιζόμεθα μὲν καὶ φοβούμεθα ἀπροαιρέτως, αἱ δ' ἀρεταὶ προαιρέσεις τινὲς ἢ οὐκ ἄνευ προαιρέσεως. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις κατὰ μὲν τὰ πάθη κινεῖσθαι λεγόμεθα, κατὰ δὲ τὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ τὰς κακίας οὐ κινεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ διακεῖσθαί πως.

Neither the excellences nor the vices, then, are feelings. For we are not called excellent or bad on account of our feelings, but we are on account of our excellences and vices; and we are neither praised nor blamed for our feelings (the person who is afraid or angry is not praised, nor is the one who is simply angry blamed, but the one who is angry in a certain way), [1106a] whereas we are praised or blamed for our excellences and vices. Again, we get angry and afraid without deciding to, whereas the excellences are kinds of decision, or at least not without decision. Besides, with respect to our feelings we are said to be moved, but with respect to our excellences and vices we are said not to be moved but to be disposed in a certain way.

1106a διὰ ταῦτα δὲ οὐδὲ δυνάμεις εἰσίν· οὔτε γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ λεγόμεθα τῷ δύνασθαι πάσχειν ἁπλῶς οὔτε κακοί, οὔτ' ἐπαινούμεθα οὔτε ψεγόμεθα· ἔτι δυνατοὶ μέν ἐσμεν φύσει, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ ἢ κακοὶ οὐ γινόμεθα φύσει· εἴπομεν δὲ περὶ τούτου πρότερον. εἰ οὖν μήτε πάθη εἰσὶν αἱ ἀρεταὶ μήτε δυνάμεις, λείπεται ἕξεις αὐτὰς εἶναι. ὅ τι μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τῷ γένει ἡ ἀρετή, εἴρηται.

For these reasons they are not capacities either: we are not called good or bad, nor praised or blamed, simply for being capable of feeling. Again, we have capacities by nature, but we do not become good or bad by nature; we spoke of this earlier. If, then, the excellences are neither feelings nor capacities, it remains that they are states. So much for what excellence is in genus.

δεῖ δὲ μὴ μόνον οὕτως εἰπεῖν, ὅτι ἕξις, ἀλλὰ καὶ ποία τις. ῥητέον οὖν ὅτι πᾶσα ἀρετή, οὗ ἂν ᾖ ἀρετή, αὐτό τε εὖ ἔχον ἀποτελεῖ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ εὖ ἀποδίδωσιν, οἷον ἡ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀρετὴ τόν τε ὀφθαλμὸν σπουδαῖον ποιεῖ καὶ τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ· τῇ γὰρ τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ ἀρετῇ εὖ ὁρῶμεν. ὁμοίως ἡ τοῦ ἵππου ἀρετὴ ἵππον τε σπουδαῖον ποιεῖ καὶ ἀγαθὸν δραμεῖν καὶ ἐνεγκεῖν τὸν ἐπιβάτην καὶ μεῖναι τοὺς πολεμίους. εἰ δὴ τοῦτ' ἐπὶ πάντων οὕτως ἔχει, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἀρετὴ εἴη ἂν ἡ ἕξις ἀφ' ἧς ἀγαθὸς ἄνθρωπος γίνεται καὶ ἀφ' ἧς εὖ τὸ ἑαυτοῦ ἔργον ἀποδώσει. πῶς δὲ τοῦτ' ἔσται, ἤδη μὲν εἰρήκαμεν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὧδ' ἔσται φανερόν, ἐὰν θεωρήσωμεν ποία τίς ἐστιν ἡ φύσις αὐτῆς.

But we must not only say that it is a state; we must also say what kind of state. We should say, then, that every excellence both brings into good condition that of which it is the excellence and makes it perform its function well. The excellence of the eye, for example, makes both the eye and its function excellent, since it is by the excellence of the eye that we see well. Similarly the excellence of a horse makes the horse excellent, and good at running, at carrying its rider and at standing firm against the enemy. If this is so in every case, then human excellence too will be the state from which a person becomes good and from which he will perform his own function well. How this will come about we have already said, but it will also become clear in the following way, if we consider what sort of nature excellence has.

THE MEAN RELATIVE TO US

Aristotle defines excellence as a chosen state lying in a mean relative to us, set by reason.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἐν παντὶ δὴ συνεχεῖ καὶ διαιρετῷ ἔστι λαβεῖν τὸ μὲν πλεῖον τὸ δ' ἔλαττον τὸ δ' ἴσον, καὶ ταῦτα ἢ κατ' αὐτὸ τὸ πρᾶγμα ἢ πρὸς ἡμᾶς· τὸ δ' ἴσον μέσον τι ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεως. λέγω δὲ τοῦ μὲν πράγματος μέσον τὸ ἴσον ἀπέχον ἀφ' ἑκατέρου τῶν ἄκρων, ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πᾶσιν, πρὸς ἡμᾶς δὲ ὃ μήτε πλεονάζει μήτε ἐλλείπει· τοῦτο δ' οὐχ ἕν, οὐδὲ ταὐτὸν πᾶσιν. οἷον εἰ τὰ δέκα πολλὰ τὰ δὲ δύο ὀλίγα, τὰ ἓξ μέσα λαμβάνουσι κατὰ τὸ πρᾶγμα· ἴσῳ γὰρ ὑπερέχει τε καὶ ὑπερέχεται· τοῦτο δὲ μέσον ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν ἀναλογίαν.	In everything continuous and divisible one can take more, less, or equal, and these either in terms of the thing itself or relative to us; and the equal is a sort of mean between excess and deficiency. By the mean of the thing I mean what is equidistant from each of the extremes, which is one and the same for everyone; by the mean relative to us, what neither exceeds nor falls short—and this is not one thing, nor the same for everyone. For example, if ten is many and two is few, six is taken as the mean in terms of the thing, since it exceeds and is exceeded by an equal amount. This is the mean according to arithmetical proportion.
τὸ δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς οὐχ οὕτω ληπτέον· 1106b οὐ γὰρ εἴ τῳ δέκα μναῖ φαγεῖν πολὺ δύο δὲ ὀλίγον, ὁ ἀλείπτης ἓξ μνᾶς προστάξει· ἔστι γὰρ ἴσως καὶ τοῦτο πολὺ τῷ ληψομένῳ ἢ ὀλίγον· Μίλωνι μὲν γὰρ ὀλίγον, τῷ δὲ ἀρχομένῳ τῶν γυμνασίων πολύ. ὁμοίως ἐπὶ δρόμου καὶ πάλης. οὕτω δὴ πᾶς ἐπιστήμων τὴν ὑπερβολὴν μὲν καὶ τὴν ἔλλειψιν φεύγει, τὸ δὲ μέσον ζητεῖ καὶ τοῦθ' αἱρεῖται, μέσον δὲ οὐ τὸ τοῦ πράγματος ἀλλὰ τὸ πρὸς ἡμᾶς.	The mean relative to us, though, is not to be taken this way. 1106b If ten pounds of food is a lot for someone to eat and two pounds a little, the trainer will not prescribe six pounds; for perhaps this too is a lot for the person who is to take it, or a little—little for Milo, a lot for someone just beginning his training. The same goes for running and wrestling. In this way every expert avoids excess and deficiency and seeks out the mean and chooses it—the mean not of the thing but relative to us.[3]
1106b εἰ δὴ πᾶσα ἐπιστήμη οὕτω τὸ ἔργον εὖ ἐπιτελεῖ, πρὸς τὸ μέσον βλέπουσα καὶ εἰς τοῦτο ἄγουσα τὰ ἔργα (ὅθεν εἰώθασιν ἐπιλέγειν τοῖς εὖ ἔχουσιν ἔργοις ὅτι οὔτ' ἀφελεῖν ἔστιν οὔτε προσθεῖναι, ὡς τῆς μὲν ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῆς ἐλλείψεως φθειρούσης τὸ εὖ, τῆς δὲ μεσότητος σῳζούσης, οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ τεχνῖται, ὡς λέγομεν, πρὸς τοῦτο βλέποντες ἐργάζονται)· ἡ δ' ἀρετὴ πάσης τέχνης ἀκριβεστέρα καὶ ἀμείνων ἐστὶν ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ φύσις, τοῦ μέσου ἂν εἴη στοχαστική. λέγω δὲ τὴν ἠθικήν· αὕτη γάρ ἐστι περὶ πάθη καὶ πράξεις, ἐν δὲ τούτοις ἔστιν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις καὶ τὸ μέσον.	If, then, every science does its work well in this way—by looking to the mean and bringing its products into line with it (which is why people usually say of well-made works that nothing can be taken away or added, on the assumption that excess and deficiency destroy what is good in them while the mean preserves it; and good craftsmen, as we say, keep their eyes on this as they work)—and if excellence, like nature, is more precise and better than any craft, then excellence would be the sort of thing that aims at the mean. I mean excellence of character; for it is concerned with feelings and actions, and in these there is excess, deficiency, and the mean.
οἷον καὶ φοβηθῆναι καὶ θαρρῆσαι καὶ ἐπιθυμῆσαι καὶ ὀργισθῆναι καὶ ἐλεῆσαι καὶ ὅλως ἡσθῆναι καὶ λυπηθῆναι ἔστι καὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον, καὶ ἀμφότερα οὐκ εὖ· τὸ δ' ὅτε δεῖ καὶ ἐφ' οἷς καὶ πρὸς οὓς καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα καὶ ὡς δεῖ, μέσον τε καὶ ἄριστον, ὅπερ ἐστὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ	For instance, one can feel fear, confidence, appetite, anger, pity, and pleasure and pain generally, both too much and too little, and in both cases not well; but to feel them when one should, about the things one should, toward the people one should,

3 Milo of Croton was a famous wrestler of the sixth century BC, legendary for his strength and his appetite. The Greek unit here, the mina, weighed roughly a pound.

GREEK

τὰς πράξεις ἔστιν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις καὶ τὸ μέσον. ἡ δ' ἀρετὴ περὶ πάθη καὶ πράξεις ἐστίν, ἐν οἷς ἡ μὲν ὑπερβολὴ ἁμαρτάνεται καὶ ἡ ἔλλειψις ψέγεται, τὸ δὲ μέσον ἐπαινεῖται καὶ κατορθοῦται· ταῦτα δ' ἄμφω τῆς ἀρετῆς. μεσότης τις ἄρα ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετή, στοχαστική γε οὖσα τοῦ μέσου.

ἔτι τὸ μὲν ἁμαρτάνειν πολλαχῶς ἔστιν (τὸ γὰρ κακὸν τοῦ ἀπείρου, ὡς οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι εἴκαζον, τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν τοῦ πεπερασμένου), τὸ δὲ κατορθοῦν μοναχῶς (διὸ καὶ τὸ μὲν ῥᾴδιον τὸ δὲ χαλεπόν, ῥᾴδιον μὲν τὸ ἀποτυχεῖν τοῦ σκοποῦ, χαλεπὸν δὲ τὸ ἐπιτυχεῖν)· καὶ διὰ ταῦτ' οὖν τῆς μὲν κακίας ἡ ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἡ ἔλλειψις, τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἡ μεσότης· ἐσθλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς, παντοδαπῶς δὲ κακοί.

ἔστιν ἄρα ἡ ἀρετὴ ἕξις προαιρετική, ἐν μεσότητι οὖσα τῇ πρὸς ἡμᾶς, 1107a ὡρισμένῃ λόγῳ καὶ ᾧ ἂν ὁ φρόνιμος ὁρίσειεν. μεσότης δὲ δύο κακιῶν, τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν· καὶ ἔτι τῷ τὰς μὲν ἐλλείπειν τὰς δ' ὑπερβάλλειν τοῦ δέοντος ἔν τε τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι, τὴν δ' ἀρετὴν τὸ μέσον καὶ εὑρίσκειν καὶ αἱρεῖσθαι. διὸ κατὰ μὲν τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸν λόγον τὸν τὸ τί ἦν εἶναι λέγοντα μεσότης ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετή, κατὰ δὲ τὸ ἄριστον καὶ τὸ εὖ ἀκρότης.

1107a οὐ πᾶσα δ' ἐπιδέχεται πρᾶξις οὐδὲ πᾶν πάθος τὴν μεσότητα· ἔνια γὰρ εὐθὺς ὠνόμασται συνειλημμένα μετὰ τῆς φαυλότητος, οἷον ἐπιχαιρεκακία ἀναισχυντία φθόνος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πράξεων μοιχεία κλοπὴ ἀνδροφονία· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα λέγεται τῷ αὐτὰ φαῦλα εἶναι, ἀλλ' οὐχ αἱ ὑπερβολαὶ αὐτῶν οὐδ' αἱ ἐλλείψεις. οὐκ ἔστιν οὖν οὐδέποτε περὶ αὐτὰ κατορθοῦν, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ἁμαρτάνειν· οὐδ' ἔστι τὸ εὖ ἢ μὴ εὖ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἐν τῷ ἧν δεῖ καὶ ὅτε καὶ ὡς μοιχεύειν, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς τὸ ποιεῖν ὁτιοῦν τούτων ἁμαρτάνειν ἐστίν. ὅμοιον οὖν τὸ ἀξιοῦν καὶ περὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν καὶ δειλαίνειν καὶ ἀκολασταίνειν εἶναι μεσότητα καὶ ὑπερβολὴν καὶ ἔλλειψιν· ἔσται γὰρ οὕτω γε ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεως μεσότης καὶ ὑπερβολῆς ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις ἐλλείψεως.

ENGLISH

for the sake of what one should, and in the way one should, is the mean and what is best—and this is what belongs to excellence. Similarly with actions, too, there is excess, deficiency, and the mean. Excellence is concerned with feelings and actions, in which excess is an error and deficiency is blamed, while the mean is praised and gets it right—and both of these belong to excellence. Excellence, then, is a kind of mean, since it is, at any rate, the sort of thing that aims at the mean.

Again, there are many ways to go wrong (for evil belongs to the unlimited, as the Pythagoreans pictured it, and good to the limited), but only one way to get it right. That is why the one is easy and the other hard: it is easy to miss the target, hard to hit it. For these reasons, too, excess and deficiency belong to vice, and the mean to excellence: "People are good in just one way, but bad in every way."[4]

Excellence, then, is a state that issues in decisions, lying in a mean relative to us, 1107a a mean determined by reason, in the way the practically wise person would determine it. It is a mean between two vices, one of excess and one of deficiency; and again, it is a mean in that the vices fall short of or exceed what is right in feelings and actions, while excellence both finds and chooses the mean. Hence, in respect of its substance and the account that states what it is to be, excellence is a mean; but with regard to what is best and doing well, it is an extreme.

But not every action or every feeling admits of a mean. Some have names that already imply badness—for instance malicious glee, shamelessness, and envy, and among actions adultery, theft, and murder. All these and others like them are so called because they themselves are bad, not their excesses or deficiencies. So one can never get it right with them, but always goes wrong; nor does doing them well or badly depend on committing adultery with the right woman, at the right time, and in the right way—simply to do any of them at all is to go wrong. It would be just as absurd, then, to claim that there is a mean, an excess, and a deficiency in doing wrong, being cowardly, and being self-indulgent; for then there would be a mean of

4 The line is quoted from an unknown poet.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	excess and deficiency, an excess of excess, and a deficiency of deficiency.
ὥσπερ δὲ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις διὰ τὸ τὸ μέσον εἶναί πως ἄκρον, οὕτως οὐδ' ἐκείνων μεσότης οὐδ' ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις, ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν πράττηται ἁμαρτάνεται· ὅλως γὰρ οὔθ' ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεως μεσότης ἔστιν, οὔτε μεσότητος ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις.	Just as there is no excess or deficiency of moderation and courage, because the mean is in a way an extreme, so too with those there is no mean, excess, or deficiency: however they are done, they are wrong. For in general there is no mean of excess and deficiency, nor excess and deficiency of a mean.

THE MEAN IN EACH EXCELLENCE

Aristotle applies the mean to particular excellences such as courage, generosity and truthfulness.

GREEK	ENGLISH
δεῖ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ μόνον καθόλου λέγεσθαι, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα ἐφαρμόττειν. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς περὶ τὰς πράξεις λόγοις οἱ μὲν καθόλου κοινότεροί εἰσιν, οἱ δ' ἐπὶ μέρους ἀληθινώτεροι· περὶ γὰρ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα αἱ πράξεις, δέον δ' ἐπὶ τούτων συμφωνεῖν. ληπτέον οὖν ταῦτα ἐκ τῆς διαγραφῆς. περὶ μὲν οὖν φόβους καὶ θάρρη ἀνδρεία μεσότης· [1107b] τῶν δ' ὑπερβαλλόντων ὁ μὲν τῇ ἀφοβίᾳ ἀνώνυμος (πολλὰ δ' ἐστὶν ἀνώνυμα), ὁ δ' ἐν τῷ θαρρεῖν ὑπερβάλλων θρασύς, ὁ δ' ἐν τῷ μὲν φοβεῖσθαι ὑπερβάλλων τῷ δὲ θαρρεῖν ἐλλείπων δειλός. περὶ ἡδονὰς δὲ καὶ λύπας—οὐ πάσας, ἧττον δὲ †καὶ† περὶ τὰς λύπας—μεσότης μὲν σωφροσύνη, ὑπερβολὴ δὲ ἀκολασία. ἐλλείποντες δὲ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς οὐ πάνυ γίνονται· διόπερ οὐδ' ὀνόματος τετυχήκασιν οὐδ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι, ἔστωσαν δὲ ἀναίσθητοι.	We must not only state this in general terms but also apply it to particular cases. For in discussions about actions, general accounts are broader, but those dealing with particulars are truer, since actions concern particulars, and our accounts must agree with these. Let us take the particular cases, then, from our table. About fears and confidence, courage is the mean. [1107b] Of those who exceed, the one who exceeds in fearlessness has no name (many states have no name); the one who exceeds in confidence is rash; and the one who exceeds in fear and falls short in confidence is a coward. About pleasures and pains—not all of them, and less so about pains—the mean is moderation, the excess self-indulgence. People who fall short with regard to pleasures are hardly found; that is why such people haven't even got a name, but let us call them insensible.[5]
1107b περὶ δὲ δόσιν χρημάτων καὶ λῆψιν μεσότης μὲν ἐλευθεριότης, ὑπερβολὴ δὲ καὶ ἔλλειψις ἀσωτία καὶ ἀνελευθερία. ἐναντίως δ' ἐν αὐταῖς ὑπερβάλλουσι καὶ ἐλλείπουσιν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἄσωτος ἐν μὲν προέσει ὑπερβάλλει ἐν δὲ λήψει ἐλλείπει, ὁ δ' ἀνελεύθερος ἐν μὲν λήψει ὑπερβάλλει ἐν δὲ προέσει ἐλλείπει. νῦν μὲν οὖν τύπῳ καὶ ἐπὶ κεφαλαίου λέγομεν, ἀρκούμενοι αὐτῷ τούτῳ· ὕστερον δὲ ἀκριβέστερον περὶ αὐτῶν διορισθήσεται. περὶ δὲ χρήματα καὶ ἄλλαι διαθέσεις εἰσί, μεσότης μὲν μεγαλοπρέπεια (ὁ γὰρ μεγαλοπρεπὴς διαφέρει ἐλευθερίου· ὃ μὲν γὰρ περὶ μεγάλα, ὃ δὲ περὶ μικρά), ὑπερβολὴ δὲ ἀπειροκαλία καὶ βαναυσία, ἔλλειψις δὲ μικροπρέπεια· διαφέρουσι δ' αὗται τῶν περὶ τὴν ἐλευθεριότητα, πῇ δὲ διαφέρουσιν, ὕστερον ῥηθήσεται.	About giving and taking money, the mean is generosity, the excess and deficiency wastefulness and stinginess. In these the excess and deficiency run in opposite directions: the wasteful person exceeds in giving away and falls short in taking, while the stingy person exceeds in taking and falls short in giving away. For now we are speaking in outline and summarily, and that is enough for present purposes; later these will be defined more precisely. About money there are other dispositions too: the mean is magnificence (for the magnificent person differs from the generous one: the former deals with large sums, the latter with small), the excess tastelessness and vulgarity, the deficiency shabbiness. These differ from the states

5 Aristotle apparently refers to a chart used in his lectures, listing each excellence with its excess and deficiency.

GREEK

ENGLISH

concerned with generosity; how they differ will be discussed later.

περὶ δὲ τιμὴν καὶ ἀτιμίαν μεσότης μὲν μεγαλοψυχία, ὑπερβολὴ δὲ χαυνότης τις λεγομένη, ἔλλειψις δὲ μικροψυχία· ὡς δ' ἐλέγομεν ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν τὴν ἐλευθεριότητα, τῷ περὶ μικρὰ διαφέρουσαν, οὕτως ἔχει τις καὶ πρὸς τὴν μεγαλοψυχίαν, περὶ τιμὴν οὖσαν μεγάλην, αὐτὴ περὶ μικρὰν οὖσα· ἔστι γὰρ ὡς δεῖ ὀρέγεσθαι τιμῆς καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ ἧττον, λέγεται δ' ὁ μὲν ὑπερβάλλων ταῖς ὀρέξεσι φιλότιμος, ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων ἀφιλότιμος, ὁ δὲ μέσος ἀνώνυμος. ἀνώνυμοι δὲ καὶ αἱ διαθέσεις, πλὴν ἡ τοῦ φιλοτίμου φιλοτιμία. ὅθεν ἐπιδικάζονται οἱ ἄκροι τῆς μέσης χώρας· καὶ ἡμεῖς δὲ ἔστι μὲν ὅτε τὸν μέσον φιλότιμον καλοῦμεν ἔστι δ' ὅτε ἀφιλότιμον, [1108a] καὶ ἔστι μὲν ὅτε ἐπαινοῦμεν τὸν φιλότιμον ἔστι δ' ὅτε τὸν ἀφιλότιμον.

About honor and dishonor, the mean is greatness of soul, the excess what is called a kind of vanity, and the deficiency smallness of soul. And just as we said that generosity is related to magnificence, differing in that it concerns small sums, so there is a state related to greatness of soul, which concerns great honor, while this one concerns small honor. For one can desire honor as one should, or more than one should, or less; the person who exceeds in these desires is called ambitious, the one who falls short unambitious, while the one in the middle has no name. Their dispositions have no names either, except the ambitious person's, ambition. That is why the extremes lay claim to the middle ground; and we ourselves sometimes call the person in the middle ambitious and sometimes unambitious, [1108a] and sometimes praise the ambitious person, sometimes the unambitious one.

1108a διὰ τίνα δ' αἰτίαν τοῦτο ποιοῦμεν, ἐν τοῖς ἑξῆς ῥηθήσεται· νῦν δὲ περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν λέγωμεν κατὰ τὸν ὑφηγημένον τρόπον. ἔστι δὲ καὶ περὶ τὴν ὀργὴν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις καὶ μεσότης, σχεδὸν δὲ ἀνωνύμων ὄντων αὐτῶν τὸν μέσον πρᾶον λέγοντες τὴν μεσότητα πραότητα καλέσωμεν· τῶν δ' ἄκρων ὁ μὲν ὑπερβάλλων ὀργίλος ἔστω, ἡ δὲ κακία ὀργιλότης, ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων ἀόργητός τις, ἡ δ' ἔλλειψις ἀοργησία. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλαι τρεῖς μεσότητες, ἔχουσαι μέν τινα ὁμοιότητα πρὸς ἀλλήλας, διαφέρουσαι δ' ἀλλήλων· πᾶσαι μὲν γάρ εἰσι περὶ λόγων καὶ πράξεων κοινωνίαν, διαφέρουσι δὲ ὅτι ἡ μέν ἐστι περὶ τἀληθὲς τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς, αἱ δὲ περὶ τὸ ἡδύ· τούτου δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐν παιδιᾷ τὸ δ' ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὸν βίον.

Why we do this will be explained in what follows; for now let us speak about the remaining states in the way we have laid down. With anger, too, there is an excess, a deficiency, and a mean. Since these have practically no names, let us call the person in the middle gentle and the mean gentleness. Of the extremes, let the one who exceeds be irascible and his vice irascibility, and the one who falls short something like unirascible and the deficiency unirascibility. There are also three other means, which have a certain likeness to one another but differ from one another. All are concerned with shared life in words and actions, but they differ in that one concerns truth in these, the others what is pleasant—and of this, one sort is found in amusement, the other in all the dealings of life.

ῥητέον οὖν καὶ περὶ τούτων, ἵνα μᾶλλον κατίδωμεν ὅτι ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ μεσότης ἐπαινετόν, τὰ δ' ἄκρα οὔτ' ἐπαινετὰ οὔτ' ὀρθὰ ἀλλὰ ψεκτά. εἰσὶ μὲν οὖν καὶ τούτων τὰ πλείω ἀνώνυμα, πειρατέον δ', ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, αὐτοὺς ὀνοματοποιεῖν σαφηνείας ἕνεκα καὶ τοῦ εὐπαρακολουθήτου. περὶ μὲν οὖν τὸ ἀληθὲς ὁ μὲν μέσος ἀληθής τις καὶ ἡ μεσότης ἀλήθεια λεγέσθω, ἡ δὲ προσποίησις ἡ μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον ἀλαζονεία καὶ ὁ ἔχων αὐτὴν ἀλαζών, ἡ δ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον εἰρωνεία καὶ εἴρων ὁ ἔχων.

So we must talk about these too, so as to see better that in everything the mean is praiseworthy, while the extremes are neither praiseworthy nor right but blameworthy. Most of these, too, have no names, but we must try, as with the others, to make up names ourselves, for the sake of clarity and so that we can be easily followed. About truth, then, let the person in the middle be called truthful and the mean truthfulness; pretense that exaggerates is boastfulness and the person who has it a boaster, and pretense that understates is self-de-

GREEK	ENGLISH
	precation and the person who has it self-deprecating.
περὶ δὲ τὸ ἡδὺ τὸ μὲν ἐν παιδιᾷ ὁ μὲν μέσος εὐτράπελος καὶ ἡ διάθεσις εὐτραπελία, ἡ δ' ὑπερβολὴ βωμολοχία καὶ ὁ ἔχων αὐτὴν βωμολόχος, ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων ἄγροικός τις καὶ ἡ ἕξις ἀγροικία· περὶ δὲ τὸ λοιπὸν ἡδὺ τὸ ἐν τῷ βίῳ ὁ μὲν ὡς δεῖ ἡδὺς ὢν φίλος καὶ ἡ μεσότης φιλία, ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλων, εἰ μὲν οὐδενὸς ἕνεκα, ἄρεσκος, εἰ δ' ὠφελείας τῆς αὐτοῦ, κόλαξ, ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν ἀηδὴς δύσερίς τις καὶ δύσκολος. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς παθήμασι καὶ περὶ τὰ πάθη μεσότητες· ἡ γὰρ αἰδὼς ἀρετὴ μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, ἐπαινεῖται δὲ καὶ ὁ αἰδήμων.	About the pleasant in amusement, the person in the middle is witty and the disposition wit; the excess is buffoonery and the person who has it a buffoon, while the one who falls short is a sort of boor and the state boorishness. About the remaining kind of pleasantness, the kind found in life generally, the person who is pleasant as one should be is friendly and the mean friendliness; the one who exceeds is obsequious if he has no further aim, a flatterer if he aims at his own advantage; and the one who falls short and is unpleasant in everything is a quarrelsome, difficult sort. There are means also in experiences and concerning feelings. Shame is not an excellence, yet the person with a sense of shame is praised.
καὶ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ὃ μὲν λέγεται μέσος, ὃ δ' ὑπερβάλλων, ὡς ὁ καταπλὴξ ὁ πάντα αἰδούμενος· ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων ἢ μηδὲν ὅλως ἀναίσχυντος, ὁ δὲ μέσος αἰδήμων. [1108b] νέμεσις δὲ μεσότης φθόνου καὶ ἐπιχαιρεκακίας, εἰσὶ δὲ περὶ λύπην καὶ ἡδονὴν τὰς ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβαίνουσι τοῖς πέλας γινομένας· ὁ μὲν γὰρ νεμεσητικὸς λυπεῖται ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀναξίως εὖ πράττουσιν, ὁ δὲ φθονερὸς ὑπερβάλλων τοῦτον ἐπὶ πᾶσι λυπεῖται, ὁ δ' ἐπιχαιρέκακος τοσοῦτον ἐλλείπει τοῦ λυπεῖσθαι ὥστε καὶ χαίρειν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτων καὶ ἄλλοθι καιρὸς ἔσται· περὶ δὲ δικαιοσύνης, ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς λέγεται, μετὰ ταῦτα διελόμενοι περὶ ἑκατέρας ἐροῦμεν πῶς μεσότητές εἰσιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν λογικῶν ἀρετῶν.	For in these, too, one person is said to be in the middle and another to exceed, like the bashful person who is ashamed of everything; while the one who falls short, or is not ashamed of anything at all, is shameless, and the one in the middle has a sense of shame. [1108b] Righteous indignation is a mean between envy and malicious glee, and these are concerned with pain and pleasure at what happens to one's neighbors. The righteously indignant person is pained at people who do well undeservedly; the envious person goes beyond him and is pained at everyone's doing well; and the person given to malicious glee falls so far short of being pained that he actually rejoices. But there will be an opportunity to discuss these elsewhere. As for justice, since it is not spoken of in just one sense, after this we will distinguish its two kinds and say how each is a mean; and similarly with the excellences of reason.

HOW THE EXTREMES ARE OPPOSED

Aristotle explains how the two vices oppose each other and the mean, and which is more opposed.

GREEK	ENGLISH
1108b τριῶν δὴ διαθέσεων οὐσῶν, δύο μὲν κακιῶν, τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν, μιᾶς δ' ἀρετῆς τῆς μεσότητος, πᾶσαι πάσαις ἀντίκεινταί πως· αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄκραι καὶ τῇ μέσῃ καὶ ἀλλήλαις ἐναντίαι εἰσίν, ἡ δὲ μέση ταῖς ἄκραις· ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ ἴσον πρὸς μὲν τὸ ἔλαττον μεῖζον πρὸς δὲ τὸ μεῖζον ἔλαττον, οὕτως αἱ μέσαι ἕξεις πρὸς μὲν τὰς ἐλλείψεις ὑπερβάλλουσι πρὸς δὲ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς ἐλλείπουσιν ἔν τε τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς	There are three dispositions, then: two vices, one of excess and one of deficiency, and one excellence, the mean; and all are in some way opposed to all. The extremes are contrary both to the mean and to each other, and the mean is contrary to the extremes. For just as the equal is greater relative to the less and less relative to the greater, so the middle states exceed relative to the deficiencies

GREEK

πράξεσιν. ὁ γὰρ ἀνδρεῖος πρὸς μὲν τὸν δειλὸν θρασὺς φαίνεται, πρὸς δὲ τὸν θρασὺν δειλός· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ σώφρων πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἀναίσθητον ἀκόλαστος, πρὸς δὲ τὸν ἀκόλαστον ἀναίσθητος, ὁ δ' ἐλευθέριος πρὸς μὲν τὸν ἀνελεύθερον ἄσωτος, πρὸς δὲ τὸν ἄσωτον ἀνελεύθερος.

διὸ καὶ ἀπωθοῦνται τὸν μέσον οἱ ἄκροι ἑκάτερος πρὸς ἑκάτερον, καὶ καλοῦσι τὸν ἀνδρεῖον ὁ μὲν δειλὸς θρασὺν ὁ δὲ θρασὺς δειλόν, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀνάλογον. οὕτω δ' ἀντικειμένων ἀλλήλοις τούτων, πλείστη ἐναντιότης ἐστὶ τοῖς ἄκροις πρὸς ἄλληλα ἢ πρὸς τὸ μέσον· πορρωτέρω γὰρ ταῦτα ἀφέστηκεν ἀλλήλων ἢ τοῦ μέσου, ὥσπερ τὸ μέγα τοῦ μικροῦ καὶ τὸ μικρὸν τοῦ μεγάλου ἢ ἄμφω τοῦ ἴσου. ἔτι πρὸς μὲν τὸ μέσον ἐνίοις ἄκροις ὁμοιότης τις φαίνεται, ὡς τῇ θρασύτητι πρὸς τὴν ἀνδρείαν καὶ τῇ ἀσωτίᾳ πρὸς τὴν ἐλευθεριότητα· τοῖς δὲ ἄκροις πρὸς ἄλληλα πλείστη ἀνομοιότης· τὰ δὲ πλεῖστον ἀπέχοντα ἀπ' ἀλλήλων ἐναντία ὁρίζονται, ὥστε καὶ μᾶλλον ἐναντία τὰ πλεῖον ἀπέχοντα.

πρὸς δὲ τὸ μέσον [1109a] ἀντίκειται μᾶλλον ἐφ' ὧν μὲν ἡ ἔλλειψις ἐφ' ὧν δὲ ἡ ὑπερβολή, οἷον ἀνδρείᾳ μὲν οὐχ ἡ θρασύτης ὑπερβολὴ οὖσα, ἀλλ' ἡ δειλία ἔλλειψις οὖσα, τῇ δὲ σωφροσύνῃ οὐχ ἡ ἀναισθησία ἔνδεια οὖσα, ἀλλ' ἡ ἀκολασία ὑπερβολὴ οὖσα. διὰ δύο δ' αἰτίας τοῦτο συμβαίνει, μίαν μὲν τὴν ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος· τῷ γὰρ ἐγγύτερον εἶναι καὶ ὁμοιότερον τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον τῷ μέσῳ, οὐ τοῦτο ἀλλὰ τοὐναντίον ἀντιτίθεμεν μᾶλλον· οἷον ἐπεὶ ὁμοιότερον εἶναι δοκεῖ τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ ἡ θρασύτης καὶ ἐγγύτερον, ἀνομοιότερον δ' ἡ δειλία, ταύτην μᾶλλον ἀντιτίθεμεν· τὰ γὰρ ἀπέχοντα πλεῖον τοῦ μέσου ἐναντιώτερα δοκεῖ εἶναι.

1109a μία μὲν οὖν αἰτία αὕτη, ἐξ αὐτοῦ τοῦ πράγματος· ἑτέρα δὲ ἐξ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν· πρὸς ἃ γὰρ αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον πεφύκαμέν πως, ταῦτα μᾶλλον ἐναντία τῷ μέσῳ φαίνεται. οἷον αὐτοὶ μᾶλλον πεφύκαμεν πρὸς τὰς ἡδονάς, διὸ εὐκαταφορώτεροί ἐσμεν πρὸς ἀκολασίαν ἢ πρὸς κοσμιότητα. ταῦτ' οὖν μᾶλλον ἐναντία λέγομεν, πρὸς ἃ ἡ ἐπίδοσις μᾶλλον γίνεται· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἡ ἀκολασία ὑπερβολὴ οὖσα ἐναντιωτέρα ἐστὶ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ.

ENGLISH

and fall short relative to the excesses, in both feelings and actions. The courageous person appears rash compared with the coward, and cowardly compared with the rash person; similarly the moderate person appears self-indulgent compared with the insensible person, and insensible compared with the self-indulgent one; and the generous person appears wasteful compared with the stingy person, and stingy compared with the wasteful one.

That is why each extreme pushes the person in the middle toward the other: the coward calls the courageous person rash, and the rash person calls him a coward, and correspondingly in the other cases. Since these are opposed to one another in this way, the extremes are more contrary to each other than to the mean; for they are further from each other than from the mean, just as the large is further from the small, and the small from the large, than both are from the equal. Again, some extremes show a certain likeness to the mean, as rashness does to courage and wastefulness to generosity, whereas the extremes are most unlike each other. And things furthest apart from each other are defined as contraries, so that things further apart are more contrary.

To the mean [1109a] it is in some cases the deficiency that is more opposed, in others the excess. For instance, what is more opposed to courage is not rashness, which is an excess, but cowardice, which is a deficiency; and to moderation not insensibility, which is a lack, but self-indulgence, which is an excess. This happens for two reasons. One comes from the thing itself: because one extreme is closer and more similar to the mean, we set not it but its contrary against the mean. For example, since rashness seems more similar and closer to courage, and cowardice less similar, it is cowardice we set against courage; for things further from the mean seem more contrary to it.

This, then, is one reason, coming from the thing itself. The other comes from ourselves: the things we are somehow more naturally inclined toward appear more contrary to the mean. For instance, we are naturally more inclined toward pleasures, which is why we are more easily carried off toward self-indulgence than toward orderliness. So we call those things more contrary toward which we more readily drift; and this is why self-indul-

GREEK	ENGLISH
	gence, which is an excess, is more contrary to moderation.

HITTING THE MEAN

Aristotle notes that hitting the mean is hard and gives practical advice for approaching it.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ ἀρετὴ ἡ ἠθικὴ μεσότης, καὶ πῶς, καὶ ὅτι μεσότης δύο κακιῶν, τῆς μὲν καθ' ὑπερβολὴν τῆς δὲ κατ' ἔλλειψιν, καὶ ὅτι τοιαύτη ἐστὶ διὰ τὸ στοχαστικὴ τοῦ μέσου εἶναι τοῦ ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ἐν ταῖς πράξεσιν, ἱκανῶς εἴρηται. διὸ καὶ ἔργον ἐστὶ σπουδαῖον εἶναι. ἐν ἑκάστῳ γὰρ τὸ μέσον λαβεῖν ἔργον, οἷον κύκλου τὸ μέσον οὐ παντὸς ἀλλὰ τοῦ εἰδότος· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ μὲν ὀργισθῆναι παντὸς καὶ ῥᾴδιον, καὶ τὸ δοῦναι ἀργύριον καὶ δαπανῆσαι· τὸ δ' ᾧ καὶ ὅσον καὶ ὅτε καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα καὶ ὡς, οὐκέτι παντὸς οὐδὲ ῥᾴδιον· διόπερ τὸ εὖ καὶ σπάνιον καὶ ἐπαινετὸν καὶ καλόν.	That excellence of character is a mean, then, and in what sense; that it is a mean between two vices, one of excess and one of deficiency; and that it is such because it aims at the mean in feelings and actions—all this has been sufficiently stated. That is also why it is hard work to be excellent. In each case it is hard work to find the middle—finding the center of a circle, for instance, is not for everyone but for someone who knows how. In the same way, getting angry is something anyone can do, and easy, and so is giving money away or spending it; but to do it to the right person, in the right amount, at the right time, for the right reason, and in the right way is no longer something anyone can do, nor is it easy. That is why doing it well is rare, praiseworthy, and fine.
διὸ δεῖ τὸν στοχαζόμενον τοῦ μέσου πρῶτον μὲν ἀποχωρεῖν τοῦ μᾶλλον ἐναντίου, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ Καλυψὼ παραινεῖ τούτου μὲν καπνοῦ καὶ κύματος ἐκτὸς ἔργε νῆα. τῶν γὰρ ἄκρων τὸ μέν ἐστιν ἁμαρτωλότερον τὸ δ' ἧττον· ἐπεὶ οὖν τοῦ μέσου τυχεῖν ἄκρως χαλεπόν, κατὰ τὸν δεύτερον, φασί, πλοῦν τὰ ἐλάχιστα ληπτέον τῶν κακῶν· τοῦτο δ' ἔσται μάλιστα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ὃν λέγομεν. [1109b] σκοπεῖν δὲ δεῖ πρὸς ἃ καὶ αὐτοὶ εὐκατάφοροί ἐσμεν· ἄλλοι γὰρ πρὸς ἄλλα πεφύκαμεν· τοῦτο δ' ἔσται γνώριμον ἐκ τῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ τῆς λύπης τῆς γινομένης περὶ ἡμᾶς. εἰς τοὐναντίον δ' ἑαυτοὺς ἀφέλκειν δεῖ· πολὺ γὰρ ἀπάγοντες τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν εἰς τὸ μέσον ἥξομεν, ὅπερ οἱ τὰ διεστραμμένα τῶν ξύλων ὀρθοῦντες ποιοῦσιν.	So someone aiming at the mean must first steer away from the more contrary extreme, as Calypso too advises: "Keep the ship clear of that spray and surf." For of the extremes one is more of an error, the other less; since, then, it is extremely hard to hit the mean, we must take the second-best course, as they say, and choose the least of the evils—and this will best be done in the way we describe. [1109b] We must also consider what we ourselves are easily carried off toward, since different people are naturally inclined toward different things; and this will become clear from the pleasure and pain that arise in us. We must drag ourselves off in the contrary direction; for by pulling far away from error we will arrive at the middle, as people do when they straighten warped timber.[6]
1109b ἐν παντὶ δὲ μάλιστα φυλακτέον τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὴν ἡδονήν· οὐ γὰρ ἀδέκαστοι κρίνομεν αὐτήν. ὅπερ οὖν οἱ δημογέροντες ἔπαθον πρὸς τὴν Ἑλένην, τοῦτο δεῖ παθεῖν καὶ ἡμᾶς πρὸς τὴν ἡδονήν, καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τὴν ἐκείνων ἐπιλέγειν φωνήν· οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὴν ἀποπεμπόμενοι ἧττον ἁμαρτησόμεθα. ταῦτ' οὖν ποιοῦντες, ὡς ἐν κεφαλαίῳ	In everything we must be most on guard against what is pleasant and against pleasure, since we are not impartial judges of it. So we should feel toward pleasure what the elders of the people felt toward Helen, and repeat their words on every occasion; for if we send pleasure away like this, we will go

6 The line is from Homer's *Odyssey* (12.219), spoken by Odysseus but echoing Circe's advice, not Calypso's. The "second sailing" was proverbial: taking to the oars when the wind fails.

GREEK

εἰπεῖν, μάλιστα δυνησόμεθα τοῦ μέσου τυγχάνειν. χαλεπὸν δ' ἴσως τοῦτο, καὶ μάλιστ' ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστον· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον διορίσαι καὶ πῶς καὶ τίσι καὶ ἐπὶ ποίοις καὶ πόσον χρόνον ὀργιστέον· καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς ὁτὲ μὲν τοὺς ἐλλείποντας ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ πράους φαμέν, ὁτὲ δὲ τοὺς χαλεπαίνοντας ἀνδρώδεις ἀποκαλοῦντες. ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν μικρὸν τοῦ εὖ παρεκβαίνων οὐ ψέγεται, οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ μᾶλλον οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἧττον, ὁ δὲ πλέον· οὗτος γὰρ οὐ λανθάνει.

ὁ δὲ μέχρι τίνος καὶ ἐπὶ πόσον ψεκτὸς οὐ ῥᾴδιον τῷ λόγῳ ἀφορίσαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλο οὐδὲν τῶν αἰσθητῶν· τὰ δὲ τοιαῦτα ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα, καὶ ἐν τῇ αἰσθήσει ἡ κρίσις. τὸ μὲν ἄρα τοσοῦτο δηλοῖ ὅτι ἡ μέση ἕξις ἐν πᾶσιν ἐπαινετή, ἀποκλίνειν δὲ δεῖ ὁτὲ μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ὁτὲ δ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἔλλειψιν· οὕτω γὰρ ῥᾷστα τοῦ μέσου καὶ τοῦ εὖ τευξόμεθα.

ENGLISH

wrong less. To sum up, then, by doing these things we will be best able to hit the mean. But this is perhaps difficult, especially in particular cases: it is not easy to determine how, with whom, over what, and for how long one should be angry. We ourselves sometimes praise those who fall short and call them gentle, and sometimes call those who are harsh manly. Yet someone who deviates a little from what is right, whether toward more or toward less, is not blamed—only someone who deviates more, since he doesn't escape notice.[7]

But up to what point and how far someone is blameworthy is not easy to define in an account—nor is anything else perceptible. Such matters lie in particulars, and the judgment rests with perception. This much, then, is clear: the middle state is praiseworthy in everything, but we must sometimes lean toward the excess and sometimes toward the deficiency; for this is the easiest way to hit the mean and what is right.

7 In the *Iliad* (3.156–60) the Trojan elders, seeing Helen on the wall, grant her beauty but wish her sent away before she brings ruin on them.

Book III

Voluntary action; courage and moderation
Aristotle analyzes voluntary action, decision and deliberation, then examines courage and moderation.

GREEK

τῆς ἀρετῆς δὴ περὶ πάθη τε καὶ πράξεις οὔσης, καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς ἑκουσίοις ἐπαίνων καὶ ψόγων γινομένων, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις συγγνώμης, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ ἐλέου, τὸ ἑκούσιον καὶ τὸ ἀκούσιον ἀναγκαῖον ἴσως διορίσαι τοῖς περὶ ἀρετῆς ἐπισκοποῦσι, χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τοῖς νομοθετοῦσι πρός τε τὰς τιμὰς καὶ τὰς κολάσεις. δοκεῖ δὴ ἀκούσια εἶναι τὰ βίᾳ ἢ δι' ἄγνοιαν γινόμενα· 1110a βίαιον δὲ οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἔξωθεν, τοιαύτη οὖσα ἐν ᾗ μηδὲν συμβάλλεται ὁ πράττων ἢ ὁ πάσχων, οἷον εἰ πνεῦμα κομίσαι ποι ἢ ἄνθρωποι κύριοι ὄντες.

ENGLISH

Since excellence is concerned with feelings and actions, and since voluntary ones meet with praise and blame, while involuntary ones meet with forgiveness and sometimes even pity, it is presumably necessary for those inquiring into excellence to distinguish the voluntary and the involuntary; it is also useful for lawgivers in assigning honors and punishments. Things that happen by force or through ignorance seem to be involuntary. 1110a Something is forced when its origin is outside, being the kind of origin to which the person acting, or rather being acted on, contributes nothing—as when a wind carries him off somewhere, or people who have him in their power.

1110a ὅσα δὲ διὰ φόβον μειζόνων κακῶν πράττεται ἢ διὰ καλόν τι, οἷον εἰ τύραννος προστάττοι αἰσχρόν τι πρᾶξαι κύριος ὢν γονέων καὶ τέκνων, καὶ πράξαντος μὲν σῴζοιντο μὴ πράξαντος δ' ἀποθνήσκοιεν, ἀμφισβήτησιν ἔχει πότερον ἀκούσιά ἐστιν ἢ ἑκούσια. τοιοῦτον δέ τι συμβαίνει καὶ περὶ τὰς ἐν τοῖς χειμῶσιν ἐκβολάς· ἁπλῶς μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἀποβάλλεται ἑκών, ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ δ' αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἅπαντες οἱ νοῦν ἔχοντες. μικταὶ μὲν οὖν εἰσιν αἱ τοιαῦται πράξεις, ἐοίκασι δὲ μᾶλλον ἑκουσίοις· αἱρεταὶ γάρ εἰσι τότε ὅτε πράττονται, τὸ δὲ τέλος τῆς πράξεως κατὰ τὸν καιρόν ἐστιν. καὶ τὸ ἑκούσιον δὴ καὶ τὸ ἀκούσιον, ὅτε πράττει, λεκτέον.

But things done from fear of greater evils, or for the sake of something fine, are disputed: are they involuntary or voluntary? Suppose, for instance, that a tyrant who had someone's parents and children in his power ordered him to do something shameful, and that if he did it they would be saved, but if not they would be put to death. Something similar happens with throwing cargo overboard in storms: no one throws things away voluntarily, considered simply, but to save himself and the others anyone with sense does. Such actions, then, are mixed, but they are more like voluntary ones; for they are choiceworthy at the time they are done, and the end of an action depends on the occasion. So the terms "voluntary" and "involuntary" must be applied with reference to the time when someone acts.

πράττει δὲ ἑκών· καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρχὴ τοῦ κινεῖν τὰ ὀργανικὰ μέρη ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις πράξεσιν ἐν αὐτῷ ἐστίν· ὧν δ' ἐν αὐτῷ ἡ ἀρχή, ἐπ' αὐτῷ καὶ τὸ πράττειν καὶ μή. ἑκούσια δὴ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἁπλῶς δ' ἴσως ἀκούσια· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἂν ἕλοιτο καθ' αὑτὸ τῶν τοιούτων οὐδέν. ἐπὶ ταῖς πράξεσι δὲ ταῖς τοιαύταις ἐνίοτε καὶ ἐπαινοῦνται, ὅταν αἰσχρόν τι ἢ λυπηρὸν ὑπομένωσιν ἀντὶ μεγάλων καὶ καλῶν· ἂν δ' ἀνάπαλιν, ψέγονται· τὰ γὰρ αἴσχισθ' ὑπομεῖναι ἐπὶ μηδενὶ καλῷ ἢ μετρίῳ φαύλου. ἐπ' ἐνίοις δ' ἔπαινος μὲν οὐ

And he acts voluntarily; for in such actions the origin of moving the limbs that serve as instruments is in him, and when the origin is in him, it is up to him to do it or not. Such things, then, are voluntary, though considered simply they are perhaps involuntary, since no one would choose any such thing for its own sake. For such actions people are sometimes even praised, when they endure some-

GREEK

γίνεται, συγγνώμη δ', ὅταν διὰ τοιαῦτα πράξῃ τις ἃ μὴ δεῖ, ἃ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην φύσιν ὑπερτείνει καὶ μηδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείναι.

ἔνια δ' ἴσως οὐκ ἔστιν ἀναγκασθῆναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀποθανετέον παθόντι τὰ δεινότατα· καὶ γὰρ τὸν Εὐριπίδου Ἀλκμαίωνα γελοῖα φαίνεται τὰ ἀναγκάσαντα μητροκτονῆσαι. ἔστι δὲ χαλεπὸν ἐνίοτε διακρῖναι ποῖον ἀντὶ ποίου αἱρετέον καὶ τί ἀντὶ τίνος ὑπομενετέον, ἔτι δὲ χαλεπώτερον ἐμμεῖναι τοῖς γνωσθεῖσιν· ὡς γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ ἐστι τὰ μὲν προσδοκώμενα λυπηρά, ἃ δ' ἀναγκάζονται αἰσχρά, ὅθεν ἔπαινοι καὶ ψόγοι γίνονται περὶ τοὺς ἀναγκασθέντας ἢ μή. [1110b] τὰ δὴ ποῖα φατέον βίαια; ἢ ἁπλῶς μέν, ὁπότ' ἂν ἡ αἰτία ἐν τοῖς ἐκτὸς ᾖ καὶ ὁ πράττων μηδὲν συμβάλληται; ἃ δὲ καθ' αὑτὰ μὲν ἀκούσιά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τῶνδε αἱρετά, καὶ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ πράττοντι, καθ' αὑτὰ μὲν ἀκούσιά ἐστι, νῦν δὲ καὶ ἀντὶ τῶνδε ἑκούσια.

1110b μᾶλλον δ' ἔοικεν ἑκουσίοις· αἱ γὰρ πράξεις ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα, ταῦτα δ' ἑκούσια. ποῖα δ' ἀντὶ ποίων αἱρετέον, οὐ ῥᾴδιον ἀποδοῦναι· πολλαὶ γὰρ διαφοραί εἰσιν ἐν τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα. εἰ δέ τις τὰ ἡδέα καὶ τὰ καλὰ φαίη βίαια εἶναι (ἀναγκάζειν γὰρ ἔξω ὄντα), πάντα ἂν εἴη αὐτῷ βίαια· τούτων γὰρ χάριν πάντες πάντα πράττουσιν. καὶ οἱ μὲν βίᾳ καὶ ἄκοντες λυπηρῶς, οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ καλὸν μεθ' ἡδονῆς· γελοῖον δὲ τὸ αἰτιᾶσθαι τὰ ἐκτός, ἀλλὰ μὴ αὐτὸν εὐθήρατον ὄντα ὑπὸ τῶν τοιούτων, καὶ τῶν μὲν καλῶν ἑαυτόν, τῶν δ' αἰσχρῶν τὰ ἡδέα. ἔοικε δὴ τὸ βίαιον εἶναι οὗ ἔξωθεν ἡ ἀρχή, μηδὲν συμβαλλομένου τοῦ βιασθέντος.

ENGLISH

thing shameful or painful in return for great and fine things; if it's the other way round, they are blamed, since to endure the most shameful things for nothing fine, or for something trivial, is the mark of a bad person. In some cases there is no praise, but there is forgiveness, when someone does what he shouldn't because of pressures that overstrain human nature and that no one could endure.

But some things, perhaps, one cannot be compelled to do; one should rather die after suffering the most terrible things. The things that "compelled" Euripides' Alcmaeon to kill his mother, for instance, seem ridiculous. It is sometimes hard to judge what should be chosen at what price, and what should be endured in return for what, and harder still to abide by one's judgment. For as a rule what is expected is painful, and what people are compelled to do is shameful; that is why praise and blame are given according to whether people have been compelled or not. [1110b] What sort of things, then, should be called forced? Is it simply those whose cause lies in external things, when the agent contributes nothing? But things that are in themselves involuntary, yet choiceworthy now and in return for these particular things, and whose origin is in the agent, are involuntary in themselves, but now and in return for these things voluntary.[1]

They are more like voluntary actions, though; for actions are in particulars, and these are voluntary. What should be chosen at what price is not easy to state, since there are many differences among particular cases. If someone were to say that pleasant and fine things are forced (since they compel us from outside), everything would be forced for him; for everyone does everything for the sake of these. And those who act by force and unwillingly act with pain, while those who act for the sake of what is pleasant or fine act with pleasure. It is ridiculous to blame external things rather than oneself for being easily caught by such things, and to hold oneself responsible for fine actions but pleasant things responsible for shameful ones. The forced, then, seems to be that whose origin is outside, the person forced contributing nothing.

1 In a lost play of Euripides, Alcmaeon killed his mother Eriphyle, apparently under pressure of his father's curse.

ACTING THROUGH IGNORANCE

Aristotle examines acting through ignorance and argues that acts done from anger or appetite are voluntary.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τὸ δὲ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν οὐχ ἑκούσιον μὲν ἅπαν ἐστίν, ἀκούσιον δὲ τὸ ἐπίλυπον καὶ ἐν μεταμελείᾳ· ὁ γὰρ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν πράξας ὁτιοῦν, μηδέν τι δυσχεραίνων ἐπὶ τῇ πράξει, ἑκὼν μὲν οὐ πέπραχεν, ὅ γε μὴ ᾔδει, οὐδ᾽ αὖ ἄκων, μὴ λυπούμενός γε. τοῦ δὴ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν ὁ μὲν ἐν μεταμελείᾳ ἄκων δοκεῖ, ὁ δὲ μὴ μεταμελόμενος, ἐπεὶ ἕτερος, ἔστω οὐχ ἑκών· ἐπεὶ γὰρ διαφέρει, βέλτιον ὄνομα ἔχειν ἴδιον. ἕτερον δ᾽ ἔοικε καὶ τὸ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν πράττειν τοῦ ἀγνοοῦντα· ὁ γὰρ μεθύων ἢ ὀργιζόμενος οὐ δοκεῖ δι᾽ ἄγνοιαν πράττειν ἀλλὰ διά τι τῶν εἰρημένων, οὐκ εἰδὼς δὲ ἀλλ᾽ ἀγνοῶν.	Whatever is done through ignorance is in every case not voluntary; but it is involuntary only when it brings pain and regret. For someone who has done something through ignorance, and feels no distress at the action, has not acted voluntarily, since he didn't know what he was doing, but not involuntarily either, since he feels no pain. Of those who act through ignorance, then, the one who regrets it seems to be an involuntary agent, while the one who doesn't regret it—since he is different—let us call a non-voluntary agent; for since he differs, it is better that he have a name of his own. Acting through ignorance also seems different from acting in ignorance. Someone who is drunk or angry does not seem to act through ignorance but because of one of the conditions just mentioned, though not knowingly but in ignorance.
ἀγνοεῖ μὲν οὖν πᾶς ὁ μοχθηρὸς ἃ δεῖ πράττειν καὶ ὧν ἀφεκτέον, καὶ διὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ἁμαρτίαν ἄδικοι καὶ ὅλως κακοὶ γίνονται· τὸ δ᾽ ἀκούσιον βούλεται λέγεσθαι οὐκ εἴ τις ἀγνοεῖ τὰ συμφέροντα· οὐ γὰρ ἡ ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει ἄγνοια αἰτία τοῦ ἀκουσίου ἀλλὰ τῆς μοχθηρίας, οὐδ᾽ ἡ καθόλου (ψέγονται γὰρ διά γε ταύτην) ἀλλ᾽ ἡ καθ᾽ ἕκαστα, ἐν οἷς καὶ περὶ ἃ ἡ πρᾶξις· [1111a] ἐν τούτοις γὰρ καὶ ἔλεος καὶ συγγνώμη· ὁ γὰρ τούτων τι ἀγνοῶν ἀκουσίως πράττει. ἴσως οὖν οὐ χεῖρον διορίσαι αὐτά, τίνα καὶ πόσα ἐστί, τίς τε δὴ καὶ τί καὶ περὶ τί ἢ ἐν τίνι πράττει, ἐνίοτε δὲ καὶ τίνι, οἷον ὀργάνῳ, καὶ ἕνεκα τίνος, οἷον σωτηρίας, καὶ πῶς, οἷον ἠρέμα ἢ σφόδρα.	Every wicked person is ignorant of what he should do and what he should refrain from, and it is through this sort of error that people become unjust and, in general, bad. But the term "involuntary" is not meant to apply when someone is ignorant of what is beneficial. For ignorance in decision is a cause not of involuntariness but of wickedness; nor is ignorance of the universal (people are blamed for that, at any rate), but ignorance of the particulars, the circumstances and objects of the action. [1111a] It is in these that pity and forgiveness come in, since someone ignorant of one of these acts involuntarily. Perhaps, then, it is not a bad idea to distinguish them—what they are and how many: who is acting, what he is doing, about what or in what he is acting, and sometimes also with what (with what instrument, for instance), for the sake of what (safety, for instance), and how (gently or violently, for instance).
1111a ἅπαντα μὲν οὖν ταῦτα οὐδεὶς ἂν ἀγνοήσειε μὴ μαινόμενος, δῆλον δ᾽ ὡς οὐδὲ τὸν πράττοντα· πῶς γὰρ ἑαυτόν γε; ὃ δὲ πράττει ἀγνοήσειεν ἄν τις, οἷον †λέγοντές φασιν ἐκπεσεῖν αὐτούς,† ἢ οὐκ εἰδέναι ὅτι ἀπόρρητα ἦν, ὥσπερ Αἰσχύλος τὰ μυστικά, ἢ δεῖξαι βουλόμενος ἀφεῖναι, ὡς ὁ τὸν καταπέλτην. οἰηθείη δ᾽ ἄν τις καὶ τὸν υἱὸν πολέμιον εἶναι ὥσπερ ἡ Μερόπη, καὶ ἐσφαιρῶσθαι τὸ λελογχωμένον δόρυ, ἢ τὸν λίθον κίσηριν εἶναι· καὶ ἐπὶ	No one who isn't mad could be ignorant of all of these, and obviously not of who is acting either—how could he be ignorant of himself? But someone might be ignorant of what he is doing, as when people say something "slipped out" while they were speaking, or that they didn't know it was secret, as Aeschylus said about the mysteries; or that they meant only to demonstrate it and it went

GREEK

σωτηρίᾳ πίσας ἀποκτείναι ἄν· καὶ θῖξαι βουλόμενος, ὥσπερ οἱ ἀκροχειριζόμενοι, πατάξειεν ἄν. περὶ πάντα δὴ ταῦτα τῆς ἀγνοίας οὔσης, ἐν οἷς ἡ πρᾶξις, ὁ τούτων τι ἀγνοήσας ἄκων δοκεῖ πεπραχέναι, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τοῖς κυριωτάτοις· κυριώτατα δ' εἶναι δοκεῖ ἐν οἷς ἡ πρᾶξις καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα.

τοῦ δὴ κατὰ τὴν τοιαύτην ἄγνοιαν ἀκουσίου λεγομένου ἔτι δεῖ τὴν πρᾶξιν λυπηρὰν εἶναι καὶ ἐν μεταμελείᾳ.

ὄντος δ' ἀκουσίου τοῦ βίᾳ καὶ δι' ἄγνοιαν, τὸ ἑκούσιον δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι οὗ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ εἰδότι τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα ἐν οἷς ἡ πρᾶξις. ἴσως γὰρ οὐ καλῶς λέγεται ἀκούσια εἶναι τὰ διὰ θυμὸν ἢ ἐπιθυμίαν. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ οὐδὲν ἔτι τῶν ἄλλων ζώων ἑκουσίως πράξει, οὐδ' οἱ παῖδες· εἶτα πότερον οὐδὲν ἑκουσίως πράττομεν τῶν δι' ἐπιθυμίαν καὶ θυμόν, ἢ τὰ καλὰ μὲν ἑκουσίως τὰ δ' αἰσχρὰ ἀκουσίως; ἢ γελοῖον ἑνός γε αἰτίου ὄντος; ἄτοπον δὲ ἴσως ἀκούσια φάναι ὧν δεῖ ὀρέγεσθαι· δεῖ δὲ καὶ ὀργίζεσθαι ἐπί τισι καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖν τινῶν, οἷον ὑγιείας καὶ μαθήσεως. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ μὲν ἀκούσια λυπηρὰ εἶναι, τὰ δὲ κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν ἡδέα. ἔτι δὲ τί διαφέρει τῷ ἀκούσια εἶναι τὰ κατὰ λογισμὸν ἢ θυμὸν ἁμαρτηθέντα;

φευκτὰ μὲν γὰρ ἄμφω, [1111b] δοκεῖ δὲ οὐχ ἧττον ἀνθρωπικὰ εἶναι τὰ ἄλογα πάθη, ὥστε καὶ αἱ πράξεις τοῦ ἀνθρώπου αἱ ἀπὸ θυμοῦ καὶ ἐπιθυμίας. ἄτοπον δὴ τὸ τιθέναι ἀκούσια ταῦτα.

ENGLISH

off, like the man with the catapult. Someone might also think his son was an enemy, as Merope did; or that a pointed spear had a guard on its tip, or that a stone was pumice; or he might kill someone with a drink given to save him; or, wanting just to touch someone, as sparrers do, he might strike him. Since ignorance can concern all these things, the circumstances of the action, someone who is ignorant of any of them seems to have acted involuntarily, especially if ignorant of the most important ones; and the most important seem to be the circumstances of the action and its purpose.[2]

But when something is called involuntary on the basis of this kind of ignorance, the action must, in addition, be painful and bring regret.

Since what is involuntary is what is done by force or through ignorance, the voluntary would seem to be that whose origin is in the agent himself, when he knows the particular circumstances of the action. For perhaps it is not right to say that things done from anger or appetite are involuntary. First, none of the other animals would then act voluntarily, and neither would children. Second, do we do nothing voluntarily that we do from appetite or anger? Or do we do the fine things voluntarily and the shameful ones involuntarily? Isn't that ridiculous, when the cause is one and the same? And it is presumably odd to call involuntary the things we ought to desire; and we ought to be angry at some things and to have an appetite for some things, such as health and learning. Also, involuntary things seem to be painful, while things done from appetite are pleasant. Further, what difference is there, as regards being involuntary, between errors committed through calculation and those committed through anger?

Both are to be avoided, [1111b] and non-rational feelings seem to be no less human, so that a person's actions that come from anger and appetite are human too. It is odd, then, to class these as involuntary.

2 Aeschylus was accused of revealing the secret rites of the Eleusinian Mysteries in his plays. In Euripides' lost *Cresphontes*, Merope nearly killed her own son, mistaking him for his murderer.

DECISION

Aristotle distinguishes decision from appetite, anger, wish and opinion.

GREEK	ENGLISH
1111b διωρισμένων δὲ τοῦ τε ἑκουσίου καὶ τοῦ ἀκουσίου, περὶ προαιρέσεως ἔπεται διελθεῖν· οἰκειότατον γὰρ εἶναι δοκεῖ τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ μᾶλλον τὰ ἤθη κρίνειν τῶν πράξεων. ἡ προαίρεσις δὴ ἑκούσιον μὲν φαίνεται, οὐ ταὐτὸν δέ, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πλέον τὸ ἑκούσιον· τοῦ μὲν γὰρ ἑκουσίου καὶ παῖδες καὶ τἆλλα ζῷα κοινωνεῖ, προαιρέσεως δ' οὔ, καὶ τὰ ἐξαίφνης ἑκούσια μὲν λέγομεν, κατὰ προαίρεσιν δ' οὔ. οἱ δὲ λέγοντες αὐτὴν ἐπιθυμίαν ἢ θυμὸν ἢ βούλησιν ἢ τινα δόξαν οὐκ ἐοίκασιν ὀρθῶς λέγειν. οὐ γὰρ κοινὸν ἡ προαίρεσις καὶ τῶν ἀλόγων, ἐπιθυμία δὲ καὶ θυμός. καὶ ὁ ἀκρατὴς ἐπιθυμῶν μὲν πράττει, προαιρούμενος δ' οὔ· ὁ ἐγκρατὴς δ' ἀνάπαλιν προαιρούμενος μέν, ἐπιθυμῶν δ' οὔ. καὶ προαιρέσει μὲν ἐπιθυμία ἐναντιοῦται, ἐπιθυμία δ' ἐπιθυμίᾳ οὔ.	Now that the voluntary and the involuntary have been distinguished, the next thing is to discuss decision. For it seems to be most closely bound up with excellence and to be a better way than actions of judging people's characters. Decision, then, appears to be something voluntary, but not the same thing; the voluntary is wider. Children and the other animals share in the voluntary, but not in decision; and things done on the spur of the moment we call voluntary, but not done by decision. Those who say it is appetite, or anger, or wish, or some kind of opinion do not seem to be right. For decision is not shared by non-rational creatures, but appetite and anger are. And the uncontrolled person acts from appetite, but not from decision, whereas the self-controlled person, on the contrary, acts from decision, but not from appetite. And appetite is opposed to decision, but appetite is not opposed to appetite.
καὶ ἡ μὲν ἐπιθυμία ἡδέος καὶ ἐπιλύπου, ἡ προαίρεσις δ' οὔτε λυπηροῦ οὔθ' ἡδέος. θυμὸς δ' ἔτι ἧττον· ἥκιστα γὰρ τὰ διὰ θυμὸν κατὰ προαίρεσιν εἶναι δοκεῖ. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ βούλησίς γε, καίπερ σύνεγγυς φαινόμενον· προαίρεσις μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι τῶν ἀδυνάτων, καὶ εἴ τις φαίη προαιρεῖσθαι, δοκοίη ἂν ἠλίθιος εἶναι· βούλησις δ' ἐστὶ καὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων, οἷον ἀθανασίας. καὶ ἡ μὲν βούλησίς ἐστι καὶ περὶ τὰ μηδαμῶς δι' αὐτοῦ πραχθέντα ἄν, οἷον ὑποκριτήν τινα νικᾶν ἢ ἀθλητήν· προαιρεῖται δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα οὐδείς, ἀλλ' ὅσα οἴεται γενέσθαι ἂν δι' αὑτοῦ.	Appetite is concerned with what is pleasant and painful, but decision is concerned with neither the painful nor the pleasant. Anger is even less like it; for things done from anger seem least of all to be done by decision. Nor, again, is it wish, though it appears closely akin. For there is no decision about impossible things, and if someone said he decided on them, he would seem a fool; but there is wish even for impossible things, such as immortality. And wish concerns also things that could never be brought about by oneself, such as a certain actor or athlete winning; no one decides on such things, only on things he thinks could come about through himself.
ἔτι δ' ἡ μὲν βούλησις τοῦ τέλους ἐστὶ μᾶλλον, ἡ δὲ προαίρεσις τῶν πρὸς τὸ τέλος, οἷον ὑγιαίνειν βουλόμεθα, προαιρούμεθα δὲ δι' ὧν ὑγιανοῦμεν, καὶ εὐδαιμονεῖν βουλόμεθα μὲν καὶ φαμέν, προαιρούμεθα δὲ λέγειν οὐχ ἁρμόζει· ὅλως γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ προαίρεσις περὶ τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν εἶναι. οὐδὲ δὴ δόξα ἂν εἴη· ἡ μὲν γὰρ δόξα δοκεῖ περὶ πάντα εἶναι, καὶ οὐδὲν ἧττον περὶ τὰ ἀίδια καὶ τὰ ἀδύνατα ἢ τὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν· καὶ τῷ ψευδεῖ καὶ ἀληθεῖ διαιρεῖται, οὐ τῷ κακῷ καὶ ἀγαθῷ, ἡ προαίρεσις δὲ τούτοις μᾶλλον. 1112a ὅλως μὲν οὖν δόξῃ ταὐτὸν ἴσως οὐδὲ λέγει οὐδείς. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τινί· τῷ γὰρ προαιρεῖσθαι τἀγαθὰ ἢ τὰ κακὰ ποιοί τινές ἐσμεν, τῷ δὲ δοξάζειν οὔ.	Again, wish is more for the end, decision for what contributes to the end. For example, we wish to be healthy, but we decide on the things through which we will become healthy; and we wish to be happy and say so, but it doesn't fit to say we decide to be happy. For in general decision seems to be about things that are up to us. Nor would it be opinion. For opinion seems to be about everything, no less about eternal and impossible things than about things up to us; and it is divided by falsity and truth, not by bad and good, whereas decision is divided more by these. 1112a Perhaps no

GREEK	ENGLISH
	one even says that it is the same as opinion in general. But it is not the same as some particular opinion either; for it is by deciding on good or bad things that we are people of a certain kind, not by holding opinions.
1112a καὶ προαιρούμεθα μὲν λαβεῖν ἢ φυγεῖν ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, δοξάζομεν δὲ τί ἐστιν ἢ τίνι συμφέρει ἢ πῶς· λαβεῖν δ' ἢ φυγεῖν οὐ πάνυ δοξάζομεν. καὶ ἡ μὲν προαίρεσις ἐπαινεῖται τῷ εἶναι οὗ δεῖ μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ ὀρθῶς, ἡ δὲ δόξα τῷ ὡς ἀληθῶς. καὶ προαιρούμεθα μὲν ἃ μάλιστα ἴσμεν ἀγαθὰ ὄντα, δοξάζομεν δὲ ἃ οὐ πάνυ ἴσμεν· δοκοῦσι δὲ οὐχ οἱ αὐτοὶ προαιρεῖσθαί τε ἄριστα καὶ δοξάζειν, ἀλλ' ἔνιοι δοξάζειν μὲν ἄμεινον, διὰ κακίαν δ' αἱρεῖσθαι οὐχ ἃ δεῖ. εἰ δὲ προγίνεται δόξα τῆς προαιρέσεως ἢ παρακολουθεῖ, οὐδὲν διαφέρει· οὐ τοῦτο γὰρ σκοποῦμεν, ἀλλ' εἰ ταὐτόν ἐστι δόξῃ τινί. τί οὖν ἢ ποῖόν τι ἐστίν, ἐπειδὴ τῶν εἰρημένων οὐθέν; ἑκούσιον μὲν δὴ φαίνεται, τὸ δ' ἑκούσιον οὐ πᾶν προαιρετόν.	And we decide to take or avoid something, or something of that sort, whereas we have opinions about what a thing is, or whom it benefits, or how; we hardly have an opinion to take or avoid something. And decision is praised for being of the right object rather than for being correct, while opinion is praised for being true. And we decide on things we know best to be good, but have opinions about things we don't really know. Nor does it seem that the same people make the best decisions and have the best opinions; some have better opinions but through vice choose what they shouldn't. Whether opinion precedes decision or accompanies it makes no difference; that is not what we are investigating, but whether decision is the same as some kind of opinion. What, then, is it, or what sort of thing, since it is none of those mentioned? It appears to be something voluntary, but not everything voluntary is decided on.
ἀλλ' ἆρά γε τὸ προβεβουλευμένον; ἡ γὰρ προαίρεσις μετὰ λόγου καὶ διανοίας. ὑποσημαίνειν δ' ἔοικε καὶ τοὔνομα ὡς ὂν πρὸ ἑτέρων αἱρετόν.	Is it, then, what has been deliberated on beforehand? For decision involves reason and thought. Even the name seems to hint at this, as meaning something chosen before other things.[3]

DELIBERATION AND WISH

Aristotle explains that we deliberate about means, not ends, and that we wish for the good.

GREEK	ENGLISH
βουλεύονται δὲ πότερον περὶ πάντων, καὶ πᾶν βουλευτόν ἐστιν, ἢ περὶ ἐνίων οὐκ ἔστι βουλή; λεκτέον δ' ἴσως βουλευτὸν οὐχ ὑπὲρ οὗ βουλεύσαιτ' ἄν τις ἠλίθιος ἢ μαινόμενος, ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ ὧν ὁ νοῦν ἔχων. περὶ δὴ τῶν ἀιδίων οὐδεὶς βουλεύεται, οἷον περὶ τοῦ κόσμου ἢ τῆς διαμέτρου καὶ τῆς πλευρᾶς, ὅτι ἀσύμμετροι. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἐν κινήσει, ἀεὶ δὲ κατὰ ταὐτὰ γινομένων, εἴτ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης εἴτε καὶ φύσει ἢ διά τινα αἰτίαν ἄλλην, οἷον τροπῶν καὶ ἀνατολῶν. οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἄλλοτε ἄλλως, οἷον αὐχμῶν καὶ ὄμβρων. οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τύχης, οἷον θησαυροῦ εὑρέσεως. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ἁπάντων, οἷον πῶς ἂν Σκύθαι ἄριστα πολιτεύοιντο οὐδεὶς Λακεδαιμονίων βουλεύεται. οὐ γὰρ γένοιτ' ἂν τούτων οὐθὲν δι' ἡμῶν.	Do people deliberate about everything—is everything a matter for deliberation—or are there some things about which there is no deliberation? We should presumably call a matter for deliberation not what a fool or a madman would deliberate about, but what a person with sense would. Now no one deliberates about eternal things, such as the universe, or the incommensurability of the diagonal and the side of a square. Nor about things in motion that always happen in the same way, whether of necessity or by nature or through some other cause, such as the solstices and the risings of the stars. Nor about things that happen now one way and now another, such as droughts

3 The Greek word for decision, *prohairesis,* literally means "choosing before" or "choosing in preference."

GREEK

ENGLISH

and rains. Nor about things that happen by chance, such as finding treasure. Nor even about all human affairs: no Spartan, for instance, deliberates about how the Scythians might best be governed. For none of these things could come about through us.

βουλευόμεθα δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν καὶ πρακτῶν· ταῦτα δὲ καὶ ἔστι λοιπά. αἰτίαι γὰρ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι φύσις καὶ ἀνάγκη καὶ τύχη, ἔτι δὲ νοῦς καὶ πᾶν τὸ δι' ἀνθρώπου. τῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἕκαστοι βουλεύονται περὶ τῶν δι' αὐτῶν πρακτῶν. 1112b καὶ περὶ μὲν τὰς ἀκριβεῖς καὶ αὐτάρκεις τῶν ἐπιστημῶν οὐκ ἔστι βουλή, οἷον περὶ γραμμάτων (οὐ γὰρ διστάζομεν πῶς γραπτέον)· ἀλλ' ὅσα γίνεται δι' ἡμῶν, μὴ ὡσαύτως δ' ἀεί, περὶ τούτων βουλευόμεθα, οἷον περὶ τῶν κατ' ἰατρικὴν καὶ χρηματιστικήν, καὶ περὶ κυβερνητικὴν μᾶλλον ἢ γυμναστικήν, ὅσῳ ἧττον διηκρίβωται, καὶ ἔτι περὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὁμοίως, μᾶλλον δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰς τέχνας ἢ τὰς ἐπιστήμας· μᾶλλον γὰρ περὶ ταύτας διστάζομεν.

We deliberate about things that are up to us and can be done—and these are in fact what is left. For the causes of things are thought to be nature, necessity and chance, and in addition intellect and everything that comes about through human agency. And each group of human beings deliberates about the things that can be done through their own efforts. 1112b About the exact and self-sufficient sciences there is no deliberation—about letters, for instance, since we are in no doubt how a word should be spelled. Rather, we deliberate about the things that come about through us but not always in the same way: for instance, about matters of medicine and of making money; and more about navigation than about athletic training, to the extent that it has been worked out less precisely; and likewise about the rest. And we deliberate more about crafts than about sciences, since we are more in doubt about them.

1112b τὸ βουλεύεσθαι δὲ ἐν τοῖς ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, ἀδήλοις δὲ πῶς ἀποβήσεται, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἀδιόριστον. συμβούλους δὲ παραλαμβάνομεν εἰς τὰ μεγάλα, ἀπιστοῦντες ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς ὡς οὐχ ἱκανοῖς διαγνῶναι. βουλευόμεθα δ' οὐ περὶ τῶν τελῶν ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν πρὸς τὰ τέλη. οὔτε γὰρ ἰατρὸς βουλεύεται εἰ ὑγιάσει, οὔτε ῥήτωρ εἰ πείσει, οὔτε πολιτικὸς εἰ εὐνομίαν ποιήσει, οὐδὲ τῶν λοιπῶν οὐδεὶς περὶ τοῦ τέλους· ἀλλὰ θέμενοι τὸ τέλος τὸ πῶς καὶ διὰ τίνων ἔσται σκοποῦσι· καὶ διὰ πλειόνων μὲν φαινομένου γίνεσθαι διὰ τίνος ῥᾷστα καὶ κάλλιστα ἐπισκοποῦσι, δι' ἑνὸς δ' ἐπιτελουμένου πῶς διὰ τούτου ἔσται κἀκεῖνο διὰ τίνος, ἕως ἂν ἔλθωσιν ἐπὶ τὸ πρῶτον αἴτιον, ὃ ἐν τῇ εὑρέσει ἔσχατόν ἐστιν.

Deliberation concerns what holds for the most part, where it is unclear how things will turn out, and where the answer is not determinate. And on important matters we call in others to deliberate with us, distrusting ourselves as not up to deciding on our own. We deliberate not about ends but about what leads to the ends. A doctor does not deliberate whether he will cure, nor an orator whether he will persuade, nor a statesman whether he will bring about good order, nor does anyone else deliberate about the end. Instead, they set down the end and consider how and by what means it will come about. If it appears that it can come about through several means, they consider by which it will come about most easily and best; if it is achieved by one means only, they consider how it will come about through this one, and through what that one will come about, until they arrive at the first cause, which is the last thing in the order of discovery.

ὁ γὰρ βουλευόμενος ἔοικε ζητεῖν καὶ ἀναλύειν τὸν εἰρημένον τρόπον ὥσπερ διάγραμμα (φαίνεται δ' ἡ μὲν ζήτησις οὐ πᾶσα εἶναι βούλευσις, οἷον αἱ μαθηματικαί, ἡ δὲ βούλευσις πᾶσα ζήτησις), καὶ τὸ ἔσχατον ἐν τῇ

For the person deliberating seems to search and analyze in the way described, as though analyzing a geometrical diagram. (Not all searching appears to be deliberation—mathematical inquiries, for in-

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀναλύσει πρῶτον εἶναι ἐν τῇ γενέσει. κἂν μὲν ἀδυνάτῳ ἐντύχωσιν, ἀφίστανται, οἷον εἰ χρημάτων δεῖ, ταῦτα δὲ μὴ οἷόν τε πορισθῆναι· ἐὰν δὲ δυνατὸν φαίνηται, ἐγχειροῦσι πράττειν. δυνατὰ δὲ ἃ δι' ἡμῶν γένοιτ' ἄν· τὰ γὰρ διὰ τῶν φίλων δι' ἡμῶν πως ἐστίν· ἡ γὰρ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμῖν. ζητεῖται δ' ὁτὲ μὲν τὰ ὄργανα ὁτὲ δ' ἡ χρεία αὐτῶν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ὁτὲ μὲν δι' οὗ ὁτὲ δὲ πῶς ἢ διὰ τίνος.

stance, are not—but all deliberation is searching.) And what comes last in the analysis seems to come first in the coming-to-be. If people run into something impossible, they give up—if money is needed, for instance, and it cannot be obtained; but if it appears possible, they set about doing it. By "possible" I mean what could come about through us; for what comes about through our friends in a sense comes about through us, since the starting point is in us. Sometimes what we are searching for is the tools, sometimes the use of them; and similarly in the other cases, sometimes it is the means, sometimes how or through whom.

ἔοικε δή, καθάπερ εἴρηται, ἄνθρωπος εἶναι ἀρχὴ τῶν πράξεων· ἡ δὲ βουλὴ περὶ τῶν αὐτῷ πρακτῶν, αἱ δὲ πράξεις ἄλλων ἕνεκα. οὐ γὰρ ἂν εἴη βουλευτὸν τὸ τέλος ἀλλὰ τὰ πρὸς τὰ τέλη· οὐδὲ δὴ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα, [1113a] οἷον εἰ ἄρτος τοῦτο ἢ πέπεπται ὡς δεῖ· αἰσθήσεως γὰρ ταῦτα. εἰ δὲ ἀεὶ βουλεύσεται, εἰς ἄπειρον ἥξει. βουλευτὸν δὲ καὶ προαιρετὸν τὸ αὐτό, πλὴν ἀφωρισμένον ἤδη τὸ προαιρετόν· τὸ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς βουλῆς κριθὲν προαιρετόν ἐστιν. παύεται γὰρ ἕκαστος ζητῶν πῶς πράξει, ὅταν εἰς αὐτὸν ἀναγάγῃ τὴν ἀρχήν, καὶ αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἡγούμενον· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ προαιρούμενον. δῆλον δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων πολιτειῶν, ἃς Ὅμηρος ἐμιμεῖτο· οἱ γὰρ βασιλεῖς ἃ προείλοντο ἀνήγγελλον τῷ δήμῳ.

It seems, then, as has been said, that a human being is a starting point of actions, and deliberation is about the things that can be done by oneself, while actions are for the sake of other things. So the end would not be an object of deliberation, but what leads to the ends. Nor are particulars objects of deliberation— [1113a] whether this is bread, for instance, or whether it has been baked as it should be—since these are matters for perception. And if one is always going to deliberate, one will go on to infinity. The object of deliberation and the object of decision are the same, except that the object of decision has already been determined: what has been judged as a result of deliberation is the object of decision. For each of us stops searching for how he will act once he has traced the starting point back to himself, and to the leading part of himself, since that is what decides. This is clear also from the ancient constitutions that Homer depicted: the kings announced to the people what they had decided.

1113a ὄντος δὲ τοῦ προαιρετοῦ βουλευτοῦ ὀρεκτοῦ τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, καὶ ἡ προαίρεσις ἂν εἴη βουλευτικὴ ὄρεξις τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν· ἐκ τοῦ βουλεύσασθαι γὰρ κρίναντες ὀρεγόμεθα κατὰ τὴν βούλευσιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν προαίρεσις τύπῳ εἰρήσθω, καὶ περὶ ποῖά ἐστι καὶ ὅτι τῶν πρὸς τὰ τέλη.

Since the object of decision is something up to us that we desire after deliberating, decision too would be a deliberative desire for things up to us. For once we have come to a judgment as a result of deliberating, we desire in accordance with our deliberation. Let this, then, serve as an outline account of decision: what sort of things it is about, and that it concerns what leads to the ends.

ἡ δὲ βούλησις ὅτι μὲν τοῦ τέλους ἐστὶν εἴρηται, δοκεῖ δὲ τοῖς μὲν τἀγαθοῦ εἶναι, τοῖς δὲ τοῦ φαινομένου ἀγαθοῦ. συμβαίνει δὲ τοῖς μὲν τὸ βουλητὸν τἀγαθὸν λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι βουλητὸν ὃ βούλεται ὁ μὴ ὀρθῶς αἱρούμενος (εἰ γὰρ ἔσται βουλητόν, καὶ ἀγαθόν· ἦν δ', εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχε, κακόν), τοῖς δ' αὖ τὸ φαινόμενον ἀγαθὸν βουλητὸν λέγουσι μὴ εἶναι φύσει βουλητόν, ἀλλ' ἑκάστῳ τὸ δοκοῦν·

That wish is for the end has already been said. But some think it is for the good, others for the apparent good. Those who say that what is wished for is the good are committed to saying that what someone who chooses incorrectly wishes for is not an object of wish at all—for if it were an object

GREEK

ἄλλο δ' ἄλλῳ φαίνεται, καὶ εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχε, τἀναντία. εἰ δὲ δὴ ταῦτα μὴ ἀρέσκει, ἆρα φατέον ἁπλῶς μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀλήθειαν βουλητὸν εἶναι τἀγαθόν, ἑκάστῳ δὲ τὸ φαινόμενον;

τῷ μὲν οὖν σπουδαίῳ τὸ κατ' ἀλήθειαν εἶναι, τῷ δὲ φαύλῳ τὸ τυχόν, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν σωμάτων τοῖς μὲν εὖ διακειμένοις ὑγιεινά ἐστι τὰ κατ' ἀλήθειαν τοιαῦτα ὄντα, τοῖς δ' ἐπινόσοις ἕτερα, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ πικρὰ καὶ γλυκέα καὶ θερμὰ καὶ βαρέα καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστα· ὁ σπουδαῖος γὰρ ἕκαστα κρίνει ὀρθῶς, καὶ ἐν ἑκάστοις τἀληθὲς αὐτῷ φαίνεται. καθ' ἑκάστην γὰρ ἕξιν ἴδιά ἐστι καλὰ καὶ ἡδέα, καὶ διαφέρει πλεῖστον ἴσως ὁ σπουδαῖος τῷ τἀληθὲς ἐν ἑκάστοις ὁρᾶν, ὥσπερ κανὼν καὶ μέτρον αὐτῶν ὤν. ἐν τοῖς πολλοῖς δὲ ἡ ἀπάτη διὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἔοικε γίνεσθαι· οὐ γὰρ οὖσα ἀγαθὸν φαίνεται. [1113b] αἱροῦνται οὖν τὸ ἡδὺ ὡς ἀγαθόν, τὴν δὲ λύπην ὡς κακὸν φεύγουσιν.

ENGLISH

of wish, it would also be good, whereas in fact, as it happened, it was bad. Those who say, on the other hand, that the apparent good is what is wished for are committed to saying that nothing is by nature an object of wish, but only what seems good to each person; and different things appear good to different people, perhaps even opposite things. If these consequences are unsatisfactory, should we say that, without qualification and in truth, what is wished for is the good, but for each person it is what appears good to him?

For the excellent person, then, it will be what is truly good; for the bad person, whatever it happens to be. It is just as with bodies: for those in good condition, what is healthy is what truly is so, while for those in poor health it is other things; and the same holds for what is bitter, sweet, hot, heavy, and so on. For the excellent person judges each case correctly, and in each case the truth appears to him. Each state of character has its own fine and pleasant things, and perhaps what most distinguishes the excellent person is that he sees the truth in each case, being as it were the standard and measure of them. In most people, deception seems to come about because of pleasure: it appears good when it is not. [1113b] So they choose the pleasant as good and avoid pain as bad.

EXCELLENCE AND VICE ARE UP TO US

Aristotle argues that excellence and vice are voluntary, since we are responsible for our states.

GREEK

1113b ὄντος δὴ βουλητοῦ μὲν τοῦ τέλους, βουλευτῶν δὲ καὶ προαιρετῶν τῶν πρὸς τὸ τέλος, αἱ περὶ ταῦτα πράξεις κατὰ προαίρεσιν ἂν εἶεν καὶ ἑκούσιοι. αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀρετῶν ἐνέργειαι περὶ ταῦτα. ἐφ' ἡμῖν δὴ καὶ ἡ ἀρετή, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ κακία. ἐν οἷς γὰρ ἐφ' ἡμῖν τὸ πράττειν, καὶ τὸ μὴ πράττειν, καὶ ἐν οἷς τὸ μή, καὶ τὸ ναί· ὥστ' εἰ τὸ πράττειν καλὸν ὂν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστί, καὶ τὸ μὴ πράττειν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἔσται αἰσχρὸν ὄν, καὶ εἰ τὸ μὴ πράττειν καλὸν ὂν ἐφ' ἡμῖν, καὶ τὸ πράττειν αἰσχρὸν ὂν ἐφ' ἡμῖν.

εἰ δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν τὰ καλὰ πράττειν καὶ τὰ αἰσχρά, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ πράττειν, τοῦτο δ' ἦν τὸ ἀγαθοῖς καὶ κακοῖς εἶναι, ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἄρα τὸ ἐπιεικέσι καὶ φαύλοις εἶναι. τὸ δὲ λέγειν ὡς οὐδεὶς ἑκὼν πονηρὸς οὐδ' ἄκων μακάριος ἔοικε

ENGLISH

Since, then, the end is something wished for, and the things that lead to the end are objects of deliberation and decision, the actions concerned with these will be in accordance with decision and voluntary. And the activities of the excellences are concerned with these. So excellence, too, is up to us, and likewise vice. For where it is up to us to act, it is also up to us not to act, and where it is up to us to say no, it is also up to us to say yes. So if acting, when it is fine, is up to us, not acting, when it is shameful, will also be up to us; and if not acting, when it is fine, is up to us, then acting, when it is shameful, is also up to us.

And if it is up to us to do fine and shameful things, and likewise not to do them, and this, as we saw, is what being good or bad consists in, then it is up to us to be decent or base. The saying that "no one is

GREEK

τὸ μὲν ψευδεῖ τὸ δ' ἀληθεῖ· μακάριος μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἄκων, ἡ δὲ μοχθηρία ἑκούσιον. ἢ τοῖς γε νῦν εἰρημένοις ἀμφισβητητέον, καὶ τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐ φατέον ἀρχὴν εἶναι οὐδὲ γεννητὴν τῶν πράξεων ὥσπερ καὶ τέκνων. εἰ δὲ ταῦτα φαίνεται καὶ μὴ ἔχομεν εἰς ἄλλας ἀρχὰς ἀναγαγεῖν παρὰ τὰς ἐν ἡμῖν, ὧν καὶ αἱ ἀρχαὶ ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ αὐτὰ ἐφ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἑκούσια.

τούτοις δ' ἔοικε μαρτυρεῖσθαι καὶ ἰδίᾳ ὑφ' ἑκάστων καὶ ὑπ' αὐτῶν τῶν νομοθετῶν· κολάζουσι γὰρ καὶ τιμωροῦνται τοὺς δρῶντας μοχθηρά, ὅσοι μὴ βίᾳ ἢ δι' ἄγνοιαν ἧς μὴ αὐτοὶ αἴτιοι, τοὺς δὲ τὰ καλὰ πράττοντας τιμῶσιν, ὡς τοὺς μὲν προτρέψοντες τοὺς δὲ κωλύσοντες. καίτοι ὅσα μήτ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐστὶ μήθ' ἑκούσια, οὐδεὶς προτρέπεται πράττειν, ὡς οὐδὲν πρὸ ἔργου ὂν τὸ πεισθῆναι μὴ θερμαίνεσθαι ἢ ἀλγεῖν ἢ πεινῆν ἢ ἄλλ' ὁτιοῦν τῶν τοιούτων· οὐθὲν γὰρ ἧττον πεισόμεθα αὐτά. καὶ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ τῷ ἀγνοεῖν κολάζουσιν, ἐὰν αἴτιος εἶναι δοκῇ τῆς ἀγνοίας, οἷον τοῖς μεθύουσι διπλᾶ τὰ ἐπιτίμια· ἡ γὰρ ἀρχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ· κύριος γὰρ τοῦ μὴ μεθυσθῆναι, τοῦτο δ' αἴτιον τῆς ἀγνοίας.

καὶ τοὺς ἀγνοοῦντάς τι τῶν ἐν τοῖς νόμοις, ἃ δεῖ ἐπίστασθαι καὶ μὴ χαλεπά ἐστι, [1114a] κολάζουσιν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις, ὅσα δι' ἀμέλειαν ἀγνοεῖν δοκοῦσιν, ὡς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὂν τὸ μὴ ἀγνοεῖν· τοῦ γὰρ ἐπιμεληθῆναι κύριοι. ἀλλ' ἴσως τοιοῦτός ἐστιν ὥστε μὴ ἐπιμεληθῆναι. ἀλλὰ τοῦ τοιούτους γενέσθαι αὐτοὶ αἴτιοι ζῶντες ἀνειμένως, καὶ τοῦ ἀδίκους ἢ ἀκολάστους εἶναι, οἳ μὲν κακουργοῦντες, οἳ δὲ ἐν πότοις καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις διάγοντες· αἱ γὰρ περὶ ἕκαστα ἐνέργειαι τοιούτους ποιοῦσιν. τοῦτο δὲ δῆλον ἐκ τῶν μελετώντων πρὸς ἡντινοῦν ἀγωνίαν ἢ πρᾶξιν· διατελοῦσι γὰρ ἐνεργοῦντες. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἀγνοεῖν ὅτι ἐκ τοῦ ἐνεργεῖν περὶ ἕκαστα αἱ ἕξεις γίνονται, κομιδῇ ἀναισθήτου. ἔτι δ' ἄλογον τὸν ἀδικοῦντα μὴ βούλεσθαι ἄδικον εἶναι ἢ τὸν ἀκολασταίνοντα ἀκόλαστον.

ENGLISH

willingly wicked or unwillingly blessed" seems to be partly false and partly true. For no one is blessed unwillingly, but wickedness is voluntary. Otherwise we must dispute what has just been said, and deny that a human being is a starting point and begetter of his actions as he is of his children. But if these things appear to be so, and we cannot trace our actions back to any starting points other than those in us, then the things whose starting points are in us are themselves up to us and voluntary.

This seems to be borne out both by individuals in private life and by lawgivers themselves. They punish and take penalties from those who do wicked things—unless they acted under force or through ignorance for which they were not themselves responsible—and they honor those who do fine things, intending to encourage the latter and deter the former. Yet no one encourages us to do things that are neither up to us nor voluntary, since there is no point in being persuaded not to get hot, or feel pain, or be hungry, or anything else of that sort; we will feel these things all the same. In fact they punish people for the ignorance itself, if the person seems responsible for it: penalties are doubled for those who are drunk, for instance, since the starting point is in the person himself, who had it in his power not to get drunk, and that was the cause of his ignorance.

They also punish those who are ignorant of something in the laws that they ought to know and that is not difficult, [1114a] and likewise in other cases where people seem to be ignorant through carelessness, on the ground that it was up to them not to be ignorant, since they had it in their power to take care. But perhaps someone is the sort of person not to take care. Yet people are themselves responsible for having become that sort, by living slackly; and for being unjust or self-indulgent, some by doing harm, others by spending their time drinking and the like. For activities of each kind make people of a corresponding kind. This is clear from those who train for any contest or action: they spend their time constantly engaged in the activity. Not to know that states come about from being active in particular ways is the mark of someone utterly obtuse. Moreover, it is unreasonable to suppose that someone who does unjust things does not wish to be unjust, or that someone

GREEK	ENGLISH
	who acts self-indulgently does not wish to be self-indulgent.
1114a εἰ δὲ μὴ ἀγνοῶν τις πράττει ἐξ ὧν ἔσται ἄδικος, ἑκὼν ἄδικος ἂν εἴη, οὐ μὴν ἐάν γε βούληται, ἄδικος ὢν παύσεται καὶ ἔσται δίκαιος. οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁ νοσῶν ὑγιής. καὶ εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχεν, ἑκὼν νοσεῖ, ἀκρατῶς βιοτεύων καὶ ἀπειθῶν τοῖς ἰατροῖς. τότε μὲν οὖν ἐξῆν αὐτῷ μὴ νοσεῖν, προεμένῳ δ' οὐκέτι, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἀφέντι λίθον ἔτ' αὐτὸν δυνατὸν ἀναλαβεῖν· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐπ' αὐτῷ τὸ βαλεῖν καὶ ῥῖψαι· ἡ γὰρ ἀρχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ. οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῷ ἀδίκῳ καὶ τῷ ἀκολάστῳ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν ἐξῆν τοιούτοις μὴ γενέσθαι, διὸ ἑκόντες εἰσίν· γενομένοις δ' οὐκέτι ἔστι μὴ εἶναι.	If someone, not in ignorance, does the things that will make him unjust, he will be unjust voluntarily. It does not follow, though, that if he wishes, he will stop being unjust and be just—any more than a sick person will become healthy that way. Yet he may well be sick voluntarily, by living without self-control and disobeying his doctors. At that point it was open to him not to be sick; but once he has let himself go, it no longer is—just as, once you have let go of a stone, you can no longer get it back. Still, throwing it was up to you, since the starting point was in you. In the same way, it was open to the unjust and the self-indulgent person at the outset not to become such people, which is why they are so voluntarily; but once they have become so, it is no longer possible for them not to be.
οὐ μόνον δ' αἱ τῆς ψυχῆς κακίαι ἑκούσιοί εἰσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνίοις καὶ αἱ τοῦ σώματος, οἷς καὶ ἐπιτιμῶμεν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ διὰ φύσιν αἰσχροῖς οὐδεὶς ἐπιτιμᾷ, τοῖς δὲ δι' ἀγυμνασίαν καὶ ἀμέλειαν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀσθένειαν καὶ πήρωσιν· οὐθεὶς γὰρ ἂν ὀνειδίσειε τυφλῷ φύσει ἢ ἐκ νόσου ἢ ἐκ πληγῆς, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἐλεήσαι· τῷ δ' ἐξ οἰνοφλυγίας ἢ ἄλλης ἀκολασίας πᾶς ἂν ἐπιτιμήσαι. τῶν δὴ περὶ τὸ σῶμα κακιῶν αἱ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἐπιτιμῶνται, αἱ δὲ μὴ ἐφ' ἡμῖν οὔ. εἰ δ' οὕτω, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων αἱ ἐπιτιμώμεναι τῶν κακιῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἂν εἶεν.	And not only are the vices of the soul voluntary; in some people those of the body are too, and we censure them for these. No one censures those who are ugly by nature, but we do censure those who are so through lack of exercise and neglect. The same goes for weakness and disability: no one would reproach someone blind by nature, or from disease or a blow—rather, they would pity him—but everyone would censure someone blind from heavy drinking or some other self-indulgence. So among the vices of the body, those that are up to us are censured, and those that are not up to us are not. If so, then in other cases too, the vices that are censured would be up to us.
εἰ δέ τις λέγοι ὅτι πάντες ἐφίενται τοῦ φαινομένου ἀγαθοῦ, τῆς δὲ φαντασίας οὐ κύριοι, 1114b ἀλλ' ὁποῖός ποθ' ἕκαστός ἐστι, τοιοῦτο καὶ τὸ τέλος φαίνεται αὐτῷ· εἰ μὲν οὖν ἕκαστος ἑαυτῷ τῆς ἕξεώς ἐστί πως αἴτιος, καὶ τῆς φαντασίας ἔσται πως αὐτὸς αἴτιος· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐθεὶς αὑτῷ αἴτιος τοῦ κακοποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ δι' ἄγνοιαν τοῦ τέλους ταῦτα πράττει, διὰ τούτων οἰόμενος αὐτῷ τὸ ἄριστον ἔσεσθαι, ἡ δὲ τοῦ τέλους ἔφεσις οὐκ αὐθαίρετος, ἀλλὰ φῦναι δεῖ ὥσπερ ὄψιν ἔχοντα, ᾗ κρινεῖ καλῶς καὶ τὸ κατ' ἀλήθειαν ἀγαθὸν αἱρήσεται, καὶ ἔστιν εὐφυὴς ᾧ τοῦτο καλῶς πέφυκεν· τὸ γὰρ μέγιστον καὶ κάλλιστον, καὶ ὃ παρ' ἑτέρου μὴ οἷόν τε λαβεῖν μηδὲ μαθεῖν, ἀλλ' οἷον ἔφυ τοιοῦτον ἕξει, καὶ τὸ εὖ καὶ τὸ καλῶς τοῦτο πεφυκέναι ἡ τελεία καὶ ἀληθινὴ ἂν εἴη εὐφυΐα.	Suppose someone says that everyone aims at the apparent good, but that we have no control over how things appear to us; 1114b rather, the end appears to each person in a way that corresponds to the sort of person he is. Then, if each person is in some way responsible for his own state, he will also be in some way responsible for how things appear to him. If not, no one is responsible for his own wrongdoing; instead he does these things through ignorance of the end, thinking that through them he will get what is best for himself. And on this view, one's aiming at the end is not self-chosen: one has to be born with something like sight, by which to judge well and choose what is truly good, and a person is well endowed by nature if he is well endowed in this respect. For it

	GREEK	ENGLISH
		is the greatest and finest thing, something one cannot get or learn from another, but will have just as one was born with it; and to be well and finely endowed with it by nature would be complete and true natural endowment.
1114b	εἰ δὴ ταῦτ' ἐστὶν ἀληθῆ, τί μᾶλλον ἡ ἀρετὴ τῆς κακίας ἔσται ἑκούσιον; ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὁμοίως, τῷ ἀγαθῷ καὶ τῷ κακῷ, τὸ τέλος φύσει ἢ ὁπωσδήποτε φαίνεται καὶ κεῖται, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ πρὸς τοῦτο ἀναφέροντες πράττουσιν ὁπωσδήποτε. εἴτε δὴ τὸ τέλος μὴ φύσει ἑκάστῳ φαίνεται οἱονδήποτε, ἀλλά τι καὶ παρ' αὐτόν ἐστιν, εἴτε τὸ μὲν τέλος φυσικόν, τῷ δὲ τὰ λοιπὰ πράττειν ἑκουσίως τὸν σπουδαῖον ἡ ἀρετὴ ἑκούσιόν ἐστιν, οὐθὲν ἧττον καὶ ἡ κακία ἑκούσιον ἂν εἴη· ὁμοίως γὰρ καὶ τῷ κακῷ ὑπάρχει τὸ δι' αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς πράξεσι καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐν τῷ τέλει.	If this is true, how will excellence be any more voluntary than vice? For to both alike, the good person and the bad, the end appears and is set by nature or in whatever way, and they act by referring everything else to it, in whatever way they act. So whether the end, whatever it is, does not appear to each person by nature but is also partly due to him, or the end is natural but excellence is voluntary because the excellent person does the rest voluntarily, in either case vice will be no less voluntary. For the bad person likewise has what is due to himself in his actions, even if not in the end.
	εἰ οὖν, ὥσπερ λέγεται, ἑκούσιοί εἰσιν αἱ ἀρεταί (καὶ γὰρ τῶν ἕξεων συναίτιοί πως αὐτοί ἐσμεν, καὶ τῷ ποιοί τινες εἶναι τὸ τέλος τοιόνδε τιθέμεθα), καὶ αἱ κακίαι ἑκούσιοι ἂν εἶεν· ὁμοίως γάρ.	If, then, as is said, the excellences are voluntary—for we are ourselves in some way jointly responsible for our states, and it is by being people of a certain kind that we set up an end of a certain kind—the vices too will be voluntary, since the same holds for them.
	κοινῇ μὲν οὖν περὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν εἴρηται ἡμῖν τό τε γένος τύπῳ, ὅτι μεσότητές εἰσιν καὶ ὅτι ἕξεις, ὑφ' ὧν τε γίνονται, ὅτι τούτων πρακτικαὶ καὶ καθ' αὐτάς, καὶ ὅτι ἐφ' ἡμῖν καὶ ἑκούσιοι, καὶ οὕτως ὡς ἂν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος προστάξῃ. οὐχ ὁμοίως δὲ αἱ πράξεις ἑκούσιοί εἰσι καὶ αἱ ἕξεις· τῶν μὲν γὰρ πράξεων ἀπ' ἀρχῆς μέχρι τοῦ τέλους κύριοί ἐσμεν, εἰδότες τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα, τῶν ἕξεων δὲ τῆς ἀρχῆς, 1115a καθ' ἕκαστα δὲ ἡ πρόσθεσις οὐ γνώριμος, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρρωστιῶν· ἀλλ' ὅτι ἐφ' ἡμῖν ἦν οὕτως ἢ μὴ οὕτω χρήσασθαι, διὰ τοῦτο ἑκούσιοι.	We have now discussed the excellences in general: we have given an outline of their genus—that they are means and that they are states—and said that they come about from certain actions and in themselves tend to produce those same actions; that they are up to us and voluntary; and that they act in whatever way correct reason prescribes. But actions and states are not voluntary in the same way. We are in control of our actions from the beginning to the end, since we know the particulars; but of our states we control only the beginning, 1115a and the gradual addition in each particular case is not noticeable, as with illnesses. Still, because it was up to us to use our capacities in this way or not, the states are voluntary.

COURAGE

Aristotle defines courage as facing death in battle for the sake of what is fine.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
1115a	ἀναλαβόντες δὲ περὶ ἑκάστης εἴπωμεν τίνες εἰσὶ καὶ περὶ ποῖα καὶ πῶς· ἅμα δ' ἔσται δῆλον καὶ πόσαι εἰσίν. καὶ πρῶτον περὶ ἀνδρείας.	Let us take up the excellences again one by one and say what they are, what sort of things they are concerned with, and how. At the same time it will become clear how many there are. First, courage.

GREEK

ὅτι μὲν οὖν μεσότης ἐστὶ περὶ φόβους καὶ θάρρη, ἤδη φανερὸν γεγένηται· φοβούμεθα δὲ δῆλον ὅτι τὰ φοβερά, ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶν ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν κακά· διὸ καὶ τὸν φόβον ὁρίζονται προσδοκίαν κακοῦ. φοβούμεθα μὲν οὖν πάντα τὰ κακά, οἷον ἀδοξίαν πενίαν νόσον ἀφιλίαν θάνατον, ἀλλ' οὐ περὶ πάντα δοκεῖ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος εἶναι· ἔνια γὰρ καὶ δεῖ φοβεῖσθαι καὶ καλόν, τὸ δὲ μὴ αἰσχρόν, οἷον ἀδοξίαν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ φοβούμενος ἐπιεικὴς καὶ αἰδήμων, ὁ δὲ μὴ φοβούμενος ἀναίσχυντος. λέγεται δ' ὑπό τινων ἀνδρεῖος κατὰ μεταφοράν· ἔχει γάρ τι ὅμοιον τῷ ἀνδρείῳ· ἄφοβος γάρ τις καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος. πενίαν δ' ἴσως οὐ δεῖ φοβεῖσθαι οὐδὲ νόσον, οὐδ' ὅλως ὅσα μὴ ἀπὸ κακίας μηδὲ δι' αὐτόν. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὁ περὶ ταῦτα ἄφοβος ἀνδρεῖος.

ENGLISH

That courage is a mean concerning fear and confidence has already become evident. Clearly, the things we fear are frightening things, and these are, broadly speaking, bad things; that is why people define fear as expectation of something bad. We fear all bad things—disgrace, poverty, disease, friendlessness, death—but the courageous person does not seem to be concerned with all of them. Some things one actually should fear, and it is fine to fear them and shameful not to—disgrace, for instance. Someone who fears it is decent and has a sense of shame; someone who does not is shameless. Some people call such a person courageous, by a metaphor, since he has something in common with the courageous person: the courageous person too is a sort of fearless person. Poverty, perhaps, one should not fear, nor disease, nor in general anything that does not come from vice or is not due to oneself. But someone who is fearless about these things is not courageous either.

λέγομεν δὲ καὶ τοῦτον καθ' ὁμοιότητα· ἔνιοι γὰρ ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς κινδύνοις δειλοὶ ὄντες ἐλευθέριοί εἰσι καὶ πρὸς χρημάτων ἀποβολὴν εὐθαρσῶς ἔχουσιν. οὐδὲ δὴ εἴ τις ὕβριν περὶ παῖδας καὶ γυναῖκα φοβεῖται ἢ φθόνον ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων, δειλός ἐστιν· οὐδ' εἰ θαρρεῖ μέλλων μαστιγοῦσθαι, ἀνδρεῖος. περὶ ποῖα οὖν τῶν φοβερῶν ὁ ἀνδρεῖος; ἢ περὶ τὰ μέγιστα; οὐθεὶς γὰρ ὑπομενετικώτερος τῶν δεινῶν. φοβερώτατον δ' ὁ θάνατος· πέρας γάρ, καὶ οὐδὲν ἔτι τῷ τεθνεῶτι δοκεῖ οὔτ' ἀγαθὸν οὔτε κακὸν εἶναι. δόξειε δ' ἂν οὐδὲ περὶ θάνατον τὸν ἐν παντὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος εἶναι, οἷον ἐν θαλάττῃ ἢ νόσοις. ἐν τίσιν οὖν; ἢ ἐν τοῖς καλλίστοις; τοιοῦτοι δὲ οἱ ἐν πολέμῳ· ἐν μεγίστῳ γὰρ καὶ καλλίστῳ κινδύνῳ.

We do call him that too, by a resemblance; for some people who are cowardly in the dangers of war are generous and face the loss of money with confidence. Nor is someone a coward if he fears outrage against his children or wife, or envy, or anything of that sort; nor courageous if he is confident when about to be flogged. With what sort of frightening things, then, is the courageous person concerned? Surely with the greatest? For no one endures terrible things better than he does. And death is the most frightening of all, since it is an end, and nothing further seems to be either good or bad for the dead. But the courageous person would not seem to be concerned even with death in every circumstance—at sea, for instance, or in illness. In what circumstances, then? Surely in the finest? And such are deaths in war, since they occur in the greatest and finest danger.

ὁμόλογοι δὲ τούτοις εἰσὶ καὶ αἱ τιμαὶ αἱ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς μονάρχοις. κυρίως δὴ λέγοιτ' ἂν ἀνδρεῖος ὁ περὶ τὸν καλὸν θάνατον ἀδεής, καὶ ὅσα θάνατον ἐπιφέρει ὑπόγυια ὄντα· τοιαῦτα δὲ μάλιστα τὰ κατὰ πόλεμον. οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν θαλάττῃ καὶ ἐν νόσοις ἀδεὴς ὁ ἀνδρεῖος, [1115b] οὐχ οὕτω δὲ ὡς οἱ θαλάττιοι· οἳ μὲν γὰρ ἀπεγνώκασι τὴν σωτηρίαν καὶ τὸν θάνατον τὸν τοιοῦτον δυσχεραίνουσιν, οἳ δὲ εὐέλπιδές εἰσι παρὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν. ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀνδρίζονται ἐν οἷς ἐστὶν ἀλκὴ ἢ καλὸν τὸ

The honors given in cities and at the courts of monarchs agree with this. In the strict sense, then, the courageous person would be the one who is fearless in the face of a fine death and of whatever situations bring death suddenly upon us; and such situations belong above all to war. Still, the courageous person is fearless at sea and in illness too, [1115b] though not in the way that sailors are. For the courageous have given up hope of safety and are

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀποθανεῖν· ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις δὲ φθοραῖς οὐδέτερον ὑπάρχει.

distressed at a death of that kind, whereas the sailors are hopeful because of their experience. Besides, people show courage in situations where there is room for prowess, or where dying is fine; and in deaths of these kinds neither is the case.

1115b τὸ δὲ φοβερὸν οὐ πᾶσι μὲν τὸ αὐτό, λέγομεν δέ τι καὶ ὑπὲρ ἄνθρωπον. τοῦτο μὲν οὖν παντὶ φοβερὸν τῷ γε νοῦν ἔχοντι· τὰ δὲ κατ' ἄνθρωπον διαφέρει μεγέθει καὶ τῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ θαρραλέα. ὁ δὲ ἀνδρεῖος ἀνέκπληκτος ὡς ἄνθρωπος. φοβήσεται μὲν οὖν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ὡς δεῖ δὲ καὶ ὡς ὁ λόγος ὑπομενεῖ τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα· τοῦτο γὰρ τέλος τῆς ἀρετῆς. ἔστι δὲ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον ταῦτα φοβεῖσθαι, καὶ ἔτι τὰ μὴ φοβερὰ ὡς τοιαῦτα φοβεῖσθαι. γίνεται δὲ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡ μὲν ὅτι ὃ οὐ δεῖ, ἡ δὲ ὅτι οὐχ ὡς δεῖ, ἡ δὲ ὅτι οὐχ ὅτε, ἤ τι τῶν τοιούτων· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τὰ θαρραλέα.

What is frightening is not the same for everyone, but we do say that some things are beyond what a human being can bear. These are frightening to everyone, at least to anyone with sense. The frightening things within human scale differ in size and in degree; and likewise the things that inspire confidence. The courageous person is undaunted, as far as a human being can be. So he will fear such things too, but he will endure them as he should and as reason directs, for the sake of the fine, since this is the end of excellence. One can fear these things more or less than one should, and also fear things that are not frightening as if they were. Errors arise when one fears what one should not, or in the way one should not, or when one should not, or something of the sort; and similarly with the things that inspire confidence.

ὁ μὲν οὖν ἃ δεῖ καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα ὑπομένων καὶ φοβούμενος, καὶ ὡς δεῖ καὶ ὅτε, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ θαρρῶν, ἀνδρεῖος· κατ' ἀξίαν γάρ, καὶ ὡς ἂν ὁ λόγος, πάσχει καὶ πράττει ὁ ἀνδρεῖος. τέλος δὲ πάσης ἐνεργείας ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἕξιν. †καὶ τῷ ἀνδρείῳ δὲ ἡ ἀνδρεία καλόν.† τοιοῦτον δὴ καὶ τὸ τέλος· ὁρίζεται γὰρ ἕκαστον τῷ τέλει. καλοῦ δὴ ἕνεκα ὁ ἀνδρεῖος ὑπομένει καὶ πράττει τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρείαν. τῶν δ' ὑπερβαλλόντων ὁ μὲν τῇ ἀφοβίᾳ ἀνώνυμος (εἴρηται δ' ἡμῖν ἐν τοῖς πρότερον ὅτι πολλὰ ἐστιν ἀνώνυμα), εἴη δ' ἂν τις μαινόμενος ἢ ἀνάλγητος, εἰ μηδὲν φοβοῖτο, μήτε σεισμὸν μήτε κύματα, καθάπερ φασὶ τοὺς Κελτούς· ὁ δὲ τῷ θαρρεῖν ὑπερβάλλων περὶ τὰ φοβερὰ θρασύς.

The one who endures and fears the right things, for the right reason, in the right way and at the right time, and is confident in the same way, is courageous; for the courageous person feels and acts as the situation merits and as reason directs. The end of every activity is what accords with the state. And to the courageous person courage is something fine. So the end too is of that kind, since each thing is defined by its end. It is for the sake of the fine, then, that the courageous person endures and does what courage requires. Of those who go to excess, the one who exceeds in fearlessness has no name (we said earlier that many states are nameless); but he would be a madman or insensible to pain if he feared nothing, neither earthquake nor waves, as they say of the Celts. The one who exceeds in confidence about frightening things is rash.

δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἀλαζὼν εἶναι ὁ θρασὺς καὶ προσποιητικὸς ἀνδρείας· ὡς γοῦν ἐκεῖνος περὶ τὰ φοβερὰ ἔχει, οὗτος βούλεται φαίνεσθαι· ἐν οἷς οὖν δύναται, μιμεῖται. διὸ καὶ εἰσὶν οἱ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν θρασύδειλοι· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ θρασυνόμενοι τὰ φοβερὰ οὐχ ὑπομένουσιν. ὁ δὲ τῷ φοβεῖσθαι ὑπερβάλλων δειλός· καὶ γὰρ ἃ μὴ δεῖ καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀκολουθεῖ αὐτῷ. 1116a ἐλλείπει δὲ καὶ τῷ θαρρεῖν· ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς λύπαις ὑπερβάλλων μᾶλλον καταφανής ἐστιν. δύσελπις δή τις ὁ δειλός· πάντα

The rash person also seems to be a boaster, one who pretends to courage. At any rate, he wants to appear to be disposed toward frightening things the way the courageous person actually is; so where he can, he imitates him. That is why most of them are rash cowards: they put on a bold front in these situations but do not endure what is frightening. The one who exceeds in fearing is a

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	γὰρ φοβεῖται. ὁ δ' ἀνδρεῖος ἐναντίως· τὸ γὰρ θαρρεῖν εὐέλπιδος.	coward, since he fears what he should not, and in the way he should not, and all the other failings of this kind attach to him. [1116a] He is also deficient in confidence, but he is more conspicuous for exceeding in pain. The coward, then, is a sort of despairing person, since he fears everything. The courageous person is the opposite, since confidence belongs to someone hopeful.
1116a	περὶ ταὐτὰ μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ὅ τε δειλὸς καὶ ὁ θρασὺς καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος, διαφόρως δ' ἔχουσι πρὸς αὐτά· οἳ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερβάλλουσι καὶ ἐλλείπουσιν, ὃ δὲ μέσως ἔχει καὶ ὡς δεῖ· καὶ οἱ μὲν θρασεῖς προπετεῖς, καὶ βουλόμενοι πρὸ τῶν κινδύνων ἐν αὐτοῖς δ' ἀφίστανται, οἱ δ' ἀνδρεῖοι ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις ὀξεῖς, πρότερον δ' ἡσύχιοι.	The coward, the rash person and the courageous person, then, are concerned with the same things, but they are differently disposed toward them. The first two exceed and fall short, while the third holds the middle position, as he should. Rash people are headlong: they are eager before the dangers arrive but pull back once in them, whereas the courageous are keen in action but calm beforehand.
	καθάπερ οὖν εἴρηται, ἡ ἀνδρεία μεσότης ἐστὶ περὶ θαρραλέα καὶ φοβερά, ἐν οἷς εἴρηται, καὶ ὅτι καλὸν αἱρεῖται καὶ ὑπομένει, ἢ ὅτι αἰσχρὸν τὸ μή. τὸ δ' ἀποθνήσκειν φεύγοντα πενίαν ἢ ἔρωτα ἤ τι λυπηρὸν οὐκ ἀνδρείου, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δειλοῦ· μαλακία γὰρ τὸ φεύγειν τὰ ἐπίπονα, καὶ οὐχ ὅτι καλὸν ὑπομένει, ἀλλὰ φεύγων κακόν.	As has been said, then, courage is a mean concerning things that inspire confidence and things that are frightening, in the circumstances described; and it chooses and endures things because that is fine, or because not doing so is shameful. But dying to escape poverty, or love, or something painful is not the mark of a courageous person but rather of a coward. For it is softness to flee from what is burdensome, and such a person endures death not because it is fine but to escape something bad.

THINGS THAT RESEMBLE COURAGE

Aristotle describes five states that resemble courage, such as civic courage and hopeful confidence.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἔστι μὲν οὖν ἡ ἀνδρεία τοιοῦτόν τι, λέγονται δὲ καὶ ἕτεραι κατὰ πέντε τρόπους· πρῶτον μὲν ἡ πολιτική· μάλιστα γὰρ ἔοικεν. δοκοῦσι γὰρ ὑπομένειν τοὺς κινδύνους οἱ πολῖται διὰ τὰ ἐκ τῶν νόμων ἐπιτίμια καὶ τὰ ὀνείδη καὶ διὰ τὰς τιμάς· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀνδρειότατοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι παρ' οἷς οἱ δειλοὶ ἄτιμοι καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖοι ἔντιμοι. τοιούτους δὲ καὶ Ὅμηρος ποιεῖ, οἷον τὸν Διομήδην καὶ τὸν Ἕκτορα· Πουλυδάμας μοι πρῶτος ἐλεγχείην ἀναθήσει· καὶ Διομήδης Ἕκτωρ γάρ ποτε φήσει ἐνὶ Τρώεσσ' ἀγορεύων Τυδείδης ὑπ' ἐμεῖο. ὡμοίωται δ' αὕτη μάλιστα τῇ πρότερον εἰρημένῃ, ὅτι δι' ἀρετὴν γίνεται· δι' αἰδῶ γὰρ καὶ διὰ καλοῦ ὄρεξιν (τιμῆς γάρ) καὶ φυγὴν ὀνείδους, αἰσχροῦ ὄντος.	Courage, then, is something of this sort. But other kinds are also spoken of, in five ways. First, civic courage, since it most resembles the real thing. Citizens seem to endure dangers because of the penalties and reproaches imposed by the laws, and because of the honors. That is why the most courageous people seem to be found where cowards are dishonored and the courageous are honored. Homer, too, portrays people of this kind, such as Diomedes and Hector: "Polydamas will be the first to heap reproach on me"; and Diomedes: "For Hector will one day say, speaking among the Trojans, 'The son of Tydeus, fleeing from me…'" This kind is most like the one described earlier, because it comes about through excellence:

GREEK	ENGLISH
	through a sense of shame, and desire for something fine (namely honor), and avoidance of reproach, which is shameful.[4]
τάξαι δ' ἄν τις καὶ τοὺς ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἀναγκαζομένους εἰς ταὐτό· χείρους δ', ὅσῳ οὐ δι' αἰδῶ ἀλλὰ διὰ φόβον αὐτὸ δρῶσι, καὶ φεύγοντες οὐ τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ λυπηρόν· ἀναγκάζουσι γὰρ οἱ κύριοι, ὥσπερ ὁ Ἕκτωρ ὃν δέ κ' ἐγὼν ἀπάνευθε μάχης πτώσσοντα νοήσω, οὔ οἱ ἄρκιον ἐσσεῖται φυγέειν κύνας. καὶ οἱ προστάττοντες, κἂν ἀναχωρῶσι τύπτοντες, τὸ αὐτὸ δρῶσι, [1116b] καὶ οἱ πρὸ τῶν τάφρων καὶ τῶν τοιούτων παρατάττοντες· πάντες γὰρ ἀναγκάζουσιν. δεῖ δ' οὐ δι' ἀνάγκην ἀνδρεῖον εἶναι, ἀλλ' ὅτι καλόν. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ἡ ἐμπειρία ἡ περὶ ἕκαστα ἀνδρεία εἶναι· ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Σωκράτης ᾠήθη ἐπιστήμην εἶναι τὴν ἀνδρείαν.	One might also put in the same class those who are compelled by their commanders. But they are worse, inasmuch as they act not from a sense of shame but from fear, avoiding not what is shameful but what is painful. For their masters compel them, as Hector does: "Whomever I see cowering apart from the battle, he will not escape the dogs." Those who post soldiers in the line and beat them if they retreat do the same, [1116b] as do those who draw them up with trenches and the like behind them: they are all using compulsion. But one should be courageous not because of compulsion but because it is fine. Experience of particular situations is also thought to be courage; that is why Socrates thought that courage was knowledge.[5]
[1116b] τοιοῦτοι δὲ ἄλλοι μὲν ἐν ἄλλοις, ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς δ' οἱ στρατιῶται· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναι πολλὰ κενὰ τοῦ πολέμου, ἃ μάλιστα συνεωράκασιν οὗτοι· φαίνονται δὴ ἀνδρεῖοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἴσασιν οἱ ἄλλοι οἷά ἐστιν. εἶτα ποιῆσαι καὶ μὴ παθεῖν μάλιστα δύνανται ἐκ τῆς ἐμπειρίας, δυνάμενοι χρῆσθαι τοῖς ὅπλοις καὶ τοιαῦτα ἔχοντες ὁποῖα ἂν εἴη καὶ πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι καὶ πρὸς τὸ μὴ παθεῖν κράτιστα· ὥσπερ οὖν ἀνόπλοις ὡπλισμένοι μάχονται καὶ ἀθληταὶ ἰδιώταις· καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις ἀγῶσιν οὐχ οἱ ἀνδρειότατοι μαχιμώτατοί εἰσιν, ἀλλ' οἱ μάλιστα ἰσχύοντες καὶ τὰ σώματα ἄριστα ἔχοντες. οἱ στρατιῶται δὲ δειλοὶ γίνονται, ὅταν ὑπερτείνῃ ὁ κίνδυνος καὶ λείπωνται τοῖς πλήθεσι καὶ ταῖς παρασκευαῖς· πρῶτοι γὰρ φεύγουσι, τὰ δὲ πολιτικὰ μένοντα ἀποθνήσκει, ὅπερ κἀπὶ τῷ Ἑρμαίῳ συνέβη.	Different people have this kind of experience in different situations, and in matters of war it is professional soldiers who have it. For war seems to be full of false alarms, which these men have seen through better than anyone; so they appear courageous because the others do not know what these things are. Then too, their experience makes them best able to inflict harm without suffering it, since they can use their weapons and have the sort of equipment that is best for both attack and defense. So they fight like armed men against unarmed, or trained athletes against amateurs; for in contests of this sort too, it is not the most courageous who are the best fighters, but those who are strongest and in the best physical condition. But professional soldiers turn coward when the danger becomes too great and they are outmatched in numbers and equipment. They are the first to run, while the citizen troops stand their ground and die—which is just what happened at the Hermaeum.[6]
τοῖς μὲν γὰρ αἰσχρὸν τὸ φεύγειν καὶ ὁ θάνατος τῆς τοιαύτης σωτηρίας αἱρετώτερος· οἳ δὲ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκινδύνευον ὡς κρείττους ὄντες, γνόντες δὲ φεύγουσι, τὸν θάνατον μᾶλλον τοῦ αἰσχροῦ φοβούμενοι· ὁ δ' ἀνδρεῖος οὐ τοιοῦτος. καὶ τὸν θυμὸν δ' ἐπὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν φέρουσιν· ἀνδρεῖοι γὰρ εἶναι δοκοῦσι καὶ οἱ διὰ θυμὸν	For to the citizens, flight is shameful, and death is more choiceworthy than safety bought that way; whereas the professionals ran the risk from the start on the assumption that they were stronger, and once they realize otherwise they run, fearing

4 The quotations are from Homer's *Iliad*: Hector at 22.100 and Diomedes at 8.148–149.
5 In our text of the *Iliad* (2.391–393) these threatening words are spoken by Agamemnon, not Hector.
6 The Hermaeum was a temple of Hermes at Coronea in Boeotia, where, in a battle of the mid-fourth century BC, citizen troops held their ground and died after their mercenaries fled.

GREEK

ὥσπερ τὰ θηρία ἐπὶ τοὺς τρώσαντας φερόμενα, ὅτι καὶ οἱ ἀνδρεῖοι θυμοειδεῖς· ἰτητικώτατον γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους, ὅθεν καὶ Ὅμηρος σθένος ἔμβαλε θυμῷ καὶ μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἔγειρε καὶ δριμὺ δ' ἀνὰ ῥῖνας μένος καὶ ἔζεσεν αἷμα· πάντα γὰρ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔοικε σημαίνειν τὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ ἔγερσιν καὶ ὁρμήν.

οἱ μὲν οὖν ἀνδρεῖοι διὰ τὸ καλὸν πράττουσιν, ὁ δὲ θυμὸς συνεργεῖ αὐτοῖς· τὰ θηρία δὲ διὰ λύπην· διὰ γὰρ τὸ πληγῆναι ἢ διὰ τὸ φοβεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ ἐάν γε ἐν ὕλῃ ἢ ἐν ἕλει ᾖ, οὐ προσέρχονται. οὐ δή ἐστιν ἀνδρεῖα διὰ τὸ ὑπ' ἀλγηδόνος καὶ θυμοῦ ἐξελαυνόμενα πρὸς τὸν κίνδυνον ὁρμᾶν, οὐθὲν τῶν δεινῶν προορῶντα, ἐπεὶ οὕτω γε κἂν οἱ ὄνοι ἀνδρεῖοι εἶεν πεινῶντες· τυπτόμενοι γὰρ οὐκ ἀφίστανται τῆς νομῆς· 1117a καὶ οἱ μοιχοὶ δὲ διὰ τὴν ἐπιθυμίαν τολμηρὰ πολλὰ δρῶσιν. οὐ δή ἐστιν ἀνδρεῖα τὰ δι' ἀλγηδόνος ἢ θυμοῦ ἐξελαυνόμενα πρὸς τὸν κίνδυνον. φυσικωτάτη δ' ἔοικεν ἡ διὰ τὸν θυμὸν εἶναι, καὶ προσλαβοῦσα προαίρεσιν καὶ τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα ἀνδρεία εἶναι.

1117a καὶ οἱ ἄνθρωποι δὴ ὀργιζόμενοι μὲν ἀλγοῦσι, τιμωρούμενοι δ' ἥδονται· οἱ δὲ διὰ ταῦτα μαχόμενοι μάχιμοι μέν, οὐκ ἀνδρεῖοι δέ· οὐ γὰρ διὰ τὸ καλὸν οὐδ' ὡς ὁ λόγος, ἀλλὰ διὰ πάθος· παραπλήσιον δ' ἔχουσί τι. οὐδὲ δὴ οἱ εὐέλπιδες ὄντες ἀνδρεῖοι· διὰ γὰρ τὸ πολλάκις καὶ πολλοὺς νενικηκέναι θαρροῦσιν ἐν τοῖς κινδύνοις· παρόμοιοι δέ, ὅτι ἄμφω θαρραλέοι· ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν ἀνδρεῖοι διὰ τὰ πρότερον εἰρημένα θαρραλέοι, οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ οἴεσθαι κράτιστοι εἶναι καὶ μηθὲν ἂν παθεῖν. τοιοῦτον δὲ ποιοῦσι καὶ οἱ μεθυσκόμενοι· εὐέλπιδες γὰρ γίνονται. ὅταν δὲ αὐτοῖς μὴ συμβῇ τὰ τοιαῦτα, φεύγουσιν· ἀνδρείου δ' ἦν τὰ φοβερὰ ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντα καὶ φαινόμενα ὑπομένειν, ὅτι καλὸν καὶ αἰσχρὸν τὸ μή.

διὸ καὶ ἀνδρειοτέρου δοκεῖ εἶναι τὸ ἐν τοῖς αἰφνιδίοις φόβοις ἄφοβον καὶ ἀτάραχον εἶναι ἢ ἐν τοῖς προδήλοις·

ENGLISH

death more than disgrace. The courageous person is not like that. People also count spirit as courage. Those who act from spirit, like wild animals rushing at those who have wounded them, also seem courageous, because the courageous are spirited too; for spirit is the thing most eager to rush into danger. Hence Homer's "he put strength into his spirit," "he roused his might and spirit," "bitter might rose up in his nostrils," and "his blood boiled." All expressions of this kind seem to signify the arousal and surge of spirit.

The courageous, then, act because of the fine, and spirit works alongside them; but wild animals act because of pain—because they have been struck, or because they are afraid; for if they are in a forest or a marsh, they do not come at you. It is not courage, then, to rush into danger driven by pain and spirit, foreseeing none of the dangers; for in that case even donkeys would be courageous when hungry, since they do not leave off grazing even when beaten. 1117a Adulterers, too, do many daring things because of their appetite. So things driven into danger by pain or spirit are not courageous. Still, the courage that comes from spirit seems to be the most natural kind, and to be courage once decision and the proper aim are added to it.

Human beings, too, feel pain when they are angry and pleasure when they take revenge. Those who fight for these reasons are good fighters, but not courageous, since they fight not because of the fine, nor as reason directs, but because of feeling; though they have something close to courage. Nor are the hopeful courageous. Because they have often won, and against many opponents, they are confident in dangers. They resemble the courageous, since both are confident; but the courageous are confident for the reasons given earlier, whereas the hopeful are confident because they think they are the strongest and would suffer nothing. People who get drunk behave this way too, since they become hopeful. But when things do not turn out that way for them, they run; whereas, as we saw, it is the mark of the courageous person to endure things that are and appear frightening to a human being, because doing so is fine and not doing so is shameful.

That is why it seems a mark of greater courage to be fearless and undisturbed in sudden alarms

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀπὸ ἕξεως γὰρ μᾶλλον ἦν, ὅτι ἧττον ἐκ παρασκευῆς· τὰ προφανῆ μὲν γὰρ κἂν ἐκ λογισμοῦ καὶ λόγου τις προέλοιτο, τὰ δ' ἐξαίφνης κατὰ τὴν ἕξιν. ἀνδρεῖοι δὲ φαίνονται καὶ οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες, καὶ εἰσὶν οὐ πόρρω τῶν εὐελπίδων, χείρους δ' ὅσῳ ἀξίωμα οὐδὲν ἔχουσιν, ἐκεῖνοι δέ. διὸ καὶ μένουσί τινα χρόνον· οἱ δ' ἠπατημένοι, ἐὰν γνῶσιν ὅτι ἕτερον ἢ ὑποπτεύσωσι, φεύγουσιν· ὅπερ οἱ Ἀργεῖοι ἔπαθον περιπεσόντες τοῖς Λάκωσιν ὡς Σικυωνίοις. οἵ τε δὴ ἀνδρεῖοι εἴρηνται ποῖοί τινες, καὶ οἱ δοκοῦντες ἀνδρεῖοι.	than in those that are foreseen; for this comes more from one's state, because it comes less from preparation. What is foreseen one might choose on the basis of calculation and reasoning, but what is sudden one chooses in accordance with one's state. Those who act in ignorance also appear courageous, and they are not far from the hopeful; but they are worse, inasmuch as they have no self-esteem, whereas the hopeful do. That is why the hopeful hold out for some time, whereas those who have been deceived run away if they learn, or suspect, that things are otherwise—which is what happened to the Argives when they fell in with the Spartans, thinking they were Sicyonians. We have now said what the courageous are like, and what those who seem courageous are like.[7]
περὶ θάρρη δὲ καὶ φόβους ἡ ἀνδρεία οὖσα οὐχ ὁμοίως περὶ ἄμφω ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον περὶ τὰ φοβερά· ὁ γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἀτάραχος καὶ περὶ ταῦθ' ὡς δεῖ ἔχων ἀνδρεῖος μᾶλλον ἢ ὁ περὶ τὰ θαρραλέα. τῷ δὴ τὰ λυπηρὰ ὑπομένειν, ὡς εἴρηται, ἀνδρεῖοι λέγονται. διὸ καὶ ἐπίλυπον ἡ ἀνδρεία, καὶ δικαίως ἐπαινεῖται· χαλεπώτερον γὰρ τὰ λυπηρὰ ὑπομένειν ἢ τῶν ἡδέων ἀπέχεσθαι.	Although courage is concerned with confidence and fear, it is not concerned with both equally, but more with frightening things. For someone who is undisturbed in these and is disposed toward them as he should be is more truly courageous than someone who is so in situations that inspire confidence. It is, then, by enduring painful things, as has been said, that people are called courageous. That is why courage is painful, and it is justly praised, since it is harder to endure painful things than to abstain from pleasant ones.
1117b οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀνδρείαν τέλος ἡδύ, ὑπὸ τῶν κύκλῳ δ' ἀφανίζεσθαι, οἷον κἀν τοῖς γυμνικοῖς ἀγῶσι γίνεται· τοῖς γὰρ πύκταις τὸ μὲν τέλος ἡδύ, οὗ ἕνεκα, ὁ στέφανος καὶ αἱ τιμαί, τὸ δὲ τύπτεσθαι ἀλγεινόν, εἴπερ σάρκινοι, καὶ λυπηρόν, καὶ πᾶς ὁ πόνος· διὰ δὲ τὸ πολλὰ ταῦτ' εἶναι, μικρὸν ὂν τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα οὐδὲν ἡδὺ φαίνεται ἔχειν. εἰ δὴ τοιοῦτόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀνδρείαν, ὁ μὲν θάνατος καὶ τὰ τραύματα λυπηρὰ τῷ ἀνδρείῳ καὶ ἄκοντι ἔσται, ὑπομενεῖ δὲ αὐτὰ ὅτι καλὸν ἢ ὅτι αἰσχρὸν τὸ μή.	Still, the end that courage aims at would seem to be pleasant, though obscured by the circumstances surrounding it, as happens in athletic contests too. For boxers, the end for the sake of which they fight—the wreath and the honors—is pleasant, but being hit is agonizing, since they are flesh and blood, and painful, as is all the toil. And because these things are many, and the end for the sake of which they fight is small, it appears to have nothing pleasant in it. If courage too is like this, death and wounds will be painful to the courageous person, and he will suffer them unwillingly; but he will endure them because it is fine to do so, or because not doing so is shameful.
καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν μᾶλλον τὴν ἀρετὴν ἔχῃ πᾶσαν καὶ εὐδαιμονέστερος ᾖ, μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τῷ θανάτῳ λυπήσεται· τῷ τοιούτῳ γὰρ μάλιστα ζῆν ἄξιον, καὶ οὗτος μεγίστων ἀγαθῶν ἀποστερεῖται εἰδώς, λυπηρὸν δὲ τοῦτο. ἀλλ'	And the more fully he has excellence in its entirety, and the happier he is, the more pain he will feel at death. For to such a person life is most worth living, and he is knowingly being deprived

7 An episode at Corinth in 392 BC, when the Argives mistook Spartan troops carrying captured Sicyonian shields for Sicyonians and were routed.

GREEK

οὐδὲν ἧττον ἀνδρεῖος, ἴσως δὲ καὶ μᾶλλον, ὅτι τὸ ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ καλὸν ἀντ' ἐκείνων αἱρεῖται. οὐ δὴ ἐν ἁπάσαις ταῖς ἀρεταῖς τὸ ἡδέως ἐνεργεῖν ὑπάρχει, πλὴν ἐφ' ὅσον τοῦ τέλους ἐφάπτεται. στρατιώτας δ' οὐδὲν ἴσως κωλύει μὴ τοὺς τοιούτους κρατίστους εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἧττον μὲν ἀνδρείους, ἄλλο δ' ἀγαθὸν μηδὲν ἔχοντας· ἕτοιμοι γὰρ οὗτοι πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους, καὶ τὸν βίον πρὸς μικρὰ κέρδη καταλλάττονται. περὶ μὲν οὖν ἀνδρείας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω· τί δ' ἐστίν, οὐ χαλεπὸν τύπῳ γε περιλαβεῖν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων.

ENGLISH

of the greatest goods; and this is painful. But he is no less courageous for that—perhaps even more so, because he chooses what is fine in war in preference to those goods. So it is not true of all the excellences that exercising them is pleasant, except insofar as one attains the end. Perhaps, though, nothing prevents the best professional soldiers from being not people of this kind but those who are less courageous and have no other good; for these are ready to face dangers, and they trade their lives for small gains. So much, then, for courage; from what has been said it is not hard to grasp what it is, at least in outline.

MODERATION

Aristotle limits moderation to bodily pleasures of touch and taste and contrasts it with self-indulgence.

GREEK

μετὰ δὲ ταύτην περὶ σωφροσύνης λέγωμεν· δοκοῦσι γὰρ τῶν ἀλόγων μερῶν αὗται εἶναι αἱ ἀρεταί. ὅτι μὲν οὖν μεσότης ἐστὶ περὶ ἡδονὰς ἡ σωφροσύνη, εἴρηται ἡμῖν· ἧττον γὰρ καὶ οὐχ ὁμοίως ἐστὶ περὶ τὰς λύπας· ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀκολασία φαίνεται. περὶ ποίας οὖν τῶν ἡδονῶν, νῦν ἀφορίσωμεν. διῃρήσθωσαν δὴ αἱ ψυχικαὶ καὶ αἱ σωματικαί, οἷον φιλοτιμία φιλομάθεια· ἑκάτερος γὰρ τούτων χαίρει, οὗ φιλητικός ἐστιν, οὐδὲν πάσχοντος τοῦ σώματος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τῆς διανοίας· οἱ δὲ περὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἡδονὰς οὔτε σώφρονες οὔτε ἀκόλαστοι λέγονται. ὁμοίως δ' οὐδ' οἱ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ὅσαι μὴ σωματικαί εἰσιν· τοὺς γὰρ φιλομύθους καὶ διηγητικοὺς καὶ περὶ τῶν τυχόντων κατατρίβοντας τὰς ἡμέρας ἀδολέσχας, ἀκολάστους δ' οὐ λέγομεν, [1118a] οὐδὲ τοὺς λυπουμένους ἐπὶ χρήμασιν ἢ φίλοις.

1118a περὶ δὲ τὰς σωματικὰς εἴη ἂν ἡ σωφροσύνη, οὐ πάσας δὲ οὐδὲ ταύτας· οἱ γὰρ χαίροντες τοῖς διὰ τῆς ὄψεως, οἷον χρώμασι καὶ σχήμασι καὶ γραφῇ, οὔτε σώφρονες οὔτε ἀκόλαστοι λέγονται· καίτοι δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι καὶ ὡς δεῖ χαίρειν καὶ τούτοις, καὶ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν καὶ ἔλλειψιν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς περὶ τὴν ἀκοήν· τοὺς γὰρ ὑπερβεβλημένως χαίροντας μέλεσιν ἢ ὑποκρίσει οὐθεὶς ἀκολάστους λέγει, οὐδὲ τοὺς ὡς δεῖ σώφρονας. οὐδὲ τοὺς περὶ τὴν ὀσμήν, πλὴν κατὰ συμβεβηκός· τοὺς γὰρ χαίροντας μήλων ἢ ῥόδων ἢ θυμιαμάτων ὀσμαῖς οὐ

ENGLISH

After courage, let us discuss moderation, since these seem to be the excellences of the non-rational parts. We have said that moderation is a mean concerning pleasures; it is concerned with pains to a lesser degree, and not in the same way. Self-indulgence too shows itself in the same area. Let us now determine what sort of pleasures it is concerned with. Let us distinguish pleasures of the soul from pleasures of the body—love of honor, for instance, and love of learning. Each of these people delights in what he loves without his body being affected at all; rather, it is his mind that is affected. Those concerned with pleasures of this kind are called neither moderate nor self-indulgent. Nor are those concerned with any of the other pleasures that are not bodily. People who love stories, who like to tell tales, and who spend their days on whatever comes along we call idle chatterers, not self-indulgent; [1118a] nor do we call people self-indulgent who are pained over money or friends.

Moderation, then, would be concerned with bodily pleasures, though not with all of these either. People who delight in the objects of sight, such as colors, shapes and painting, are called neither moderate nor self-indulgent; and yet it would seem possible to delight in these too as one should, and to excess or deficiency. The same goes for the objects of hearing: no one calls those who delight excessively in music or acting self-indulgent, nor those who do so as they should moder-

GREEK

λέγομεν ἀκολάστους, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τοὺς μύρων ἢ ὄψων· χαίρουσι γὰρ τούτοις οἱ ἀκόλαστοι, ὅτι διὰ τούτων ἀνάμνησις γίνεται αὐτοῖς τῶν ἐπιθυμημάτων.

ἴδοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους, ὅταν πεινῶσι, χαίροντας ταῖς τῶν βρωμάτων ὀσμαῖς· τὸ δὲ τοιούτοις χαίρειν ἀκολάστου· τούτῳ γὰρ ἐπιθυμήματα ταῦτα. οὐκ ἔστι δὲ οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις ζῴοις κατὰ ταύτας τὰς αἰσθήσεις ἡδονὴ πλὴν κατὰ συμβεβηκός. οὐδὲ γὰρ ταῖς ὀσμαῖς τῶν λαγωῶν αἱ κύνες χαίρουσιν ἀλλὰ τῇ βρώσει, τὴν δ' αἴσθησιν ἡ ὀσμὴ ἐποίησεν· οὐδ' ὁ λέων τῇ φωνῇ τοῦ βοὸς ἀλλὰ τῇ ἐδωδῇ· ὅτι δ' ἐγγύς ἐστι, διὰ τῆς φωνῆς ᾔσθετο, καὶ χαίρειν δὴ ταύτῃ φαίνεται· ὁμοίως δ' οὐδ' ἰδὼν ἢ εὑρὼν ἔλαφον ἢ ἄγριον αἶγα, ἀλλ' ὅτι βορὰν ἕξει. περὶ τὰς τοιαύτας δ' ἡδονὰς ἡ σωφροσύνη καὶ ἡ ἀκολασία ἐστὶν ὧν καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ ζῷα κοινωνεῖ, ὅθεν ἀνδραποδώδεις καὶ θηριώδεις φαίνονται· αὗται δ' εἰσὶν ἁφὴ καὶ γεῦσις.

φαίνονται δὲ καὶ τῇ γεύσει ἐπὶ μικρὸν ἢ οὐθὲν χρῆσθαι· τῆς γὰρ γεύσεώς ἐστιν ἡ κρίσις τῶν χυμῶν, ὅπερ ποιοῦσιν οἱ τοὺς οἴνους δοκιμάζοντες καὶ τὰ ὄψα ἀρτύοντες· οὐ πάνυ δὲ χαίρουσι τούτοις, ἢ οὐχ οἵ γε ἀκόλαστοι, ἀλλὰ τῇ ἀπολαύσει, ἣ γίνεται πᾶσα δι' ἁφῆς καὶ ἐν σιτίοις καὶ ἐν ποτοῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀφροδισίοις λεγομένοις. διὸ καὶ ηὔξατό τις ὀψοφάγος ὢν τὸν φάρυγγα αὑτῷ μακρότερον γεράνου γενέσθαι, ὡς ἡδόμενος τῇ ἁφῇ. 1118b κοινοτάτη δὴ τῶν αἰσθήσεων καθ' ἣν ἡ ἀκολασία· καὶ δόξειεν ἂν δικαίως ἐπονείδιστος εἶναι, ὅτι οὐχ ᾗ ἄνθρωποί ἐσμεν ὑπάρχει, ἀλλ' ᾗ ζῷα. τὸ δὴ τοιούτοις χαίρειν καὶ μάλιστα ἀγαπᾶν θηριῶδες.

1118b καὶ γὰρ αἱ ἐλευθεριώταται τῶν διὰ τῆς ἁφῆς ἡδονῶν ἀφῄρηνται, οἷον αἱ ἐν τοῖς γυμνασίοις διὰ τρίψεως καὶ τῆς θερμασίας γινόμεναι· οὐ γὰρ περὶ πᾶν τὸ σῶμα ἡ τοῦ ἀκολάστου ἁφή, ἀλλὰ περί τινα μέρη.

ENGLISH

ate. Nor do we call people so for the pleasures of smell, except incidentally. We do not call people self-indulgent who delight in the smell of apples or roses or incense, but rather those who delight in the smell of perfumes or rich dishes; for self-indulgent people delight in these because they remind them of the objects of their appetites.

One can also see other people, when they are hungry, delighting in the smell of food; but to delight in such things is the mark of a self-indulgent person, since these are the objects of his appetites. Nor do the other animals take pleasure through these senses, except incidentally. Dogs do not delight in the scent of hares, but in eating them; the scent merely made them aware of the hares. Nor does the lion delight in the lowing of the ox, but in devouring it; he perceived through the lowing that the ox was near, and so he appears to delight in the sound. Similarly, it is not the sight or discovery of a deer or a wild goat that pleases him, but the prospect of a meal. Moderation and self-indulgence are concerned with the kind of pleasures that the other animals share in too, which is why they appear slavish and brutish. These are touch and taste.

But they seem to make little or no use even of taste. For taste has to do with discriminating flavors, which is what people do when they test wines or season dishes; and people don't much enjoy doing that—or at least the self-indulgent don't. What they enjoy is the gratification, which comes about entirely through touch, in food and drink and in what are called the pleasures of sex. That is why a certain glutton prayed that his throat might become longer than a crane's, since it was the touching that gave him pleasure. 1118b So the sense that self-indulgence is concerned with is the most widely shared of the senses; and it would seem justly open to reproach, since it belongs to us not insofar as we are human but insofar as we are animals. To enjoy such things, then, and to like them most of all, is brutish.[8]

For even the most refined of the pleasures of touch are excluded, such as those produced in the gymnasium by massage and warmth; for the self-indulgent person's touching does not concern the whole body, only certain parts of it.

8 The glutton is named elsewhere (*Eudemian Ethics* 1231a) as Philoxenus, son of Eryxis.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τῶν δ' ἐπιθυμιῶν αἳ μὲν κοιναὶ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, αἳ δ' ἴδιοι καὶ ἐπίθετοι· οἷον ἡ μὲν τῆς τροφῆς φυσική· πᾶς γὰρ ἐπιθυμεῖ ὁ ἐνδεὴς ξηρᾶς ἢ ὑγρᾶς τροφῆς, ὁτὲ δὲ ἀμφοῖν, καὶ εὐνῆς, φησὶν Ὅμηρος, ὁ νέος καὶ ἀκμάζων· τὸ δὲ τοιᾶσδε ἢ τοιᾶσδε, οὐκέτι πᾶς, οὐδὲ τῶν αὐτῶν. διὸ φαίνεται ἡμέτερον εἶναι. οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἔχει γέ τι καὶ φυσικόν· ἕτερα γὰρ ἑτέροις ἐστὶν ἡδέα, καὶ ἔνια πᾶσιν ἡδίω τῶν τυχόντων. ἐν μὲν οὖν ταῖς φυσικαῖς ἐπιθυμίαις ὀλίγοι ἁμαρτάνουσι καὶ ἐφ' ἕν, ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖον· τὸ γὰρ ἐσθίειν τὰ τυχόντα ἢ πίνειν ἕως ἂν ὑπερπλησθῇ, ὑπερβάλλειν ἐστὶ τὸ κατὰ φύσιν τῷ πλήθει· ἀναπλήρωσις γὰρ τῆς ἐνδείας ἡ φυσικὴ ἐπιθυμία. διὸ λέγονται οὗτοι γαστρίμαργοι, ὡς παρὰ τὸ δέον πληροῦντες αὐτήν.	Of appetites, some seem to be common, others peculiar to individuals and acquired. The appetite for food, for example, is natural: everyone who lacks it has an appetite for dry or liquid nourishment, sometimes for both, and—as Homer says—for a bed, if he is young and in his prime. But not everyone has an appetite for this or that particular kind, nor for the same things. That is why such appetite seems to be our own. Still, it has something natural about it too: different things are pleasant to different people, and some things are more pleasant to everyone than just anything at random. Now in the natural appetites few people go wrong, and only in one direction, toward too much. For eating or drinking whatever is at hand until one is overfull is exceeding the natural amount in quantity, since natural appetite is the replenishment of a lack. That is why these people are called "belly-mad": they fill their bellies beyond what is right.[9]
τοιοῦτοι δὲ γίνονται οἱ λίαν ἀνδραποδώδεις. περὶ δὲ τὰς ἰδίας τῶν ἡδονῶν πολλοὶ καὶ πολλαχῶς ἁμαρτάνουσιν. τῶν γὰρ φιλοτοιούτων λεγομένων ἢ τῷ χαίρειν οἷς μὴ δεῖ, ἢ τῷ μᾶλλον ἢ ὡς οἱ πολλοί, ἢ μὴ ὡς δεῖ, κατὰ πάντα δ' οἱ ἀκόλαστοι ὑπερβάλλουσιν· καὶ γὰρ χαίρουσιν ἐνίοις οἷς οὐ δεῖ (μισητὰ γάρ), καὶ εἴ τισι δεῖ χαίρειν τῶν τοιούτων, μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ ἢ ὡς οἱ πολλοὶ χαίρουσιν.	It is people who are excessively slavish who turn out like this. But with the pleasures peculiar to individuals many people go wrong, and in many ways. People called "fond of" this or that are so called either for enjoying what they shouldn't, or for enjoying it more than most people do, or not in the way they should; but the self-indulgent exceed in all these ways. They enjoy some things they shouldn't (since those things are hateful), and if there are some such things one should enjoy, they enjoy them more than one should and more than most people do.
ἡ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς ὑπερβολὴ ὅτι ἀκολασία καὶ ψεκτόν, δῆλον· περὶ δὲ τὰς λύπας οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀνδρείας τῷ ὑπομένειν λέγεται σώφρων οὐδ' ἀκόλαστος τῷ μή, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἀκόλαστος τῷ λυπεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ ὅτι τῶν ἡδέων οὐ τυγχάνει (καὶ τὴν λύπην δὲ ποιεῖ αὐτῷ ἡ ἡδονή), ὁ δὲ σώφρων τῷ μὴ λυπεῖσθαι τῇ ἀπουσίᾳ καὶ τῷ ἀπέχεσθαι τοῦ ἡδέος.	It is clear, then, that excess in pleasures is self-indulgence and is blameworthy. With pains, though, it is not as with courage: one is not called moderate for enduring them, or self-indulgent for not enduring them. Rather, the self-indulgent person is so called for being more pained than he should be at not getting pleasant things (even his pain is produced by pleasure), and the moderate person for not being pained at their absence and at abstaining from what is pleasant.
1119a ὁ μὲν οὖν ἀκόλαστος ἐπιθυμεῖ τῶν ἡδέων πάντων ἢ τῶν μάλιστα, καὶ ἄγεται ὑπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ὥστε ἀντὶ τῶν ἄλλων ταῦθ' αἱρεῖσθαι· διὸ καὶ λυπεῖται καὶ ἀποτυγχάνων καὶ ἐπιθυμῶν· μετὰ λύπης γὰρ ἡ ἐπιθυμία·	The self-indulgent person, then, has an appetite for all pleasant things, or for the most pleasant, and is led by his appetite to choose these over everything else. That is why he is pained both

9 The phrase echoes *Iliad* 24.129–31, where Thetis urges the grieving Achilles to eat and to go to bed with a woman.

GREEK

ἀτόπῳ δ' ἔοικε τὸ δι' ἡδονὴν λυπεῖσθαι. ἐλλείποντες δὲ τὰ περὶ τὰς ἡδονὰς καὶ ἧττον ἢ δεῖ χαίροντες οὐ πάνυ γίνονται· οὐ γὰρ ἀνθρωπική ἐστιν ἡ τοιαύτη ἀναισθησία· καὶ γὰρ τὰ λοιπὰ ζῷα διακρίνει τὰ βρώματα, καὶ τοῖς μὲν χαίρει τοῖς δ' οὔ· εἰ δέ τῳ μηδέν ἐστιν ἡδὺ μηδὲ διαφέρει ἕτερον ἑτέρου, πόρρω ἂν εἴη τοῦ ἄνθρωπος εἶναι· οὐ τέτευχε δ' ὁ τοιοῦτος ὀνόματος διὰ τὸ μὴ πάνυ γίνεσθαι.

ὁ δὲ σώφρων μέσως μὲν περὶ ταῦτ' ἔχει· οὔτε γὰρ ἥδεται οἷς μάλιστα ὁ ἀκόλαστος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον δυσχεραίνει, οὐδ' ὅλως οἷς μὴ δεῖ οὐδὲ σφόδρα τοιούτῳ οὐδενί, οὔτ' ἀπόντων λυπεῖται οὐδ' ἐπιθυμεῖ, ἢ μετρίως, οὐδὲ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, οὐδ' ὅτε μὴ δεῖ, οὐδ' ὅλως τῶν τοιούτων οὐδέν· ὅσα δὲ πρὸς ὑγίειάν ἐστιν ἢ πρὸς εὐεξίαν ἡδέα ὄντα, τούτων ὀρέξεται μετρίως καὶ ὡς δεῖ, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡδέων μὴ ἐμποδίων τούτοις ὄντων ἢ παρὰ τὸ καλὸν ἢ ὑπὲρ τὴν οὐσίαν. ὁ γὰρ οὕτως ἔχων μᾶλλον ἀγαπᾷ τὰς τοιαύτας ἡδονὰς τῆς ἀξίας· ὁ δὲ σώφρων οὐ τοιοῦτος, ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος.

ἑκουσίῳ δὲ μᾶλλον ἔοικεν ἡ ἀκολασία τῆς δειλίας. ἢ μὲν γὰρ δι' ἡδονήν, ἡ δὲ διὰ λύπην, ὧν τὸ μὲν αἱρετόν, τὸ δὲ φευκτόν· καὶ ἡ μὲν λύπη ἐξίστησι καὶ φθείρει τὴν τοῦ ἔχοντος φύσιν, ἡ δὲ ἡδονὴ οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο ποιεῖ. μᾶλλον δὴ ἑκούσιον. διὸ καὶ ἐπονειδιστότερον· καὶ γὰρ ἐθισθῆναι ῥᾷον πρὸς αὐτά· πολλὰ γὰρ ἐν τῷ βίῳ τὰ τοιαῦτα, καὶ οἱ ἐθισμοὶ ἀκίνδυνοι, ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν φοβερῶν ἀνάπαλιν. δόξειε δ' ἂν οὐχ ὁμοίως ἑκούσιον ἡ δειλία εἶναι τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστον· αὐτὴ μὲν γὰρ ἄλυπος, ταῦτα δὲ διὰ λύπην ἐξίστησιν, ὥστε καὶ τὰ ὅπλα ῥιπτεῖν καὶ τἆλλα ἀσχημονεῖν· διὸ καὶ δοκεῖ βίαια εἶναι. τῷ δ' ἀκολάστῳ ἀνάπαλιν τὰ μὲν καθ' ἕκαστα ἑκούσια (ἐπιθυμοῦντι γὰρ καὶ ὀρεγομένῳ), τὸ δ' ὅλον ἧττον· οὐθεὶς γὰρ ἐπιθυμεῖ ἀκόλαστος εἶναι.

ENGLISH

when he fails to get them and while he has the appetite, since appetite involves pain—though it seems absurd to be pained on account of pleasure. People who fall short with regard to pleasures, and enjoy them less than they should, hardly occur at all; such insensibility is not human. Even the other animals discriminate among foods, enjoying some and not others; and if there is someone to whom nothing is pleasant, and one thing is no different from another, he would be far from being human. Such a person has not received a name, because he hardly occurs.

The moderate person is in a middle condition with respect to these things. He takes no pleasure in what the self-indulgent person most enjoys—rather, it annoys him—nor at all in what he shouldn't, nor intensely in anything of this sort. He is not pained at their absence and has no appetite for them, or only moderately, and not more than he should, nor when he shouldn't, nor anything of that kind at all. But whatever pleasant things make for health or fitness he will desire moderately and as he should, and other pleasant things too, provided they do not hinder these, and are not contrary to what is fine or beyond his means. For someone who is disposed that way loves such pleasures more than they are worth; the moderate person is not like that, but loves them as correct reason prescribes.

Self-indulgence seems more voluntary than cowardice. The one is caused by pleasure, the other by pain, and of these the first is something to choose and the second something to avoid. Pain also unsettles and ruins the nature of the one who feels it, while pleasure does nothing of the sort. So self-indulgence is more voluntary—and that is why it is also more open to reproach. For it is easier to become habituated to resist pleasures, since there are many such things in life and the habituation carries no danger, whereas with frightening things it is the reverse. Cowardice, however, would seem not to be voluntary in the same way as its particular instances. Cowardice itself involves no pain, but the particular situations unsettle a person through pain, so that he throws away his arms and disgraces himself in other ways; that is why they are even thought to be forced. For the self-indulgent person it is the reverse: the particular acts are voluntary (since he has an appetite and a de-

	GREEK	ENGLISH
		sire for them), but the condition as a whole less so, since no one has an appetite to be self-indulgent.
	τὸ δ' ὄνομα τῆς ἀκολασίας καὶ ἐπὶ τὰς παιδικὰς ἁμαρτίας φέρομεν·	We also apply the name "self-indulgence" to the faults of children,
1119b	ἔχουσι γάρ τινα ὁμοιότητα. πότερον δ' ἀπὸ ποτέρου καλεῖται, οὐθὲν πρὸς τὰ νῦν διαφέρει, δῆλον δ' ὅτι τὸ ὕστερον ἀπὸ τοῦ προτέρου. οὐ κακῶς δ' ἔοικε μετενηνέχθαι· κεκολάσθαι γὰρ δεῖ τὸ τῶν αἰσχρῶν ὀρεγόμενον καὶ πολλὴν αὔξησιν ἔχον, τοιοῦτον δὲ μάλιστα ἡ ἐπιθυμία καὶ ὁ παῖς· κατ' ἐπιθυμίαν γὰρ ζῶσι καὶ τὰ παιδία, καὶ μάλιστα ἐν τούτοις ἡ τοῦ ἡδέος ὄρεξις. εἰ οὖν μὴ ἔσται εὐπειθὲς καὶ ὑπὸ τὸ ἄρχον, ἐπὶ πολὺ ἥξει· ἄπληστος γὰρ ἡ τοῦ ἡδέος ὄρεξις καὶ πανταχόθεν τῷ ἀνοήτῳ, καὶ ἡ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας ἐνέργεια αὔξει τὸ συγγενές, κἂν μεγάλαι καὶ σφοδραὶ ὦσι, καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν ἐκκρούουσιν.	1119b since they bear a certain resemblance. Which is named after which makes no difference for present purposes, but clearly the later is named after the earlier. And the transfer seems not a bad one. For what needs to be chastened is whatever desires shameful things and has great capacity for growth, and that is above all what appetite and a child are like: children too live by appetite, and the desire for what is pleasant is strongest in them. So if it is not obedient and under the authority of the ruling part, it will go far. For in someone without sense the desire for what is pleasant is insatiable and comes from every direction; the exercise of appetite increases what is akin to it; and if the appetites are great and intense, they even knock out reasoning.[10]
1119b	διὸ δεῖ μετρίας εἶναι αὐτὰς καὶ ὀλίγας, καὶ τῷ λόγῳ μηθὲν ἐναντιοῦσθαι—τὸ δὲ τοιοῦτον εὐπειθὲς λέγομεν καὶ κεκολασμένον—ὥσπερ δὲ τὸν παῖδα δεῖ κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦ παιδαγωγοῦ ζῆν, οὕτω καὶ τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν κατὰ τὸν λόγον. διὸ δεῖ τοῦ σώφρονος τὸ ἐπιθυμητικὸν συμφωνεῖν τῷ λόγῳ· σκοπὸς γὰρ ἀμφοῖν τὸ καλόν, καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖ ὁ σώφρων ὧν δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ καὶ ὅτε· οὕτω δὲ τάττει καὶ ὁ λόγος. ταῦτ' οὖν ἡμῖν εἰρήσθω περὶ σωφροσύνης.	That is why appetites must be moderate and few, and must not oppose reason in anything—this is what we call obedient and chastened. Just as a child should live according to the instructions of his tutor, so the appetitive part should live according to reason. So in the moderate person the appetitive part should be in harmony with reason, since the aim of both is the fine; the moderate person has an appetite for the things he should, in the way he should, and when he should, and this is also what reason prescribes. So much, then, for moderation.[11]

10 The Greek word *akolasia*, "self-indulgence", literally means "unchastened-ness" (from *kolazein*, "to chasten, punish"), hence its use for spoiled children.

11 The "tutor" (*paidagōgos*) was a household slave who escorted a boy and supervised his behavior.

Book IV

The other excellences of character
Aristotle describes generosity, magnificence, greatness of soul, gentleness, and the social excellences.

GREEK

λέγωμεν δ' ἑξῆς περὶ ἐλευθεριότητος. δοκεῖ δὴ εἶναι ἡ περὶ χρήματα μεσότης· ἐπαινεῖται γὰρ ὁ ἐλευθέριος οὐκ ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς, οὐδ' ἐν οἷς ὁ σώφρων, οὐδ' αὖ ἐν ταῖς κρίσεσιν, ἀλλὰ περὶ δόσιν χρημάτων καὶ λῆψιν, μᾶλλον δ' ἐν τῇ δόσει. χρήματα δὲ λέγομεν πάντα ὅσων ἡ ἀξία νομίσματι μετρεῖται. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ ἀσωτία καὶ ἡ ἀνελευθερία περὶ χρήματα ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ ἐλλείψεις· καὶ τὴν μὲν ἀνελευθερίαν προσάπτομεν ἀεὶ τοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ περὶ χρήματα σπουδάζουσι, τὴν δ' ἀσωτίαν ἐπιφέρομεν ἐνίοτε συμπλέκοντες· τοὺς γὰρ ἀκρατεῖς καὶ εἰς ἀκολασίαν δαπανηροὺς ἀσώτους καλοῦμεν. διὸ καὶ φαυλότατοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι· πολλὰς γὰρ ἅμα κακίας ἔχουσιν.

ENGLISH

Let us next discuss generosity. It seems to be the mean concerning wealth. For the generous person is praised not in matters of war, nor in those where the moderate person is praised, nor again in judicial decisions, but in the giving and taking of wealth, and more in the giving. By "wealth" we mean everything whose value is measured by money. Wastefulness and stinginess are excesses and deficiencies concerning wealth. Stinginess we always attach to those who care about wealth more than they should; but "wastefulness" we sometimes apply by lumping things together, since we call people wasteful who lack self-control and spend lavishly on self-indulgence. That is why they are thought to be the worst sort of people: they have many vices at once.[1]

οὐ δὴ οἰκείως προσαγορεύονται· βούλεται γὰρ ἄσωτος εἶναι ὁ ἓν κακὸν ἔχων, 1120a τὸ φθείρειν τὴν οὐσίαν· ἄσωτος γὰρ ὁ δι' αὑτὸν ἀπολλύμενος, δοκεῖ δ' ἀπώλειά τις αὑτοῦ εἶναι καὶ ἡ τῆς οὐσίας φθορά, ὡς τοῦ ζῆν διὰ τούτων ὄντος. οὕτω δὴ τὴν ἀσωτίαν ἐκδεχόμεθα. ὧν δ' ἐστὶ χρεία, ἔστι τούτοις χρῆσθαι καὶ εὖ καὶ κακῶς· ὁ πλοῦτος δ' ἐστὶ τῶν χρησίμων· ἑκάστῳ δ' ἄριστα χρῆται ὁ ἔχων τὴν περὶ τοῦτο ἀρετήν· καὶ πλούτῳ δὴ χρήσεται ἄριστα ὁ ἔχων τὴν περὶ τὰ χρήματα ἀρετήν· οὗτος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλευθέριος. χρῆσις δ' εἶναι δοκεῖ χρημάτων δαπάνη καὶ δόσις· ἡ δὲ λῆψις καὶ ἡ φυλακὴ κτῆσις μᾶλλον. διὸ μᾶλλόν ἐστι τοῦ ἐλευθερίου τὸ διδόναι οἷς δεῖ ἢ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν δεῖ καὶ μὴ λαμβάνειν ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ.

But this is not the proper name for them. For "wasteful" is meant for someone with one vice, 1120a that of destroying his substance. The wasteful person is one who is ruined through his own fault, and the destruction of one's substance seems to be a kind of ruin of oneself, since living depends on it. This, then, is how we understand wastefulness. Things that have a use can be used both well and badly, and wealth is a useful thing; and each thing is used best by the person who has the excellence concerned with it. So wealth too will be used best by the person who has the excellence concerned with wealth, and this is the generous person. Using wealth seems to consist in spending and giving; taking and keeping are more a matter of possessing. That is why it is more characteristic of the generous person to give to the right people than to take from the right sources and not take from the wrong ones.[2]

1120a τῆς γὰρ ἀρετῆς μᾶλλον τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν ἢ τὸ εὖ πάσχειν, καὶ τὰ καλὰ πράττειν μᾶλλον ἢ τὰ αἰσχρὰ μὴ πράττειν· οὐκ

For it belongs to excellence more to do good than to have good done to one, and more to do fine

1 The Greek for "generosity", *eleutheriotēs*, literally means the quality befitting a free person (*eleutheros*); its opposite, *aneleutheria* ("stinginess"), suggests something unworthy of a free person.

GREEK

ἄδηλον δ' ὅτι τῇ μὲν δόσει ἕπεται τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν καὶ τὸ καλὰ πράττειν, τῇ δὲ λήψει τὸ εὖ πάσχειν ἢ μὴ αἰσχροπραγεῖν. καὶ ἡ χάρις τῷ διδόντι, οὐ τῷ μὴ λαμβάνοντι, καὶ ὁ ἔπαινος δὲ μᾶλλον. καὶ ῥᾷον δὲ τὸ μὴ λαβεῖν τοῦ δοῦναι· τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον ἧττον προΐενται μᾶλλον ἢ οὐ λαμβάνουσι τὸ ἀλλότριον. καὶ ἐλευθέριοι δὲ λέγονται οἱ διδόντες· οἱ δὲ μὴ λαμβάνοντες οὐκ εἰς ἐλευθεριότητα ἐπαινοῦνται, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἧττον εἰς δικαιοσύνην· οἱ δὲ λαμβάνοντες οὐδ' ἐπαινοῦνται πάνυ. φιλοῦνται δὲ σχεδὸν μάλιστα οἱ ἐλευθέριοι τῶν ἀπ' ἀρετῆς· ὠφέλιμοι γὰρ, τοῦτο δ' ἐν τῇ δόσει.

αἱ δὲ κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις καλαὶ καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα. καὶ ὁ ἐλευθέριος οὖν δώσει τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα καὶ ὀρθῶς· οἷς γὰρ δεῖ καὶ ὅσα καὶ ὅτε, καὶ τἆλλα ὅσα ἕπεται τῇ ὀρθῇ δόσει· καὶ ταῦτα ἡδέως ἢ ἀλύπως· τὸ γὰρ κατ' ἀρετὴν ἡδὺ ἢ ἄλυπον, ἥκιστα δὲ λυπηρόν. ὁ δὲ διδοὺς οἷς μὴ δεῖ, ἢ μὴ τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα ἀλλὰ διά τιν' ἄλλην αἰτίαν, οὐκ ἐλευθέριος ἀλλ' ἄλλος τις ῥηθήσεται. οὐδ' ὁ λυπηρῶς· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἕλοιτ' ἂν τὰ χρήματα τῆς καλῆς πράξεως, τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἐλευθερίου. οὐδὲ λήψεται δὲ ὅθεν μὴ δεῖ· οὐ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ μὴ τιμῶντος τὰ χρήματα ἡ τοιαύτη λῆψις. οὐκ ἂν εἴη δὲ οὐδ' αἰτητικός· οὐ γάρ ἐστι τοῦ εὖ ποιοῦντος εὐχερῶς εὐεργετεῖσθαι.

ὅθεν δὲ δεῖ, λήψεται, [1120b] οἷον ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων κτημάτων, οὐχ ὡς καλὸν ἀλλ' ὡς ἀναγκαῖον, ὅπως ἔχῃ διδόναι. οὐδ' ἀμελήσει τῶν ἰδίων, βουλόμενός γε διὰ τούτων τισὶν ἐπαρκεῖν. οὐδὲ τοῖς τυχοῦσι δώσει, ἵνα ἔχῃ διδόναι οἷς δεῖ καὶ ὅτε καὶ οὗ καλόν. ἐλευθερίου δ' ἐστὶ σφόδρα καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλειν ἐν τῇ δόσει, ὥστε καταλείπειν ἑαυτῷ ἐλάττω· τὸ γὰρ μὴ βλέπειν ἐφ' ἑαυτὸν ἐλευθερίου. κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν δ' ἡ ἐλευθεριότης λέγεται· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ πλήθει τῶν διδομένων τὸ ἐλευθέριον, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ τοῦ διδόντος ἕξει, αὕτη δὲ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν δίδωσιν. οὐθὲν δὴ κωλύει ἐλευθεριώτερον εἶναι τὸν τὰ ἐλάττω διδόντα, ἐὰν ἀπ' ἐλαττόνων διδῷ.

ENGLISH

things than not to do shameful ones. And it is quite clear that doing good and doing fine things go with giving, while having good done to one, or not doing what is shameful, goes with taking. Gratitude goes to the giver, not to the one who does not take, and so, even more, does praise. Not taking is also easier than giving, since people are less willing to part with what is their own than to refrain from taking what belongs to others. It is givers, too, who are called generous; those who do not take are praised not for generosity but no less for justice; and those who take are hardly praised at all. Of all people who are loved for their excellence, the generous are perhaps loved most, since they are beneficial, and this lies in their giving.

Actions in accordance with excellence are fine and done for the sake of the fine. So the generous person too will give for the sake of the fine, and rightly: to the right people, in the right amounts, at the right time, with everything else that goes with right giving. And he will do so with pleasure, or without pain, since what accords with excellence is pleasant or painless, and least of all painful. Someone who gives to the wrong people, or not for the sake of the fine but for some other reason, will be called not generous but something else. Nor will someone who gives with pain, since he would prefer the wealth to the fine action, and that is not the generous person's way. Nor will the generous person take from the wrong sources, since such taking is not characteristic of someone who does not value wealth. Nor would he be one to ask for things, since it is not characteristic of someone who does good to others to accept benefits readily.

He will take from the right sources, [1120b] for instance from his own possessions—not as something fine but as something necessary, so that he has something to give. Nor will he neglect his own property, since he wants to help others by means of it. Nor will he give to just anyone, so that he can give to the right people, at the right time, and where it is fine to do so. It is also very characteristic of the generous person to go to excess in giving, so that he leaves less for himself, since not looking out for oneself is characteristic of the generous person. Generosity is spoken of relative to one's

2 The Greek for "wasteful", *asōtos*, literally means "unsaved" or "past saving", which Aristotle takes as self-ruin.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
		means. For generosity lies not in the quantity given but in the state of the giver, and this state gives in proportion to one's means. So nothing prevents the person who gives less from being more generous, if he gives from smaller means.
1120b	ἐλευθεριώτεροι δὲ εἶναι δοκοῦσιν οἱ μὴ κτησάμενοι ἀλλὰ παραλαβόντες τὴν οὐσίαν· ἄπειροί τε γὰρ τῆς ἐνδείας, καὶ πάντες ἀγαπῶσι μᾶλλον τὰ αὑτῶν ἔργα, ὥσπερ οἱ γονεῖς καὶ οἱ ποιηταί. πλουτεῖν δ' οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὸν ἐλευθέριον, μήτε ληπτικὸν ὄντα μήτε φυλακτικόν, προετικὸν δὲ καὶ μὴ τιμῶντα δι' αὐτὰ τὰ χρήματα ἀλλ' ἕνεκα τῆς δόσεως. διὸ καὶ ἐγκαλεῖται τῇ τύχῃ ὅτι οἱ μάλιστα ἄξιοι ὄντες ἥκιστα πλουτοῦσιν. συμβαίνει δ' οὐκ ἀλόγως τοῦτο· οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε χρήματ' ἔχειν μὴ ἐπιμελόμενον ὅπως ἔχῃ, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων. οὐ μὴν δώσει γε οἷς οὐ δεῖ οὐδ' ὅτε μὴ δεῖ, οὐδ' ὅσα ἄλλα τοιαῦτα· οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔτι πράττοι κατὰ τὴν ἐλευθεριότητα, καὶ εἰς ταῦτα ἀναλώσας οὐκ ἂν ἔχοι εἰς ἃ δεῖ ἀναλίσκειν.	Those who have not made their fortune themselves but inherited it seem to be more generous: they have no experience of need, and everyone is fonder of their own creations, as parents and poets are. It is not easy for the generous person to be rich, since he is not inclined to take or to keep, but is free with his money and values it not for its own sake but for the sake of giving. That is why people complain against fortune that those who most deserve to be rich are the least rich. But this happens not without reason: one cannot have money without taking care to have it, just as with anything else. He will not, however, give to the wrong people or at the wrong time, and so on; for then he would no longer be acting in accordance with generosity, and having spent on these things he would not have enough to spend on the right ones.
	ὥσπερ γὰρ εἴρηται, ἐλευθέριός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν οὐσίαν δαπανῶν καὶ εἰς ἃ δεῖ· ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλων ἄσωτος. διὸ τοὺς τυράννους οὐ λέγομεν ἀσώτους· τὸ γὰρ πλῆθος τῆς κτήσεως οὐ δοκεῖ ῥᾴδιον εἶναι ταῖς δόσεσι καὶ ταῖς δαπάναις ὑπερβάλλειν. τῆς ἐλευθεριότητος δὴ μεσότητος οὔσης περὶ χρημάτων δόσιν καὶ λῆψιν, ὁ ἐλευθέριος καὶ δώσει καὶ δαπανήσει εἰς ἃ δεῖ καὶ ὅσα δεῖ, ὁμοίως ἐν μικροῖς καὶ μεγάλοις, καὶ ταῦτα ἡδέως· καὶ λήψεται δ' ὅθεν δεῖ καὶ ὅσα δεῖ. τῆς ἀρετῆς γὰρ περὶ ἄμφω οὔσης μεσότητος, ποιήσει ἀμφότερα ὡς δεῖ· ἕπεται γὰρ τῇ ἐπιεικεῖ δόσει ἡ τοιαύτη λῆψις, ἡ δὲ μὴ τοιαύτη ἐναντία ἐστίν. αἱ μὲν οὖν ἑπόμεναι γίνονται ἅμα ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, αἱ δ' ἐναντίαι δῆλον ὡς οὔ.	For, as has been said, the generous person is the one who spends in accordance with his means and on the right things; the one who exceeds is wasteful. That is why we do not call tyrants wasteful: it does not seem easy for their gifts and expenditures to exceed the size of their holdings. Since generosity is a mean concerning the giving and taking of wealth, the generous person will give and spend on the right things and in the right amounts, in small matters and large alike, and do so with pleasure; and he will take from the right sources and in the right amounts. For since the excellence is a mean concerning both, he will do both as he should: taking of this kind goes along with decent giving, while taking of the other kind is contrary to it. So the kinds that go together are found together in the same person, while the contrary kinds clearly are not.
1121a	ἐὰν δὲ παρὰ τὸ δέον καὶ τὸ καλῶς ἔχον συμβαίνῃ αὐτῷ ἀναλίσκειν, λυπήσεται, μετρίως δὲ καὶ ὡς δεῖ· τῆς ἀρετῆς γὰρ καὶ ἥδεσθαι καὶ λυπεῖσθαι ἐφ' οἷς δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ. καὶ εὐκοινώνητος δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἐλευθέριος εἰς χρήματα· δύναται γὰρ ἀδικεῖσθαι, μὴ τιμῶν γε τὰ χρήματα, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀχθόμενος εἴ τι δέον μὴ ἀνάλωσεν ἢ λυπούμενος εἰ μὴ δέον τι ἀνάλωσεν, καὶ τῷ Σιμωνίδῃ οὐκ ἀρεσκόμενος. ὁ δ' ἄσωτος καὶ ἐν τούτοις διαμαρτάνει· οὔτε γὰρ ἥδεται ἐφ' οἷς δεῖ οὐδὲ ὡς δεῖ οὔτε λυπεῖται· ἔσται δὲ προϊοῦσι	If he happens to spend contrary to what is right and fine, he will be pained, but moderately and as he should, since it belongs to excellence to be pleased and pained at the right things and in the right way. The generous person is also easy to deal with in money matters. He can be wronged, since he does not value wealth, and he is more upset if he has failed to spend something he should have than pained if he has spent something he should

GREEK

φανερώτερον. εἴρηται δὴ ἡμῖν ὅτι ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ ἐλλείψεις εἰσὶν ἡ ἀσωτία καὶ ἡ ἀνελευθερία, καὶ ἐν δυσίν, ἐν δόσει καὶ λήψει· καὶ τὴν δαπάνην γὰρ εἰς τὴν δόσιν τίθεμεν.

ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀσωτία τῷ διδόναι καὶ μὴ λαμβάνειν ὑπερβάλλει, τῷ δὲ λαμβάνειν ἐλλείπει, ἡ δ' ἀνελευθερία τῷ διδόναι μὲν ἐλλείπει, τῷ λαμβάνειν δ' ὑπερβάλλει, πλὴν ἐν μικροῖς. τὰ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἀσωτίας οὐ πάνυ συνδυάζεται· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον μηδαμόθεν λαμβάνοντα πᾶσι διδόναι· ταχέως γὰρ ἐπιλείπει ἡ οὐσία τοὺς ἰδιώτας διδόντας, οἵπερ καὶ δοκοῦσιν ἄσωτοι εἶναι· ἐπεὶ ὅ γε τοιοῦτος δόξειεν ἂν οὐ μικρῷ βελτίων εἶναι τοῦ ἀνελευθέρου. εὐίατός τε γάρ ἐστι καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἡλικίας καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς ἀπορίας, καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον δύναται ἐλθεῖν. ἔχει γὰρ τὰ τοῦ ἐλευθερίου· καὶ γὰρ δίδωσι καὶ οὐ λαμβάνει, οὐδέτερον δ' ὡς δεῖ οὐδ' εὖ. εἰ δὴ τοῦτο ἐθισθείη ἤ πως ἄλλως μεταβάλοι, εἴη ἂν ἐλευθέριος· δώσει γὰρ οἷς δεῖ, καὶ οὐ λήψεται ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ.

διὸ καὶ δοκεῖ οὐκ εἶναι φαῦλος τὸ ἦθος· οὐ γὰρ μοχθηροῦ οὐδ' ἀγεννοῦς τὸ ὑπερβάλλειν διδόντα καὶ μὴ λαμβάνοντα, ἠλιθίου δέ. ὁ δὲ τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον ἄσωτος πολὺ δοκεῖ βελτίων τοῦ ἀνελευθέρου εἶναι διά τε τὰ εἰρημένα, καὶ ὅτι ὃ μὲν ὠφελεῖ πολλούς, ὃ δὲ οὐθένα, ἀλλ' οὐδ' αὐτόν. ἀλλ' οἱ πολλοὶ τῶν ἀσώτων, καθάπερ εἴρηται, καὶ λαμβάνουσιν ὅθεν μὴ δεῖ, καὶ εἰσὶ κατὰ τοῦτο ἀνελεύθεροι. ληπτικοὶ δὲ γίνονται διὰ τὸ βούλεσθαι μὲν ἀναλίσκειν, εὐχερῶς δὲ τοῦτο ποιεῖν μὴ δύνασθαι· ταχὺ γὰρ ἐπιλείπει αὐτοὺς τὰ ὑπάρχοντα. ἀναγκάζονται οὖν ἑτέρωθεν πορίζειν. 1121b ἅμα δὲ καὶ διὰ τὸ μηδὲν τοῦ καλοῦ φροντίζειν ὀλιγώρως καὶ πάντοθεν λαμβάνουσιν· διδόναι γὰρ ἐπιθυμοῦσι, τὸ δὲ πῶς ἢ πόθεν οὐδὲν αὐτοῖς διαφέρει.

1121b διόπερ οὐδ' ἐλευθέριοι αἱ δόσεις αὐτῶν εἰσίν· οὐ γὰρ καλαί, οὐδὲ τούτου ἕνεκα, οὐδὲ ὡς δεῖ· ἀλλ' ἐνίοτε οὓς δεῖ πένεσθαι, τούτους πλουσίους ποιοῦσι, καὶ τοῖς μὲν μετρίοις τὰ ἤθη οὐδὲν ἂν δοῖεν, τοῖς δὲ κόλαξιν ἤ τιν'

ENGLISH

not have; and he does not agree with Simonides. The wasteful person goes wrong in these respects too: he is neither pleased nor pained at the right things or in the right way. This will become clearer as we go on. We have said, then, that wastefulness and stinginess are excesses and deficiencies, and in two things, giving and taking; for we count spending as part of giving.[3]

Wastefulness exceeds in giving and not taking, and falls short in taking; stinginess falls short in giving and exceeds in taking, except in small matters. Now the features of wastefulness do not often go together, since it is not easy to give to everyone while taking from nowhere: private individuals who give quickly run through their substance, and they are the ones who are thought to be wasteful. Yet such a person would seem to be considerably better than the stingy one. He is easily cured, both by age and by lack of means, and he can come to the mean. For he has the features of the generous person: he gives and does not take, though he does neither as he should or well. If he were trained in this, or changed in some other way, he would be generous, since he would give to the right people and not take from the wrong sources.

That is why he is thought not to be bad in character; for exceeding in giving and not taking is the mark not of a wicked or ignoble person but of a foolish one. The person who is wasteful in this way seems much better than the stingy person, both for the reasons given and because the one benefits many people while the other benefits no one, not even himself. But most wasteful people, as has been said, also take from the wrong sources, and in this respect they are stingy. They become grasping because they want to spend but cannot easily do so, since their resources quickly run out. So they are forced to get supplies from elsewhere. 1121b At the same time, because they give no thought to what is fine, they take carelessly and from every source; they have an appetite for giving, but how or from where makes no difference to them.

That is why their gifts are not generous either: they are not fine, nor given for the sake of the fine, nor in the right way. Sometimes they make rich those who ought to be poor; they would give noth-

3 Simonides was proverbial for his love of money.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἄλλην ἡδονὴν πορίζουσι πολλά. διὸ καὶ ἀκόλαστοι αὐτῶν εἰσὶν οἱ πολλοί· εὐχερῶς γὰρ ἀναλίσκοντες καὶ εἰς τὰς ἀκολασίας δαπανηροί εἰσι, καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ζῆν πρὸς τὰς ἡδονὰς ἀποκλίνουσιν. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἄσωτος ἀπαιδαγώγητος γενόμενος εἰς ταῦτα μεταβαίνει, τυχὼν δ' ἐπιμελείας εἰς τὸ μέσον καὶ εἰς τὸ δέον ἀφίκοιτ' ἄν. ἡ δ' ἀνελευθερία ἀνίατός τ' ἐστίν (δοκεῖ γὰρ τὸ γῆρας καὶ πᾶσα ἀδυναμία ἀνελευθέρους ποιεῖν), καὶ συμφυέστερον τοῖς ἀνθρώποις τῆς ἀσωτίας· οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ φιλοχρήματοι μᾶλλον ἢ δοτικοί.

ing to people of moderate character, but a great deal to flatterers or to those who provide them with some other pleasure. That is also why most of them are self-indulgent: since they spend readily, they are lavish on self-indulgence as well, and because they do not live with a view to the fine, they slide toward pleasures. The wasteful person, then, drifts into these things if he is left without guidance, but with care he might reach the mean and what is right. Stinginess, on the other hand, is incurable (old age and every kind of incapacity seem to make people stingy), and it is more innate in human beings than wastefulness: most people are fonder of money than of giving.

καὶ διατείνει δ' ἐπὶ πολύ, καὶ πολυειδές ἐστιν· πολλοὶ γὰρ τρόποι δοκοῦσι τῆς ἀνελευθερίας εἶναι. ἐν δυσὶ γὰρ οὖσα, τῇ τ' ἐλλείψει τῆς δόσεως καὶ τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τῆς λήψεως, οὐ πᾶσιν ὁλόκληρος παραγίνεται, ἀλλ' ἐνίοτε χωρίζεται, καὶ οἱ μὲν τῇ λήψει ὑπερβάλλουσιν, οἱ δὲ τῇ δόσει ἐλλείπουσιν.

It is also far-reaching and takes many forms, since there seem to be many kinds of stinginess. It consists in two things, deficiency in giving and excess in taking, and it does not come whole to everyone; sometimes the two are separated, and some people exceed in taking while others fall short in giving.

οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις προσηγορίαις οἷον φειδωλοὶ γλίσχροι κίμβικες, πάντες τῇ δόσει ἐλλείπουσι, τῶν δ' ἀλλοτρίων οὐκ ἐφίενται οὐδὲ βούλονται λαμβάνειν, οἱ μὲν διά τινα ἐπιείκειαν καὶ εὐλάβειαν τῶν αἰσχρῶν ᾽δοκοῦσι γὰρ ἔνιοι ἢ φασί γε διὰ τοῦτο φυλάττειν, ἵνα μή ποτ' ἀναγκασθῶσιν αἰσχρόν τι πρᾶξαι· τούτων δὲ καὶ ὁ κυμινοπρίστης καὶ πᾶς ὁ τοιοῦτος· ὠνόμασται δ' ἀπὸ τῆς ὑπερβολῆς τοῦ μηδὲν ἂν δοῦναί· οἱ δ' αὖ διὰ φόβον ἀπέχονται τῶν ἀλλοτρίων ὡς οὐ ῥᾴδιον αὐτὸν μὲν τὰ ἑτέρων λαμβάνειν, τὰ δ' αὐτοῦ ἑτέρους μή· ἀρέσκει οὖν αὐτοῖς τὸ μήτε λαμβάνειν μήτε διδόναι. οἱ δ' αὖ κατὰ τὴν λῆψιν ὑπερβάλλουσι τῷ πάντοθεν λαμβάνειν καὶ πᾶν, οἷον οἱ τὰς ἀνελευθέρους ἐργασίας ἐργαζόμενοι, πορνοβοσκοὶ καὶ πάντες οἱ τοιοῦτοι, καὶ τοκισταὶ κατὰ μικρὰ καὶ ἐπὶ πολλῷ.

Those who go by such names as "tight-fisted", "miserly" and "cheapskate" all fall short in giving, but they do not covet other people's property or want to take it. Some do so from a kind of decency and a wariness of what is shameful (some seem, or at least claim, to hold on to their money for this reason, so that they may never be forced to do anything shameful; among these is the cumin-splitter and everyone of that sort, who is so called from his excessive unwillingness to give anything). Others, again, keep away from other people's property out of fear, on the ground that it is not easy to take what belongs to others without others taking what is yours; so they are content neither to take nor to give. Others, again, exceed in taking by taking anything from anywhere, such as those who practice occupations unworthy of a free person—brothel-keepers and all such people—and those who lend small sums at high interest.[4]

1122a πάντες γὰρ οὗτοι ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ λαμβάνουσι, καὶ ὁπόσον οὐ δεῖ. κοινὸν δ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ἡ αἰσχροκέρδεια φαίνεται· πάντες γὰρ ἕνεκα κέρδους, καὶ τούτου μικροῦ, ὀνείδη ὑπομένουσιν. τοὺς γὰρ τὰ μεγάλα μὴ ὅθεν δὲ δεῖ λαμβάνοντας, μηδὲ ἃ δεῖ, οὐ λέγομεν ἀνελευθέρους, οἷον τοὺς τυράννους πόλεις πορθοῦντας καὶ ἱερὰ συλῶντας, ἀλλὰ πονηροὺς μᾶλλον καὶ ἀσεβεῖς καὶ ἀδίκους. ὁ μέντοι

For all of these take from the wrong sources, and more than they should. What they have in common is evidently shameful profiteering, since all of them put up with reproach for the sake of gain, and small gain at that. For those who take great things from the wrong sources, and take what they should not—tyrants who sack cities and plunder

4 A "cumin-splitter" was a proverbial skinflint, one who would split even a tiny cumin seed rather than give it away.

GREEK	ENGLISH
κυβευτὴς καὶ ὁ λωποδύτης καὶ ὁ λῃστὴς τῶν ἀνελευθέρων εἰσίν· αἰσχροκερδεῖς γάρ. κέρδους γὰρ ἕνεκα ἀμφότεροι πραγματεύονται καὶ ὀνείδη ὑπομένουσιν, καὶ οἱ μὲν κινδύνους τοὺς μεγίστους ἕνεκα τοῦ λήμματος, οἱ δ' ἀπὸ τῶν φίλων κερδαίνουσιν, οἷς δεῖ διδόναι. ἀμφότεροι δὴ ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ κερδαίνειν βουλόμενοι αἰσχροκερδεῖς· καὶ πᾶσαι δὴ αἱ τοιαῦται λήψεις ἀνελεύθεροι.	temples, for instance—we do not call stingy but rather wicked, impious and unjust. The gambler, however, and the clothes-thief and the bandit are among the stingy, since they are shameful profiteers. Both kinds pursue their business for the sake of gain and put up with reproach: the one runs the greatest risks for the sake of the loot, while the other makes gains from his friends, to whom one ought to give. Both, then, since they want to make gains from the wrong sources, are shameful profiteers; and all such taking is stingy.
εἰκότως δὲ τῇ ἐλευθεριότητι ἀνελευθερία ἐναντίον λέγεται· μεῖζόν τε γάρ ἐστι κακὸν τῆς ἀσωτίας, καὶ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ ταύτην ἁμαρτάνουσιν ἢ κατὰ τὴν λεχθεῖσαν ἀσωτίαν. περὶ μὲν οὖν ἐλευθεριότητος καὶ τῶν ἀντικειμένων κακιῶν τοσαῦτ' εἰρήσθω.	It is reasonable that stinginess is called the opposite of generosity: it is a greater evil than wastefulness, and people go wrong more in this direction than in the direction of wastefulness as we have described it. So much, then, for generosity and the vices opposed to it.

MAGNIFICENCE

Aristotle describes magnificence as fitting spending on a large scale, with its vulgar and petty extremes.

GREEK	ENGLISH
δόξαι δ' ἂν ἀκόλουθον εἶναι καὶ περὶ μεγαλοπρεπείας διελθεῖν. δοκεῖ γὰρ καὶ αὐτὴ περὶ χρήματά τις ἀρετὴ εἶναι· οὐχ ὥσπερ δ' ἡ ἐλευθεριότης διατείνει περὶ πάσας τὰς ἐν χρήμασι πράξεις, ἀλλὰ περὶ τὰς δαπανηρὰς μόνον· ἐν τούτοις δ' ὑπερέχει τῆς ἐλευθεριότητος μεγέθει. καθάπερ γὰρ τοὔνομα αὐτὸ ὑποσημαίνει, ἐν μεγέθει πρέπουσα δαπάνη ἐστίν. τὸ δὲ μέγεθος πρός τι· οὐ γὰρ τὸ αὐτὸ δαπάνημα τριηράρχῳ καὶ ἀρχιθεωρῷ. τὸ πρέπον δὴ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ ὅ. ὁ δ' ἐν μικροῖς ἢ ἐν μετρίοις κατ' ἀξίαν δαπανῶν οὐ λέγεται μεγαλοπρεπής, οἷον τὸ πολλάκι δόσκον ἀλήτῃ, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν μεγάλοις οὕτως. ὁ μὲν γὰρ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἐλευθέριος, ὁ δ' ἐλευθέριος οὐδὲν μᾶλλον μεγαλοπρεπής.	It would seem to follow next to discuss magnificence as well, since this too seems to be an excellence concerned with wealth. But unlike generosity it does not extend to all actions involving wealth, only to those involving expenditure; and in these it surpasses generosity in scale. For, as the name itself suggests, it is fitting expenditure on a large scale. But scale is relative: the expense is not the same for a trierarch as for the leader of a sacred embassy. What is fitting, then, is relative to the person himself, to the occasion and to the object. The person who spends as befits the worth of small or moderate things is not called magnificent—as in "many a time I gave to a wanderer"—but only the one who does so in great things. For the magnificent person is generous, but the generous person is no more magnificent for that.[5]
τῆς τοιαύτης δ' ἕξεως ἡ μὲν ἔλλειψις μικροπρέπεια καλεῖται, ἡ δ' ὑπερβολὴ βαναυσία καὶ ἀπειροκαλία καὶ ὅσαι τοιαῦται, οὐχ ὑπερβάλλουσαι τῷ μεγέθει περὶ ἃ δεῖ, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς οὐ δεῖ καὶ ὡς οὐ δεῖ λαμπρυνόμεναι· ὕστερον δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐροῦμεν. ὁ δὲ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἐπιστήμονι ἔοικεν· τὸ πρέπον γὰρ δύναται θεωρῆσαι καὶ δαπανῆσαι μεγάλα ἐμμελῶς. [1122b] ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴπομεν, ἡ ἕξις	The deficiency of this state is called shabbiness, and the excess vulgarity, tastelessness and the like, which exceed not in the scale of spending on the right things but by making a splash in the wrong things and in the wrong way. We will speak about these later. The magnificent person is like an expert: he can see what is fitting and spend

5 A trierarch paid to fit out and command a warship; the leader of a sacred embassy headed a city's delegation to a festival abroad—both costly public services. The quotation is from *Odyssey* 17.420.

GREEK

ταῖς ἐνεργείαις ὁρίζεται, καὶ ὧν ἐστίν. αἱ δὴ τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς δαπάναι μεγάλαι καὶ πρέπουσαι. τοιαῦτα δὴ καὶ τὰ ἔργα· οὕτω γὰρ ἔσται μέγα δαπάνημα καὶ πρέπον τῷ ἔργῳ. ὥστε τὸ μὲν ἔργον τῆς δαπάνης ἄξιον δεῖ εἶναι, τὴν δὲ δαπάνην τοῦ ἔργου, ἢ καὶ ὑπερβάλλειν. δαπανήσει δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα· κοινὸν γὰρ τοῦτο ταῖς ἀρεταῖς.

1122b καὶ ἔτι ἡδέως καὶ προετικῶς· ἡ γὰρ ἀκριβολογία μικροπρεπές. καὶ πῶς κάλλιστον καὶ πρεπωδέστατον, σκέψαιτ' ἂν μᾶλλον ἢ πόσου καὶ πῶς ἐλαχίστου. ἀναγκαῖον δὴ καὶ ἐλευθέριον τὸν μεγαλοπρεπῆ εἶναι. καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἐλευθέριος δαπανήσει ἃ δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ· ἐν τούτοις δὲ τὸ μέγα τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς, οἷον μέγεθος, περὶ ταῦτα τῆς ἐλευθεριότητος οὔσης, καὶ ἀπὸ τῆς ἴσης δαπάνης τὸ ἔργον ποιήσει μεγαλοπρεπέστερον. οὐ γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ ἀρετὴ κτήματος καὶ ἔργου. κτῆμα μὲν γὰρ τὸ πλείστου ἄξιον τιμιώτατον, οἷον χρυσός, ἔργον δὲ τὸ μέγα καὶ καλόν (τοῦ γὰρ τοιούτου ἡ θεωρία θαυμαστή, τὸ δὲ μεγαλοπρεπὲς θαυμαστόν)· καὶ ἔστιν ἔργου ἀρετή, μεγαλοπρέπεια, ἐν μεγέθει.

ἔστι δὲ τῶν δαπανημάτων οἷα λέγομεν τὰ τίμια, οἷον τὰ περὶ θεούς, ἀναθήματα καὶ κατασκευαὶ καὶ θυσίαι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ πᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ ὅσα πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν εὐφιλοτίμητά ἐστιν, οἷον εἴ που χορηγεῖν οἴονται δεῖν λαμπρῶς ἢ τριηραρχεῖν ἢ καὶ ἑστιᾶν τὴν πόλιν. ἐν ἅπασι δ' ὥσπερ εἴρηται, καὶ πρὸς τὸν πράττοντα ἀναφέρεται τὸ τίς ὢν καὶ τίνων ὑπαρχόντων· ἄξια γὰρ δεῖ τούτων εἶναι, καὶ μὴ μόνον τῷ ἔργῳ ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ποιοῦντι πρέπειν. διὸ πένης μὲν οὐκ ἂν εἴη μεγαλοπρεπής· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀφ' ὧν πολλὰ δαπανήσει πρεπόντως· ὁ δ' ἐπιχειρῶν ἠλίθιος· παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν γὰρ καὶ τὸ δέον, κατ' ἀρετὴν δὲ τὸ ὀρθῶς.

ENGLISH

great sums tastefully. [1122b] For, as we said at the beginning, a state is defined by its activities and by its objects. The expenditures of the magnificent person, then, are great and fitting. So too are the works he produces, for in this way the expenditure will be great and also fitting to the work. So the work must be worthy of the expenditure, and the expenditure worthy of the work, or even exceed it. The magnificent person will spend such sums for the sake of the fine, since this is common to the excellences.

And further, he will do so with pleasure and freely, since precise accounting is shabby. He will consider how to make the work finest and most fitting rather than how much it will cost and how it can be done most cheaply. The magnificent person, then, must also be generous. For the generous person too will spend what he should and as he should; and it is in these things that the greatness of the magnificent person—his scale, as it were—lies, generosity being concerned with the same things; and from an equal expenditure he will make the work more magnificent. For the excellence of a possession and of a work is not the same. The most valuable possession is the one worth the most, gold for example; but the most valuable work is one that is great and fine (for the sight of such a thing is wonderful, and what is magnificent is wonderful). And the excellence of a work, magnificence, lies in scale.

Among expenditures, magnificence belongs to those we call honorable, such as those connected with the gods—votive offerings, buildings and sacrifices—and likewise with everything divine; and to those that are objects of honorable ambition in public life, as when people think they should fund a chorus splendidly, or equip a warship, or even give a feast for the city. In all these cases, as has been said, the question also refers to the agent: who he is and what means he has. For the expenditures must be worthy of these, and befit not only the work but also the one who produces it. That is why a poor man could not be magnificent: he does not have the means to spend large sums fittingly, and the one who tries is foolish, since it goes against what is due and proper, whereas acting rightly is what accords with excellence.[6]

6 Funding a chorus for a dramatic festival was one of the public services that Athens imposed on its wealthiest citizens.

GREEK

πρέπει δὲ καὶ οἷς τοιαῦτα προϋπάρχει δι' αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν προγόνων ἢ ὧν αὐτοῖς μέτεστιν, καὶ τοῖς εὐγενέσι καὶ τοῖς ἐνδόξοις καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα μέγεθος ἔχει καὶ ἀξίωμα. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν τοιοῦτος ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής, καὶ ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις δαπανήμασιν ἡ μεγαλοπρέπεια, ὥσπερ εἴρηται· μέγιστα γὰρ καὶ ἐντιμότατα· τῶν δὲ ἰδίων ὅσα εἰσάπαξ γίνεται, [1123a] οἷον γάμος καὶ εἴ τι τοιοῦτον, καὶ εἰ περί τι ἡ πᾶσα πόλις σπουδάζει ἢ οἱ ἐν ἀξιώματι, καὶ περὶ ξένων δὲ ὑποδοχὰς καὶ ἀποστολάς, καὶ δωρεὰς καὶ ἀντιδωρεάς· οὐ γὰρ εἰς ἑαυτὸν δαπανηρὸς ὁ μεγαλοπρεπὴς ἀλλ' εἰς τὰ κοινά, τὰ δὲ δῶρα τοῖς ἀναθήμασιν ἔχει τι ὅμοιον.

1123a μεγαλοπρεποῦς δὲ καὶ οἶκον κατασκευάσασθαι πρεπόντως τῷ πλούτῳ (κόσμος γάρ τις καὶ οὗτος), καὶ περὶ ταῦτα μᾶλλον δαπανᾶν ὅσα πολυχρόνια τῶν ἔργων (κάλλιστα γὰρ ταῦτα), καὶ ἐν ἑκάστοις τὸ πρέπον· οὐ γὰρ ταὐτὰ ἁρμόζει θεοῖς καὶ ἀνθρώποις, οὐδ' ἐν ἱερῷ καὶ τάφῳ. καὶ ἐπεὶ τῶν δαπανημάτων ἕκαστον μέγα ἐν τῷ γένει, καὶ μεγαλοπρεπέστατον ἁπλῶς μὲν τὸ ἐν μεγάλῳ μέγα, ἐνταῦθα δὲ τὸ ἐν τούτοις μέγα, καὶ διαφέρει τὸ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ μέγα τοῦ ἐν τῷ δαπανήματι· σφαῖρα μὲν γὰρ ἡ καλλίστη ἢ λήκυθος μεγαλοπρέπειαν ἔχει παιδικοῦ δώρου, ἡ δὲ τούτου τιμὴ μικρὸν καὶ ἀνελεύθερον· διὰ τοῦτό ἐστι τοῦ μεγαλοπρεποῦς, ἐν ᾧ ἂν ποιῇ γένει, μεγαλοπρεπῶς ποιεῖν (τὸ γὰρ τοιοῦτον οὐκ εὐυπέρβλητον) καὶ ἔχον κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦ δαπανήματος.

τοιοῦτος μὲν οὖν ὁ μεγαλοπρεπής· ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλων καὶ βάναυσος τῷ παρὰ τὸ δέον ἀναλίσκειν ὑπερβάλλει, ὥσπερ εἴρηται. ἐν γὰρ τοῖς μικροῖς τῶν δαπανημάτων πολλὰ ἀναλίσκει καὶ λαμπρύνεται παρὰ μέλος, οἷον ἐρανιστὰς γαμικῶς ἑστιῶν, καὶ κωμῳδοῖς χορηγῶν ἐν τῇ παρόδῳ πορφύραν εἰσφέρων, ὥσπερ οἱ Μεγαροῖ. καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ποιήσει οὐ τοῦ καλοῦ ἕνεκα, ἀλλὰ τὸν πλοῦτον ἐπιδεικνύμενος, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα οἰόμενος θαυμάζεσθαι, καὶ οὗ μὲν δεῖ πολλὰ ἀναλῶσαι, ὀλίγα δαπανῶν, οὗ δ' ὀλίγα, πολλά. ὁ δὲ μικροπρεπὴς περὶ πάντα ἐλλείψει, καὶ τὰ μέγιστα ἀναλώσας ἐν μικρῷ τὸ καλὸν ἀπολεῖ, καὶ ὅ τι ἂν ποιῇ μέλλων καὶ σκοπῶν πῶς

ENGLISH

It also befits those who already have such resources, whether through their own efforts or from their ancestors or from people they are connected with, and the well-born and the famous and so on, since all these things carry greatness and prestige. The magnificent person, then, is above all of this kind, and magnificence lies in expenditures of this kind, as has been said, since these are the greatest and most honored. Among private expenditures it lies in those that happen once, [1123a] such as a wedding or anything of that kind; in anything the whole city, or people of standing, take seriously; in receiving and sending off foreign guests; and in gifts and return gifts. For the magnificent person spends not on himself but on public things, and gifts have something in common with votive offerings.

It is also characteristic of the magnificent person to furnish his house in a way that befits his wealth (since this too is a kind of adornment), and to spend more on works that last a long time (since these are the finest), and in each case on what is fitting; for the same things do not suit gods and human beings, or a temple and a tomb. Each expenditure is great in its own kind: the most magnificent without qualification is a great expenditure on a great object, but in a given case it is what is great in those circumstances. And greatness in the work differs from greatness in the expenditure: the finest ball or oil flask has the magnificence of a present for a child, though its price is small and mean. That is why it is characteristic of the magnificent person, whatever kind of thing he produces, to produce it magnificently (for such a thing is not easily surpassed), and in a way that matches the worth of the expenditure.

Such, then, is the magnificent person. The one who exceeds, the vulgar person, exceeds, as has been said, by spending beyond what is right. On small expenses he spends a great deal and makes a tasteless display—entertaining his dining club as if it were a wedding feast, for instance, or, when funding a chorus for a comedy, bringing it on for its entrance in purple, as they do at Megara. And he will do all such things not for the sake of the fine but to show off his wealth, thinking he is admired for them, spending little where he should spend much and much where he should spend little. The shabby person will fall short in

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἂν ἐλάχιστον ἀναλώσαι, καὶ ταῦτ' ὀδυρόμενος, καὶ πάντ' οἰόμενος μείζω ποιεῖν ἢ δεῖ.	everything. After spending enormous sums he will spoil the fine effect for a trifle; whatever he does, he hesitates and considers how he can spend the least, and even then he grumbles, thinking he is doing everything on a bigger scale than he should.[7]
εἰσὶ μὲν οὖν αἱ ἕξεις αὗται κακίαι, οὐ μὴν ὀνείδη γ' ἐπιφέρουσι διὰ τὸ μήτε βλαβεραὶ τῷ πέλας εἶναι μήτε λίαν ἀσχήμονες.	These states are vices, then, but they do not bring reproach, since they are neither harmful to one's neighbor nor too unseemly.

GREATNESS OF SOUL

Aristotle portrays the great-souled person, who claims great honor and deserves it.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἡ δὲ μεγαλοψυχία περὶ μεγάλα μὲν καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ὀνόματος ἔοικεν εἶναι, περὶ ποῖα δ' ἐστὶ πρῶτον λάβωμεν· 1123b διαφέρει δ' οὐδὲν τὴν ἕξιν ἢ τὸν κατὰ τὴν ἕξιν σκοπεῖν. δοκεῖ δὴ μεγαλόψυχος εἶναι ὁ μεγάλων αὑτὸν ἀξιῶν ἄξιος ὤν· ὁ γὰρ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν αὐτὸ ποιῶν ἠλίθιος, τῶν δὲ κατ' ἀρετὴν οὐδεὶς ἠλίθιος οὐδ' ἀνόητος. μεγαλόψυχος μὲν οὖν ὁ εἰρημένος. ὁ γὰρ μικρῶν ἄξιος καὶ τούτων ἀξιῶν ἑαυτὸν σώφρων, μεγαλόψυχος δ' οὔ· ἐν μεγέθει γὰρ ἡ μεγαλοψυχία, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ κάλλος ἐν μεγάλῳ σώματι, οἱ μικροὶ δ' ἀστεῖοι καὶ σύμμετροι, καλοὶ δ' οὔ. ὁ δὲ μεγάλων ἑαυτὸν ἀξιῶν ἀνάξιος ὢν χαῦνος· ὁ δὲ μειζόνων ἢ ἄξιος οὐ πᾶς χαῦνος.	Greatness of soul seems, even from its name, to be concerned with great things; let us first grasp what sort of things. 1123b It makes no difference whether we examine the state or the person who has it. The great-souled person seems to be one who thinks himself worthy of great things and is worthy of them. For someone who does this beyond his worth is a fool, and no one who acts in accordance with excellence is foolish or senseless. The great-souled person, then, is the one described. For the person who is worthy of small things and thinks himself worthy of them is moderate, but not great-souled; greatness of soul lies in greatness, just as beauty lies in a large body—small people are neat and well proportioned, but not beautiful. The person who thinks himself worthy of great things when he is unworthy of them is vain; but not everyone who thinks himself worthy of more than he is worth is vain.
1123b ὁ δ' ἐλαττόνων ἢ ἄξιος μικρόψυχος, ἐάν τε μεγάλων ἐάν τε μετρίων, ἐάν τε καὶ μικρῶν ἄξιος ὢν ἔτι ἐλαττόνων αὑτὸν ἀξιοῖ. καὶ μάλιστ' ἂν δόξειεν ὁ μεγάλων ἄξιος· τί γὰρ ἂν ἐποίει, εἰ μὴ τοσούτων ἦν ἄξιος; ἔστι δὴ ὁ μεγαλόψυχος τῷ μὲν μεγέθει ἄκρος, τῷ δὲ ὡς δεῖ μέσος· τοῦ γὰρ κατ' ἀξίαν αὑτὸν ἀξιοῖ· οἱ δ' ὑπερβάλλουσι καὶ ἐλλείπουσιν. εἰ δὴ μεγάλων ἑαυτὸν ἀξιοῖ ἄξιος ὤν, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν μεγίστων, περὶ ἓν μάλιστ' ἂν εἴη.	The person who thinks himself worthy of less than he is worth is small-souled, whether he is worthy of great things or moderate ones, or even if he is worthy of small things and thinks himself worthy of still less. And the one who is worthy of great things would seem to be small-souled most of all; for what would he do if he were not worthy of so much? The great-souled person, then, is at an extreme in terms of greatness, but at the mean in terms of doing as he should, since he thinks himself worthy of what he is worth, while the others exceed and fall short. If, then, he thinks himself worthy of great things, and is worthy of them, and

7 Megara, a neighbor of Athens, was known to Athenians for crude comedy; purple-dyed costumes were an extravagant luxury.

GREEK

ENGLISH

above all of the greatest things, he would be concerned above all with one thing.

ἡ δ' ἀξία λέγεται πρὸς τὰ ἐκτὸς ἀγαθά· μέγιστον δὲ τοῦτ' ἂν θείημεν ὃ τοῖς θεοῖς ἀπονέμομεν, καὶ οὗ μάλιστ' ἐφίενται οἱ ἐν ἀξιώματι, καὶ τὸ ἐπὶ τοῖς καλλίστοις ἆθλον· τοιοῦτον δ' ἡ τιμή· μέγιστον γὰρ δὴ τοῦτο τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν· περὶ τιμὰς δὴ καὶ ἀτιμίας ὁ μεγαλόψυχός ἐστιν ὡς δεῖ. καὶ ἄνευ δὲ λόγου φαίνονται οἱ μεγαλόψυχοι περὶ τιμὴν εἶναι· τιμῆς γὰρ μάλιστα οἱ μεγάλοι ἀξιοῦσιν ἑαυτούς, κατ' ἀξίαν δέ. ὁ δὲ μικρόψυχος ἐλλείπει καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν καὶ πρὸς τὸ τοῦ μεγαλοψύχου ἀξίωμα. ὁ δὲ χαῦνος πρὸς ἑαυτὸν μὲν ὑπερβάλλει, οὐ μὴν τόν γε μεγαλόψυχον. ὁ δὲ μεγαλόψυχος, εἴπερ τῶν μεγίστων ἄξιος, ἄριστος ἂν εἴη· μείζονος γὰρ ἀεὶ ὁ βελτίων ἄξιος, καὶ μεγίστων ὁ ἄριστος. τὸν ὡς ἀληθῶς ἄρα μεγαλόψυχον δεῖ ἀγαθὸν εἶναι.

Worth is spoken of in relation to external goods. And we would take the greatest of these to be what we render to the gods, what people of standing most aim at, and the prize awarded for the finest deeds; and such a thing is honor, since this is the greatest of external goods. So the great-souled person is concerned with honors and dishonors as he should be. Even without argument, great-souled people are evidently concerned with honor, since it is honor above all that great people think themselves worthy of, though in accordance with their worth. The small-souled person falls short both in relation to himself and in relation to the worth of the great-souled person. The vain person exceeds in relation to himself, though not in relation to the great-souled person. The great-souled person, since he is worthy of the greatest things, would be the best person; for the better person is always worthy of more, and the best person of the greatest things. So the truly great-souled person must be good.

καὶ δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι μεγαλοψύχου τὸ ἐν ἑκάστῃ ἀρετῇ μέγα. οὐδαμῶς τ' ἂν ἁρμόζοι μεγαλοψύχῳ φεύγειν παρασείσαντι, οὐδ' ἀδικεῖν· τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκα πράξει αἰσχρὰ ᾧ γ' οὐδὲν μέγα; καθ' ἕκαστα δ' ἐπισκοποῦντι πάμπαν γελοῖος φαίνοιτ' ἂν ὁ μεγαλόψυχος μὴ ἀγαθὸς ὤν. οὐκ εἴη δ' ἂν οὐδὲ τιμῆς ἄξιος φαῦλος ὤν· τῆς ἀρετῆς γὰρ ἆθλον ἡ τιμή, καὶ ἀπονέμεται τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς. [1124a] ἔοικε μὲν οὖν ἡ μεγαλοψυχία οἷον κόσμος τις εἶναι τῶν ἀρετῶν· μείζους γὰρ αὐτὰς ποιεῖ, καὶ οὐ γίνεται ἄνευ ἐκείνων. διὰ τοῦτο χαλεπὸν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ μεγαλόψυχον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἄνευ καλοκαγαθίας.

And what is great in each excellence would seem to belong to the great-souled person. It would be quite out of character for a great-souled person to run away with his arms flailing, or to do wrong; for why would someone do shameful things when nothing is great to him? And if we look at the particulars one by one, a great-souled person who was not good would appear utterly ridiculous. Nor would he be worthy of honor if he were bad, since honor is the prize of excellence and is rendered to the good. [1124a] Greatness of soul seems, then, to be a kind of adornment of the excellences, since it makes them greater and does not arise without them. That is why it is hard to be truly great-souled: it is impossible without being fine and good in every respect.

1124a μάλιστα μὲν οὖν περὶ τιμὰς καὶ ἀτιμίας ὁ μεγαλόψυχός ἐστι· καὶ ἐπὶ μὲν ταῖς μεγάλαις καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν σπουδαίων μετρίως ἡσθήσεται, ὡς τῶν οἰκείων τυγχάνων ἢ καὶ ἐλαττόνων· ἀρετῆς γὰρ παντελοῦς οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο ἀξία τιμή, οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἀποδέξεταί γε τῷ μὴ ἔχειν αὐτοὺς μείζω αὐτῷ ἀπονέμειν· τῆς δὲ παρὰ τῶν τυχόντων καὶ ἐπὶ μικροῖς πάμπαν ὀλιγωρήσει· οὐ γὰρ τούτων ἄξιος· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἀτιμίας· οὐ γὰρ ἔσται δικαίως περὶ αὐτόν. μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἐστίν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, ὁ μεγαλόψυχος περὶ τιμάς, οὐ μὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ πλοῦτον καὶ δυναστείαν καὶ πᾶσαν

It is chiefly with honors and dishonors, then, that the great-souled person is concerned. At great honors conferred by excellent people he will be moderately pleased, as getting what is properly his, or even less; for no honor could be worthy of complete excellence. Still, he will accept it, since they have nothing greater to bestow on him. But honor from just anyone, and for small things, he will utterly disdain, since that is not what he is worthy of; and likewise dishonor, since it will not

GREEK

εὐτυχίαν καὶ ἀτυχίαν μετρίως ἕξει, ὅπως ἂν γίνηται, καὶ οὔτ' εὐτυχῶν περιχαρὴς ἔσται οὔτ' ἀτυχῶν περίλυπος. οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ τιμὴν οὕτως ἔχει ὡς μέγιστον ὄν.

αἱ γὰρ δυναστεῖαι καὶ ὁ πλοῦτος διὰ τὴν τιμήν ἐστιν αἱρετά· οἱ γοῦν ἔχοντες αὐτὰ τιμᾶσθαι δι' αὐτῶν βούλονται· ᾧ δὲ καὶ ἡ τιμὴ μικρόν ἐστι, τούτῳ καὶ τἆλλα. διὸ ὑπερόπται δοκοῦσιν εἶναι. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τὰ εὐτυχήματα συμβάλλεσθαι πρὸς μεγαλοψυχίαν. οἱ γὰρ εὐγενεῖς ἀξιοῦνται τιμῆς καὶ οἱ δυναστεύοντες ἢ πλουτοῦντες· ἐν ὑπεροχῇ γάρ, τὸ δ' ἀγαθῷ ὑπερέχον πᾶν ἐντιμότερον. διὸ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα μεγαλοψυχοτέρους ποιεῖ· τιμῶνται γὰρ ὑπὸ τινῶν· κατ' ἀλήθειαν δ' ὁ ἀγαθὸς μόνος τιμητός· ᾧ δ' ἄμφω ὑπάρχει, μᾶλλον ἀξιοῦται τιμῆς. οἱ δ' ἄνευ ἀρετῆς τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀγαθὰ ἔχοντες οὔτε δικαίως ἑαυτοὺς μεγάλων ἀξιοῦσιν οὔτε ὀρθῶς μεγαλόψυχοι λέγονται· ἄνευ γὰρ ἀρετῆς παντελοῦς οὐκ ἔστι ταῦτα. ὑπερόπται δὲ καὶ ὑβρισταὶ καὶ οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔχοντες ἀγαθὰ γίνονται.

ἄνευ γὰρ ἀρετῆς οὐ ῥᾴδιον φέρειν ἐμμελῶς τὰ εὐτυχήματα· [1124b] οὐ δυνάμενοι δὲφέρειν καὶ οἰόμενοι τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερέχειν ἐκείνων μὲν καταφρονοῦσιν, αὐτοὶ δ' ὅ τι ἂν τύχωσι πράττουσιν. μιμοῦνται γὰρ τὸν μεγαλόψυχον οὐχ ὅμοιοι ὄντες, τοῦτο δὲ δρῶσιν ἐν οἷς δύνανται· τὰ μὲν οὖν κατ' ἀρετὴν οὐ πράττουσι, καταφρονοῦσι δὲ τῶν ἄλλων. ὁ μὲν γὰρ μεγαλόψυχος δικαίως καταφρονεῖ (δοξάζει γὰρ ἀληθῶς), οἱ δὲ πολλοὶ τυχόντως. οὐκ ἔστι δὲ μικροκίνδυνος οὐδὲ φιλοκίνδυνος διὰ τὸ ὀλίγα τιμᾶν, μεγαλοκίνδυνος δέ, καὶ ὅταν κινδυνεύῃ, ἀφειδὴς τοῦ βίου ὡς οὐκ ἄξιον ὂν πάντως ζῆν. καὶ οἷος εὖ ποιεῖν, εὐεργετούμενος δ' αἰσχύνεται· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ὑπερέχοντος, τὸ δ' ὑπερεχομένου. καὶ ἀντευεργετικὸς πλειόνων· οὕτω γάρ οἱ προσοφλήσει ὁ ὑπάρξας καὶ ἔσται εὖ πεπονθώς.

ENGLISH

justly apply to him. So although, as has been said, the great-souled person is concerned chiefly with honors, he will nevertheless also be moderately disposed toward wealth and power and every kind of good and bad fortune, however it turns out; he will be neither overjoyed at good fortune nor overwhelmed by bad. For he does not even regard honor as the greatest thing.

For power and wealth are choiceworthy because of honor; at any rate, those who have them want to be honored for them. But someone to whom even honor is a small thing will regard the rest as small too. That is why great-souled people are thought to be disdainful. Good fortune is also thought to contribute to greatness of soul. For the well-born are thought worthy of honor, and so are the powerful and the wealthy, since they stand in a position of superiority, and whatever is superior in something good is held in greater honor. So things like these also make people more great-souled, because they are honored by some for them. In truth, though, only the good person deserves honor; but someone who has both is thought more worthy of honor. Those who have goods of this sort without excellence neither have a just claim to think themselves worthy of great things nor are rightly called great-souled, since that is impossible without complete excellence. Instead, people who have such goods become disdainful and arrogant too.

For without excellence it isn't easy to bear good fortune gracefully. [1124b] Unable to bear it, and thinking themselves superior to everyone else, they look down on others while themselves doing whatever they happen to feel like. They imitate the great-souled person without being like him, and they do so where they can: they don't perform the actions that come from excellence, but they do look down on others. For the great-souled person is justified in his disdain, since his judgments are true, whereas most people's disdain is random. He doesn't court small dangers, nor is he fond of danger, since there are few things he values highly; but he will face great dangers, and when he does, he doesn't spare his life, since he thinks life is not worth living at any price. He is the sort to do good turns, but he is ashamed to receive them, since the one is the mark of a superior, the other of an inferior. And he repays a benefit with a

GREEK

ENGLISH

greater one, since that way the one who started it will end up in his debt in turn and will be the one who has been well treated.

1124b δοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ μνημονεύειν οὗ ἂν ποιήσωσιν εὖ, ὧν δ' ἂν πάθωσιν οὔ (ἐλάττων γὰρ ὁ παθὼν εὖ τοῦ ποιήσαντος, βούλεται δ' ὑπερέχειν), καὶ τὰ μὲν ἡδέως ἀκούειν, τὰ δ' ἀηδῶς· διὸ καὶ τὴν Θέτιν οὐ λέγειν τὰς εὐεργεσίας τῷ Διί, οὐδ' οἱ Λάκωνες πρὸς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους, ἀλλ' ἃ πεπόνθεσαν εὖ.

Such people also seem to remember the good they do but not the good they receive (for the recipient of a benefit is inferior to the benefactor, and the great-souled person wants to be superior), and to enjoy hearing about the former but not the latter. That, it seems, is why Thetis doesn't mention to Zeus the services she has done him, and why the Spartans didn't mention theirs to the Athenians, but only the benefits they had received.[8]

μεγαλοψύχου δὲ καὶ τὸ μηδενὸς δεῖσθαι ἢ μόλις, ὑπηρετεῖν δὲ προθύμως, καὶ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἐν ἀξιώματι καὶ εὐτυχίαις μέγαν εἶναι, πρὸς δὲ τοὺς μέσους μέτριον· τῶν μὲν γὰρ ὑπερέχειν χαλεπὸν καὶ σεμνόν, τῶν δὲ ῥᾴδιον, καὶ ἐπ' ἐκείνοις μὲν σεμνύνεσθαι οὐκ ἀγεννές, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ταπεινοῖς φορτικόν, ὥσπερ εἰς τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς ἰσχυρίζεσθαι· καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔντιμα μὴ ἰέναι, ἢ οὗ πρωτεύουσιν ἄλλοι· καὶ ἀργὸν εἶναι καὶ μελλητὴν ἀλλ' ἢ ὅπου τιμὴ μεγάλη ἢ ἔργον, καὶ ὀλίγων μὲν πρακτικόν, μεγάλων δὲ καὶ ὀνομαστῶν.

It is also characteristic of the great-souled person to need nothing, or scarcely anything, yet to be eager to help others; and to carry himself with dignity toward people of rank and good fortune, but with moderation toward those of the middling sort. For it is difficult and impressive to be superior to the former, but easy to be superior to the latter; and to put on airs among the former is not ill-bred, while to do so among humble people is vulgar, like showing off one's strength against the weak. He also doesn't go after the usual objects of honor, or things where others hold first place. He is idle and slow to act except where great honor or a great deed is at stake; and he does few things, but those great and notable.

ἀναγκαῖον δὲ καὶ φανερομισῆ εἶναι καὶ φανερόφιλον (τὸ γὰρ λανθάνειν φοβουμένου, καὶ ἀμελεῖν τῆς ἀληθείας μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς δόξης), καὶ λέγειν καὶ πράττειν φανερῶς (παρρησιαστὴς γὰρ διὰ τὸ καταφρονητικὸς εἶναι, καὶ ἀληθευτικός, πλὴν ὅσα μὴ δι' εἰρωνείαν εἰρωνεία δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολλούς), καὶ πρὸς ἄλλον μὴ δύνασθαι ζῆν ἀλλ' ἢ φίλον· 1125a δουλικὸν γάρ· διὸ καὶ πάντες οἱ κόλακες θητικοὶ καὶ οἱ ταπεινοὶ κόλακες. οὐδὲ θαυμαστικός· οὐδὲν γὰρ μέγα αὐτῷ ἐστίν. οὐδὲ μνησίκακος· οὐ γὰρ μεγαλοψύχου τὸ ἀπομνημονεύειν, ἄλλως τε καὶ κακά, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον παρορᾶν. οὐδ' ἀνθρωπολόγος· οὔτε γὰρ περὶ αὑτοῦ ἐρεῖ οὔτε περὶ ἑτέρου· οὔτε γὰρ ἵνα ἐπαινῆται μέλει αὐτῷ οὔθ' ὅπως οἱ ἄλλοι ψέγωνται· οὐδ' αὖ ἐπαινετικός ἐστιν· διόπερ οὐδὲ κακολόγος, οὐδὲ τῶν ἐχθρῶν, εἰ μὴ δι' ὕβριν.

He must also be open in his hatreds and open in his friendships (for concealment belongs to someone who is afraid, and to care less for the truth than for what people will think), and he must speak and act openly. For he speaks frankly because he is disdainful, and he is truthful, except when he is being self-deprecating, as he is with the many. He is also unable to live in dependence on another, unless it is a friend, 1125a since that is slavish. That is why all flatterers are servile, and people of low standing are flatterers. Nor is he given to admiration, since nothing is great to him. Nor does he bear grudges, since it isn't characteristic of a great-souled person to keep remembering things, especially wrongs; rather, he overlooks them. Nor is he a gossip: he won't talk about himself or about anyone else, since he isn't concerned to be praised or to have others blamed. Then again, he isn't given to praising others either. So he

8 Thetis, the sea goddess and mother of Achilles, petitions Zeus in the first book of Homer's *Iliad*.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	doesn't speak ill of others, not even of his enemies, except to insult them deliberately.
1125a καὶ περὶ ἀναγκαίων ἢ μικρῶν ἥκιστα ὀλοφυρτικὸς καὶ δεητικός· σπουδάζοντος γὰρ οὕτως ἔχειν περὶ ταῦτα. καὶ οἷος κεκτῆσθαι μᾶλλον τὰ καλὰ καὶ ἄκαρπα τῶν καρπίμων καὶ ὠφελίμων· αὐτάρκους γὰρ μᾶλλον. καὶ κίνησις δὲ βραδεῖα τοῦ μεγαλοψύχου δοκεῖ εἶναι, καὶ φωνὴ βαρεῖα, καὶ λέξις στάσιμος· οὐ γὰρ σπευστικὸς ὁ περὶ ὀλίγα σπουδάζων, οὐδὲ σύντονος ὁ μηδὲν μέγα οἰόμενος· ἡ δ' ὀξυφωνία καὶ ἡ ταχυτὴς διὰ τούτων. τοιοῦτος μὲν οὖν ὁ μεγαλόψυχος· ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων μικρόψυχος, ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλων χαῦνος. οὐ κακοὶ μὲν οὖν δοκοῦσιν εἶναι οὐδ' οὗτοι (οὐ γὰρ κακοποιοί εἰσιν), ἡμαρτημένοι δέ.	And about necessities or small matters he is the last person to lament or plead, since to behave that way about such things is the mark of someone who takes them seriously. He is also the sort to own beautiful things that bring no return rather than profitable and useful ones, since that is more fitting for someone self-sufficient. The great-souled person is also thought to have a slow gait, a deep voice and a steady way of speaking. For someone who takes few things seriously is not in a hurry, and someone who thinks nothing is great is not tense; shrillness of voice and haste come from those things. Such, then, is the great-souled person. The one who falls short is small-souled, and the one who exceeds is vain. These people too are not thought to be bad (since they do no harm), but mistaken.
ὁ μὲν γὰρ μικρόψυχος ἄξιος ὢν ἀγαθῶν ἑαυτὸν ἀποστερεῖ ὧν ἄξιός ἐστι, καὶ ἔοικε κακὸν ἔχειν τι ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἀξιοῦν ἑαυτὸν τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ ἀγνοεῖν δ' ἑαυτόν· ὠρέγετο γὰρ ἂν ὧν ἄξιος ἦν, ἀγαθῶν γε ὄντων. οὐ μὴν ἠλίθιοί γε οἱ τοιοῦτοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ὀκνηροί. ἡ τοιαύτη δὲ δόξα δοκεῖ καὶ χείρους ποιεῖν· ἕκαστοι γὰρ ἐφίενται τῶν κατ' ἀξίαν, ἀφίστανται δὲ καὶ τῶν πράξεων τῶν καλῶν καὶ τῶν ἐπιτηδευμάτων ὡς ἀνάξιοι ὄντες, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν. οἱ δὲ χαῦνοι ἠλίθιοι καὶ ἑαυτοὺς ἀγνοοῦντες, καὶ ταῦτ' ἐπιφανῶς· οὐ γὰρ ἄξιοι ὄντες τοῖς ἐντίμοις ἐπιχειροῦσιν, εἶτα ἐξελέγχονται· καὶ ἐσθῆτι κοσμοῦνται καὶ σχήματι καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις, καὶ βούλονται τὰ εὐτυχήματα καὶ φανερὰ εἶναι αὐτῶν, καὶ λέγουσι περὶ αὐτῶν ὡς διὰ τούτων τιμηθησόμενοι.	For the small-souled person, though worthy of good things, deprives himself of what he deserves, and seems to have something bad about him from not thinking himself worthy of good things, and seems not to know himself; otherwise he would have reached for what he deserved, since those things are good. Yet such people are not thought to be foolish, but rather timid. But this sort of opinion of themselves seems actually to make them worse. For each kind of person aims at what accords with their worth; and these people hold back from fine actions and pursuits because they consider themselves unworthy, and likewise from external goods. Vain people, on the other hand, are foolish and don't know themselves, and this is plain to see. For they attempt honorable undertakings though they aren't worthy of them, and then they are shown up. They adorn themselves with clothes and posturing and the like; they want their good fortune to be conspicuous, and they talk about it, as though they will be honored for it.
ἀντιτίθεται δὲ τῇ μεγαλοψυχίᾳ ἡ μικροψυχία μᾶλλον τῆς χαυνότητος· καὶ γὰρ γίνεται μᾶλλον καὶ χεῖρόν ἐστιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν μεγαλοψυχία περὶ τιμήν ἐστι μεγάλην, ὥσπερ εἴρηται.	Smallness of soul is more opposed to greatness of soul than vanity is, since it is both more common and worse. Greatness of soul, then, is concerned with great honor, as has been said.

AMBITION AND ITS NAMELESS MEAN

Aristotle identifies an unnamed mean concerning ordinary honor, between ambition and lack of ambition.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
1125b	ἔοικε δὲ καὶ περὶ ταύτην εἶναι ἀρετή τις, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἐλέχθη, ἡ δόξειεν ἂν παραπλησίως ἔχειν πρὸς τὴν μεγαλοψυχίαν ὥσπερ καὶ ἡ ἐλευθεριότης πρὸς τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν. ἄμφω γὰρ αὗται τοῦ μὲν μεγάλου ἀφεστᾶσι, περὶ δὲ τὰ μέτρια καὶ μικρὰ διατιθέασιν ἡμᾶς ὡς δεῖ· ὥσπερ δ' ἐν λήψει καὶ δόσει χρημάτων μεσότης ἔστι καὶ ὑπερβολή τε καὶ ἔλλειψις, οὕτω καὶ ἐν τιμῆς ὀρέξει τὸ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ ἧττον, καὶ τὸ ὅθεν δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ. τόν τε γὰρ φιλότιμον ψέγομεν ὡς μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ τῆς τιμῆς ἐφιέμενον, τόν τε ἀφιλότιμον ὡς οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῖς καλοῖς προαιρούμενον τιμᾶσθαι.	But there also seems to be an excellence concerned with honor, as was said in our first discussion, which would seem to be related to greatness of soul much as generosity is related to magnificence. For both of these stand apart from what is great, and dispose us as we should be toward moderate and small matters. Just as in the taking and giving of money there is a mean, and an excess and a deficiency, so too in the desire for honor there is more than one should and less, and seeking it from the right sources and in the right way. For we blame the ambitious person for aiming at honor more than he should and from the wrong sources, and the unambitious person for not choosing to be honored even for fine things.
	ἔστι δ' ὅτε τὸν φιλότιμον ἐπαινοῦμεν ὡς ἀνδρώδη καὶ φιλόκαλον, τὸν δ' ἀφιλότιμον ὡς μέτριον καὶ σώφρονα, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις εἴπομεν. δῆλον δ' ὅτι πλεοναχῶς τοῦ φιλοτοιούτου λεγομένου οὐκ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ φέρομεν ἀεὶ τὸ φιλότιμον, ἀλλ' ἐπαινοῦντες μὲν ἐπὶ τὸ μᾶλλον ἢ οἱ πολλοί, ψέγοντες δ' ἐπὶ τὸ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ. ἀνωνύμου δ' οὔσης τῆς μεσότητος, ὡς ἐρήμης ἔοικεν ἀμφισβητεῖν τὰ ἄκρα. ἐν οἷς δ' ἔστιν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις, καὶ τὸ μέσον· ὀρέγονται δὲ τῆς τιμῆς καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ ἧττον· ἔστι δὴ καὶ ὡς δεῖ· ἐπαινεῖται δ' οὖν ἡ ἕξις αὕτη, μεσότης οὖσα περὶ τιμὴν ἀνώνυμος. φαίνεται δὲ πρὸς μὲν τὴν φιλοτιμίαν ἀφιλοτιμία, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀφιλοτιμίαν φιλοτιμία, πρὸς ἀμφότερα δὲ ἀμφότερά πως.	But sometimes we praise the ambitious person as manly and a lover of what is fine, and the unambitious person as modest and moderate, as we also said in our first discussion. It is clear that, since "lover of such-and-such" is said in more than one way, we don't always apply the term "lover of honor" to the same thing: when we praise, we apply it to loving honor more than most people do; when we blame, to loving it more than one should. And since the mean has no name, the extremes seem to dispute over it as if it were unclaimed. But where there is excess and deficiency, there is also a mean. People desire honor both more than they should and less; so it is also possible to desire it as one should. In any case, this state is praised, being a nameless mean concerned with honor. Compared with ambition it appears as lack of ambition, compared with lack of ambition it appears as ambition, and compared with both it appears in a way as both.
	ἔοικε δὲ τοῦτ' εἶναι καὶ περὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετάς. ἀντικεῖσθαι δ' ἐνταῦθ' οἱ ἄκροι φαίνονται διὰ τὸ μὴ ὠνομάσθαι τὸν μέσον.	This seems to hold of the other excellences too. But in this case the extremes appear to be opposed only to each other, because the person in the middle has not been given a name.

GENTLENESS

Aristotle treats gentleness as the mean concerning anger, between irascibility and lack of spirit.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πραότης δ' ἐστὶ μεσότης περὶ ὀργάς· ἀνωνύμου δ' ὄντος τοῦ μέσου, σχεδὸν δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄκρων, ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον τὴν πραότητα φέρομεν, πρὸς τὴν ἔλλειψιν ἀποκλίνουσαν, ἀνώνυμον οὖσαν. ἡ δ' ὑπερβολὴ ὀργιλότης τις λέγοιτ' ἄν. τὸ μὲν γὰρ πάθος ἐστὶν ὀργή, τὰ δ' ἐμποιοῦντα πολλὰ καὶ διαφέροντα. ὁ μὲν οὖν ἐφ' οἷς δεῖ καὶ οἷς δεῖ ὀργιζόμενος, ἔτι δὲ καὶ ὡς δεῖ καὶ ὅτε καὶ ὅσον χρόνον, ἐπαινεῖται· πρᾶος δὴ οὗτος ἂν εἴη, εἴπερ ἡ πραότης ἐπαινεῖται. βούλεται γὰρ ὁ πρᾶος ἀτάραχος εἶναι καὶ μὴ ἄγεσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους, ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν ὁ λόγος τάξῃ, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον χρόνον χαλεπαίνειν· 1126a ἁμαρτάνειν δὲ δοκεῖ μᾶλλον ἐπὶ τὴν ἔλλειψιν· οὐ γὰρ τιμωρητικὸς ὁ πρᾶος, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον συγγνωμονικός.	Gentleness is a mean concerned with anger. Since the middle state has no name, and the extremes are almost nameless too, we apply "gentleness" to the middle state, though it leans toward the deficiency, which has no name. The excess might be called a kind of irascibility. For the feeling is anger, but what produces it is many and various. The person who gets angry at the right things and with the right people, and also in the right way, at the right time and for the right length of time, is praised. This, then, would be the gentle person, since gentleness is praised. For the gentle person wants to be unperturbed and not to be led by his feeling, but to be angry in the way reason prescribes, at the things and for the length of time it prescribes. 1126a But he seems to err rather in the direction of deficiency, since the gentle person is not inclined to revenge, but rather to forgiveness.
1126a ἡ δ' ἔλλειψις, εἴτ' ἀοργησία τίς ἐστιν εἴθ' ὅ τι δή ποτε, ψέγεται. οἱ γὰρ μὴ ὀργιζόμενοι ἐφ' οἷς δεῖ ἠλίθιοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, καὶ οἱ μὴ ὡς δεῖ μηδ' ὅτε μηδ' οἷς δεῖ· δοκεῖ γὰρ οὐκ αἰσθάνεσθαι οὐδὲ λυπεῖσθαι, μὴ ὀργιζόμενός τε οὐκ εἶναι ἀμυντικός, τὸ δὲ προπηλακιζόμενον ἀνέχεσθαι καὶ τοὺς οἰκείους περιορᾶν ἀνδραποδῶδες. ἡ δ' ὑπερβολὴ κατὰ πάντα μὲν γίνεται (καὶ γὰρ οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς οὐ δεῖ, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, καὶ θᾶττον, καὶ πλείω χρόνον), οὐ μὴν ἅπαντά γε τῷ αὐτῷ ὑπάρχει. οὐ γὰρ ἂν δύναιτ' εἶναι· τὸ γὰρ κακὸν καὶ ἑαυτὸ ἀπόλλυσι, κἂν ὁλόκληρον ᾖ, ἀφόρητον γίνεται.	The deficiency, whether it is a kind of unirascibility or whatever it may be, is blamed. For those who don't get angry at the things they should are thought to be fools, and so are those who don't get angry in the right way, at the right time, or with the right people. Such a person seems not to perceive things or be pained by them, and, since he doesn't get angry, not to be inclined to defend himself; and to put up with being insulted, and to let one's own people be insulted, is slavish. The excess occurs in all these respects (being angry with the wrong people, at the wrong things, more than one should, more quickly, and for longer), but not all of them belong to the same person. That would be impossible, since what is bad destroys even itself, and if it is present in full it becomes unbearable.
οἱ μὲν οὖν ὀργίλοι ταχέως μὲν ὀργίζονται καὶ οἷς οὐ δεῖ καὶ ἐφ' οἷς οὐ δεῖ καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, παύονται δὲ ταχέως· ὃ καὶ βέλτιστον ἔχουσιν. συμβαίνει δ' αὐτοῖς τοῦτο, ὅτι οὐ κατέχουσι τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλ' ἀνταποδιδόασιν ᾗ φανεροί εἰσι διὰ τὴν ὀξύτητα, εἶτ' ἀποπαύονται. ὑπερβολῇ δ' εἰσὶν οἱ ἀκρόχολοι ὀξεῖς καὶ πρὸς πᾶν ὀργίλοι καὶ ἐπὶ παντί· ὅθεν καὶ τοὔνομα. οἱ δὲ πικροὶ δυσδιάλυτοι, καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ὀργίζονται· κατέχουσι γὰρ τὸν θυμόν. παῦλα δὲ γίνεται ὅταν ἀνταποδιδῷ· ἡ γὰρ τιμωρία παύει τῆς ὀργῆς, ἡδονὴν ἀντὶ τῆς λύπης ἐμποιοῦσα. τούτου δὲ μὴ γινομένου τὸ	Irascible people, then, get angry quickly, with the wrong people, at the wrong things and more than they should, but they stop quickly, which is the best thing about them. This happens to them because they don't hold their anger in, but, being quick-tempered, retaliate openly and then stop. The choleric are excessively quick, irascible about everything and at every occasion, hence their name. Sulky people are hard to appease and stay angry for a long time, since they keep their anger

GREEK	ENGLISH
βάρος ἔχουσιν· διὰ γὰρ τὸ μὴ ἐπιφανὲς εἶναι οὐδὲ συμπείθει αὐτοὺς οὐδείς, ἐν αὑτῷ δὲ πέψαι τὴν ὀργὴν χρόνου δεῖ. εἰσὶ δ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἑαυτοῖς ὀχληρότατοι καὶ τοῖς μάλιστα φίλοις.	in. It stops when they retaliate, for revenge puts an end to anger by producing pleasure in place of pain. If this doesn't happen, they carry the weight of it; for since it isn't out in the open, no one even tries to talk them round, and digesting one's anger inside oneself takes time. People like this are most troublesome to themselves and to their closest friends.[9]
χαλεποὺς δὲ λέγομεν τοὺς ἐφ' οἷς τε μὴ δεῖ χαλεπαίνοντας καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ καὶ πλείω χρόνον, καὶ μὴ διαλλαττομένους ἄνευ τιμωρίας ἢ κολάσεως. τῇ πραότητι δὲ μᾶλλον τὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἀντιτίθεμεν· καὶ γὰρ μᾶλλον γίνεται· ἀνθρωπικώτερον γὰρ τὸ τιμωρεῖσθαι· καὶ πρὸς τὸ συμβιοῦν οἱ χαλεποὶ χείρους. ὃ δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρότερον εἴρηται, καὶ ἐκ τῶν λεγομένων δῆλον· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον διορίσαι τὸ πῶς καὶ τίσι καὶ ἐπὶ ποίοις καὶ πόσον χρόνον ὀργιστέον, καὶ τὸ μέχρι τίνος ὀρθῶς ποιεῖ τις ἢ ἁμαρτάνει. ὁ μὲν γὰρ μικρὸν παρεκβαίνων οὐ ψέγεται, οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ μᾶλλον οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ ἧττον· ἐνίοτε γὰρ τοὺς ἐλλείποντας ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ πράους φαμέν, [1126b] καὶ τοὺς χαλεπαίνοντας ἀνδρώδεις ὡς δυναμένους ἄρχειν.	We call "bad-tempered" those who are angry at the wrong things, more than they should be and for longer, and who aren't reconciled without revenge or punishment. It is the excess that we set more in opposition to gentleness, since it occurs more often (for taking revenge is more human), and bad-tempered people are worse to live with. What was said earlier is also clear from what we are saying now: it isn't easy to determine how, with whom, at what and for how long one should be angry, and up to what point one acts rightly or goes wrong. For someone who strays a little, whether toward more or toward less, is not blamed; sometimes we praise those who fall short and call them gentle, [1126b] and call those who are harsh manly, as being capable of ruling.
1126b ὁ δὴ πόσον καὶ πῶς παρεκβαίνων ψεκτός, οὐ ῥᾴδιον τῷ λόγῳ ἀποδοῦναι· ἐν γὰρ τοῖς καθ' ἕκαστα κἀν τῇ αἰσθήσει ἡ κρίσις. ἀλλὰ τό γε τοσοῦτον δῆλον, ὅτι ἡ μὲν μέση ἕξις ἐπαινετή, καθ' ἣν οἷς δεῖ ὀργιζόμεθα καὶ ἐφ' οἷς δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα, αἱ δ' ὑπερβολαὶ καὶ ἐλλείψεις ψεκταί, καὶ ἐπὶ μικρὸν μὲν γινόμεναι ἠρέμα, ἐπὶ πλέον δὲ μᾶλλον, ἐπὶ πολὺ δὲ σφόδρα. δῆλον οὖν ὅτι τῆς μέσης ἕξεως ἀνθεκτέον. αἱ μὲν οὖν περὶ τὴν ὀργὴν ἕξεις εἰρήσθωσαν.	So how far and in what way someone must stray to be blameworthy is not easy to state in an account, since the judgment lies in particulars and in perception. But this much at least is clear: the middle state is praiseworthy, the one 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 deficiencies are blameworthy—mildly so if they go a little way, more so if further, and severely if a long way. Clearly, then, we should hold to the middle state. So much, then, for the states concerned with anger.

FRIENDLINESS AND FLATTERY

Aristotle describes the unnamed mean in social life between obsequiousness and quarrelsomeness.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὁμιλίαις καὶ τῷ συζῆν καὶ λόγων καὶ πραγμάτων κοινωνεῖν οἳ μὲν ἄρεσκοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι, οἱ πάντα πρὸς ἡδονὴν ἐπαινοῦντες καὶ οὐθὲν ἀντιτείνοντες, ἀλλ' οἰόμενοι δεῖν ἄλυποι τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν εἶναι· οἱ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίας τούτοις πρὸς πάντα ἀντιτείνοντες καὶ τοῦ λυπεῖν οὐδ' ὁτιοῦν φροντίζοντες δύσκολοι καὶ δυσέριδες	In social encounters, in living together and in sharing conversation and activities, some people are thought to be obsequious: those who praise everything to give pleasure and never object, but think they must avoid causing pain to whomever they meet. Those who, on the contrary, object to

9 "Choleric" renders *akrocholoi,* literally "bile at the top," i.e. people whose anger is always at the surface.

GREEK

καλοῦνται. ὅτι μὲν οὖν αἱ εἰρημέναι ἕξεις ψεκταί εἰσιν, οὐκ ἄδηλον, καὶ ὅτι ἡ μέση τούτων ἐπαινετή, καθ' ἣν ἀποδέξεται ἃ δεῖ καὶ ὡς δεῖ, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δυσχερανεῖ· ὄνομα δ' οὐκ ἀποδέδοται αὐτῇ τι, ἔοικε δὲ μάλιστα φιλίᾳ. τοιοῦτος γάρ ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν μέσην ἕξιν οἷον βουλόμεθα λέγειν τὸν ἐπιεικῆ φίλον, τὸ στέργειν προσλαβόντα.

διαφέρει δὲ τῆς φιλίας, ὅτι ἄνευ πάθους ἐστὶ καὶ τοῦ στέργειν οἷς ὁμιλεῖ· οὐ γὰρ τῷ φιλεῖν ἢ ἐχθαίρειν ἀποδέχεται ἕκαστα ὡς δεῖ, ἀλλὰ τῷ τοιοῦτος εἶναι. ὁμοίως γὰρ πρὸς ἀγνῶτας καὶ γνωρίμους καὶ συνήθεις καὶ ἀσυνήθεις αὐτὸ ποιήσει, πλὴν καὶ ἐν ἑκάστοις ὡς ἁρμόζει· οὐ γὰρ ὁμοίως προσήκει συνήθων καὶ ὀθνείων φροντίζειν, οὐδ' αὖ λυπεῖν. καθόλου μὲν οὖν εἴρηται ὅτι ὡς δεῖ ὁμιλήσει, ἀναφέρων δὲ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν καὶ τὸ συμφέρον στοχάσεται τοῦ μὴ λυπεῖν ἢ συνηδύνειν.

ἔοικε μὲν γὰρ περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας εἶναι τὰς ἐν ταῖς ὁμιλίαις γινομένας· τούτων δ' ὅσας μὲν αὐτῷ ἐστὶ μὴ καλὸν ἢ βλαβερὸν συνηδύνειν, δυσχερανεῖ, καὶ προαιρήσεται λυπεῖν· κἂν τῷ ποιοῦντι δ' ἀσχημοσύνην φέρῃ, καὶ ταύτην μὴ μικράν, ἢ βλάβην, ἡ δ' ἐναντίωσις μικρὰν λύπην, οὐκ ἀποδέξεται ἀλλὰ δυσχερανεῖ. διαφερόντως δ' ὁμιλήσει τοῖς ἐν ἀξιώμασι καὶ τοῖς τυχοῦσι, 1127a καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ ἧττον γνωρίμοις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας διαφοράς, ἑκάστοις ἀπονέμων τὸ πρέπον, καὶ καθ' αὐτὸ μὲν αἱρούμενος τὸ συνηδύνειν, λυπεῖν δ' εὐλαβούμενος, τοῖς δ' ἀποβαίνουσιν, ἐὰν ᾖ μείζω, συνεπόμενος, λέγω δὲ τῷ καλῷ καὶ τῷ συμφέροντι. καὶ ἡδονῆς δ' ἕνεκα τῆς εἰσαῦθις μεγάλης μικρὰ λυπήσει.

1127a ὁ μὲν οὖν μέσος τοιοῦτός ἐστιν, οὐκ ὠνόμασται δέ· τοῦ δὲ συνηδύνοντος ὁ μὲν τοῦ ἡδὺς εἶναι στοχαζόμενος μὴ διά τι ἄλλο ἄρεσκος, ὁ δ' ὅπως ὠφέλειά τις αὐτῷ γίνηται εἰς χρήματα καὶ ὅσα διὰ χρημάτων, κόλαξ· ὁ δὲ πᾶσι δυσχεραίνων εἴρηται ὅτι δύσκολος καὶ δύσερις.

ENGLISH

everything and don't care in the least about causing pain are called cantankerous and quarrelsome. It is plain enough that the states just described are blameworthy, and that the middle state between them is praiseworthy, the one in virtue of which a person will accept what he should and in the way he should, and likewise object. No name has been given to this state, but it most resembles friendship. For the person in the middle state is the kind we mean when we speak of a decent friend, except with affection added.

It differs from friendship in being without feeling or affection for those one associates with. For such a person accepts each thing as he should not because he loves or hates, but because of the sort of person he is. He will behave the same way toward people he doesn't know and people he knows, toward intimates and strangers, though in each case as is fitting; for it isn't appropriate to show the same concern for intimates and for strangers, or, for that matter, to cause them pain in the same way. It has been said in general terms, then, that he will associate with people as he should; and it is by reference to what is fine and what is beneficial that he will aim not to cause pain or to contribute pleasure.

For he seems to be concerned with the pleasures and pains that arise in social encounters. Of these, whenever it is not fine, or is harmful, for him to share in someone's pleasure, he will object and decide to cause pain instead. And if something would bring discredit, and no small discredit, or harm to the person doing it, while opposing it would cause only a little pain, he won't accept it but will object. He will behave differently with people of rank and with ordinary people, 1127a and with those he knows more or less well, and similarly with respect to other differences, giving each what is fitting. In itself he prefers to contribute pleasure and is wary of causing pain, but he is guided by the consequences if these are weightier —I mean consequences for what is fine and beneficial. And for the sake of a great pleasure later on, he will cause small pains.

Such, then, is the person in the middle, but he has no name. Of those who contribute to others' pleasure, the one who aims at being pleasant for no further reason is obsequious, while the one who does it to get some advantage for himself, in money or

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀντικεῖσθαι δὲ φαίνεται τὰ ἄκρα ἑαυτοῖς διὰ τὸ ἀνώνυμον εἶναι τὸ μέσον.	in what money buys, is a flatterer. The one who objects to everything is, as has been said, cantankerous and quarrelsome. The extremes appear to be opposed to each other because the middle has no name.

TRUTHFULNESS AND BOASTFULNESS

Aristotle describes truthfulness about oneself as the mean between boastfulness and self-deprecation.

GREEK	ENGLISH
περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ δὲ σχεδόν ἐστι καὶ ἡ τῆς ἀλαζονείας καὶ εἰρωνείας μεσότης· ἀνώνυμος δὲ καὶ αὐτή. οὐ χεῖρον δὲ καὶ τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπελθεῖν· μᾶλλόν τε γὰρ ἂν εἰδείημεν τὰ περὶ τὸ ἦθος, καθ' ἕκαστον διελθόντες, καὶ μεσότητας εἶναι τὰς ἀρετὰς πιστεύσαιμεν ἄν, ἐπὶ πάντων οὕτως ἔχον συνιδόντες. ἐν δὴ τῷ συζῆν οἱ μὲν πρὸς ἡδονὴν καὶ λύπην ὁμιλοῦντες εἴρηνται, περὶ δὲ τῶν ἀληθευόντων τε καὶ ψευδομένων εἴπωμεν ὁμοίως ἐν λόγοις καὶ πράξεσι καὶ τῷ προσποιήματι.	The mean between boastfulness and self-deprecation is concerned with roughly the same things, and it too is nameless. It's not a bad idea to go through these states as well; for we would understand what concerns character better if we went through each one, and we would be more confident that the excellences are means once we saw that this holds in every case. Now in living together, those who associate with others with a view to pleasure and pain have been discussed; let us speak in the same way about those who are truthful and those who are false in what they say and do and in the claims they make.
δοκεῖ δὴ ὁ μὲν ἀλαζὼν προσποιητικὸς τῶν ἐνδόξων εἶναι καὶ μὴ ὑπαρχόντων καὶ μειζόνων ἢ ὑπάρχει, ὁ δὲ εἴρων ἀνάπαλιν ἀρνεῖσθαι τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ἢ ἐλάττω ποιεῖν, ὁ δὲ μέσος αὐθέκαστός τις ὢν ἀληθευτικὸς καὶ τῷ βίῳ καὶ τῷ λόγῳ, τὰ ὑπάρχοντα ὁμολογῶν εἶναι περὶ αὑτόν, καὶ οὔτε μείζω οὔτε ἐλάττω. ἔστι δὲ τούτων ἕκαστα καὶ ἕνεκά τινος ποιεῖν καὶ μηδενός. ἕκαστος δ' οἷός ἐστι, τοιαῦτα λέγει καὶ πράττει καὶ οὕτω ζῇ, ἐὰν μή τινος ἕνεκα πράττῃ. καθ' αὑτὸ δὲ τὸ μὲν ψεῦδος φαῦλον καὶ ψεκτόν, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς καλὸν καὶ ἐπαινετόν. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀληθευτικὸς μέσος ὢν ἐπαινετός, οἱ δὲ ψευδόμενοι ἀμφότεροι μὲν ψεκτοί, μᾶλλον δ' ὁ ἀλαζών. περὶ ἑκατέρου δ' εἴπωμεν, πρότερον δὲ περὶ τοῦ ἀληθευτικοῦ.	The boaster, then, is thought to be someone who lays claim to distinctions he doesn't have, or greater ones than he has; the self-deprecator, conversely, to be someone who disclaims what he has or makes it smaller; and the person in the middle, being straightforward, to be truthful both in how he lives and in what he says, acknowledging what he has, neither more nor less. Each of these things can be done for some purpose or for none. And each person speaks and acts and lives in accordance with the sort of person he is, unless he is acting for some purpose. In itself, falsehood is base and blameworthy, and truth fine and praiseworthy. So too the truthful person, being in the middle, is praiseworthy, while both kinds of false person are blameworthy, but the boaster more so. Let us discuss each of them, beginning with the truthful person.[10]
οὐ γὰρ περὶ τοῦ ἐν ταῖς ὁμολογίαις ἀληθεύοντος λέγομεν, οὐδ' ὅσα εἰς ἀδικίαν ἢ δικαιοσύνην συντείνει [1127b] (ἄλλης γὰρ ἂν εἴη ταῦτ' ἀρετῆς), ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς μηδενὸς τοιούτου διαφέροντος καὶ ἐν λόγῳ καὶ ἐν βίῳ ἀληθεύει τῷ τὴν ἕξιν τοιοῦτος εἶναι. δόξειε δ' ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος ἐπιεικὴς εἶναι. ὁ γὰρ φιλαλήθης, καὶ ἐν οἷς μὴ διαφέρει ἀληθεύων,	We are not talking about someone who is truthful in agreements, or in matters bearing on injustice or justice [1127b] (these would belong to another excellence), but about someone who, in cases where nothing of that kind is at stake, is truthful both in speech and in life because he has that sort of state.

10 "Self-deprecation" renders *eirōneia,* the root of "irony": understatement about oneself.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀληθεύσει καὶ ἐν οἷς διαφέρει ἔτι μᾶλλον· ὡς γὰρ αἰσχρὸν τὸ ψεῦδος εὐλαβήσεται, ὅ γε καὶ καθ' αὑτὸ ηὐλαβεῖτο· ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ἐπαινετός. ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ἀληθοῦς ἀποκλίνει· ἐμμελέστερον γὰρ φαίνεται διὰ τὸ ἐπαχθεῖς τὰς ὑπερβολὰς εἶναι.	Such a person would seem to be decent. For a lover of truth, who is truthful even where nothing is at stake, will be all the more truthful where something is; he will avoid falsehood as shameful, since he avoided it even in itself. Such a person is praiseworthy. He leans toward understatement rather than the truth, since this seems in better taste, because exaggerations are tiresome.
1127b ὁ δὲ μείζω τῶν ὑπαρχόντων προσποιούμενος μηδενὸς ἕνεκα φαύλῳ μὲν ἔοικεν (οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχαιρε τῷ ψεύδει), μάταιος δὲ φαίνεται μᾶλλον ἢ κακός· εἰ δ' ἕνεκά τινος, ὁ μὲν δόξης ἢ τιμῆς οὐ λίαν ψεκτός, †ὡς ὁ ἀλαζών,† ὁ δὲ ἀργυρίου, ἢ ὅσα εἰς ἀργύριον, ἀσχημονέστερος (οὐκ ἐν τῇ δυνάμει δ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἀλαζών, ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει· κατὰ τὴν ἕξιν γὰρ καὶ τῷ τοιόσδε εἶναι ἀλαζών ἐστιν)· ὥσπερ καὶ ψεύστης ὃ μὲν τῷ ψεύδει αὐτῷ χαίρων, ὃ δὲ δόξης ὀρεγόμενος ἢ κέρδους. οἱ μὲν οὖν δόξης χάριν ἀλαζονευόμενοι τὰ τοιαῦτα προσποιοῦνται ἐφ' οἷς ἔπαινος ἢ εὐδαιμονισμός, οἱ δὲ κέρδους, ὧν καὶ ἀπόλαυσίς ἐστι τοῖς πέλας καὶ διαλαθεῖν ἔστι μὴ ὄντα, οἷον μάντιν σοφὸν ἰατρόν.	Someone who claims more than he has for no purpose seems to be of a base sort (otherwise he wouldn't enjoy lying), but he appears foolish rather than bad. If he does it for a purpose, then the one who does it for reputation or honor is, for a boaster, not very blameworthy, while the one who does it for money, or for things that bring money, is more disgraceful. (Someone is a boaster not by capacity but by decision; for it is in virtue of his state, and by being a certain sort of person, that he is a boaster.) In the same way, one liar enjoys the lie itself, while another wants reputation or gain. Those who boast for the sake of reputation, then, claim the sort of qualities that bring praise or congratulation, while those who boast for gain claim qualities that others can enjoy and whose absence can go unnoticed, such as being a skilled seer or doctor.
διὰ τοῦτο οἱ πλεῖστοι προσποιοῦνται τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ ἀλαζονεύονται· ἔστι γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὰ εἰρημένα. οἱ δ' εἴρωνες ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον λέγοντες χαριέστεροι μὲν τὰ ἤθη φαίνονται· οὐ γὰρ κέρδους ἕνεκα δοκοῦσι λέγειν, ἀλλὰ φεύγοντες τὸ ὀγκηρόν· μάλιστα δὲ καὶ οὗτοι τὰ ἔνδοξα ἀπαρνοῦνται, οἷον καὶ Σωκράτης ἐποίει. οἱ δὲ τὰ μικρὰ καὶ φανερὰ προσποιούμενοι βαυκοπανοῦργοι λέγονται καὶ εὐκαταφρονητότεροί εἰσιν· καὶ ἐνίοτε ἀλαζονεία φαίνεται, οἷον ἡ τῶν Λακώνων ἐσθής· καὶ γὰρ ἡ ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἡ λίαν ἔλλειψις ἀλαζονικόν. οἱ δὲ μετρίως χρώμενοι τῇ εἰρωνείᾳ καὶ περὶ τὰ μὴ λίαν ἐμποδὼν καὶ φανερὰ εἰρωνευόμενοι χαρίεντες φαίνονται. ἀντικεῖσθαι δ' ὁ ἀλαζὼν φαίνεται τῷ ἀληθευτικῷ· χείρων γάρ.	That is why most people claim such things and boast about them: they have the features just mentioned. Self-deprecators, who understate, appear more refined in character, since they seem to speak not for gain but to avoid pomposity. These people especially disclaim things that bring distinction, as Socrates used to do. But those who disclaim small and obvious things are called humbugs and are more contemptible; and sometimes this is plainly a form of boastfulness, like the Spartan style of dress, since both excess and extreme deficiency are boastful. Those who use self-deprecation in moderation, and about things that are not too commonplace and obvious, appear refined. It is the boaster who appears opposed to the truthful person, since he is worse.[11]

11 Spartans affected a pointedly plain, austere style of dress.

WIT AND TACT

Aristotle treats wit as the mean in amusement between buffoonery and boorishness, then discusses shame.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	οὔσης δὲ καὶ ἀναπαύσεως ἐν τῷ βίῳ, καὶ ἐν ταύτῃ διαγωγῆς μετὰ παιδιᾶς, δοκεῖ καὶ ἐνταῦθα εἶναι ὁμιλία τις ἐμμελής,	Since life also includes rest, and rest includes spending time in amusement, it seems that here too there is a tasteful kind of social exchange:
1128a	καὶ οἷα δεῖ λέγειν καὶ ὥς, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἀκούειν. διοίσει δὲ καὶ τὸ ἐν τοιούτοις λέγειν ἢ τοιούτων ἀκούειν. δῆλον δ' ὡς καὶ περὶ ταῦτ' ἔστιν ὑπερβολή τε καὶ ἔλλειψις τοῦ μέσου. οἱ μὲν οὖν τῷ γελοίῳ ὑπερβάλλοντες βωμολόχοι δοκοῦσιν εἶναι καὶ φορτικοί, γλιχόμενοι πάντως τοῦ γελοίου, καὶ μᾶλλον στοχαζόμενοι τοῦ γέλωτα ποιῆσαι ἢ τοῦ λέγειν εὐσχήμονα καὶ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν σκωπτόμενον· οἱ δὲ μήτ' αὐτοὶ ἂν εἰπόντες μηδὲν γελοῖον τοῖς τε λέγουσι δυσχεραίνοντες ἄγροικοι καὶ σκληροὶ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι.	1128a what one should say and how, and likewise what one should listen to. It will also make a difference what sort of company one is speaking or listening in. Clearly here too there is an excess and a deficiency relative to the mean. Those who go to excess in joking are thought to be buffoons and vulgar, hankering after a laugh at any cost, and aiming more at raising a laugh than at saying what is seemly and not hurting the person they are making fun of. Those who would never say anything funny themselves and are annoyed with those who do are thought to be boorish and stiff.
1128a	οἱ δ' ἐμμελῶς παίζοντες εὐτράπελοι προσαγορεύονται, οἷον εὔτροποι· τοῦ γὰρ ἤθους αἱ τοιαῦται δοκοῦσι κινήσεις εἶναι, ὥσπερ δὲ τὰ σώματα ἐκ τῶν κινήσεων κρίνεται, οὕτω καὶ τὰ ἤθη. ἐπιπολάζοντος δὲ τοῦ γελοίου, καὶ τῶν πλείστων χαιρόντων τῇ παιδιᾷ καὶ τῷ σκώπτειν μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ, καὶ οἱ βωμολόχοι εὐτράπελοι προσαγορεύονται ὡς χαρίεντες· ὅτι δὲ διαφέρουσι, καὶ οὐ μικρόν, ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων δῆλον. τῇ μέσῃ δ' ἕξει οἰκεῖον καὶ ἡ ἐπιδεξιότης ἐστίν· τοῦ δ' ἐπιδεξίου ἐστὶ τοιαῦτα λέγειν καὶ ἀκούειν οἷα τῷ ἐπιεικεῖ καὶ ἐλευθερίῳ ἁρμόττει· ἔστι γάρ τινα πρέποντα τῷ τοιούτῳ λέγειν ἐν παιδιᾶς μέρει καὶ ἀκούειν, καὶ ἡ τοῦ ἐλευθερίου παιδιὰ διαφέρει τῆς τοῦ ἀνδραποδώδους, καὶ πεπαιδευμένου καὶ ἀπαιδεύτου.	Those who joke tastefully are called witty, as it were "quick-turning," since such movements are thought to belong to character; and just as bodies are judged by their movements, so are characters. But since opportunities for laughter are everywhere, and most people enjoy amusement and teasing more than they should, even buffoons are called witty, as though they were refined; but it is clear from what has been said that they differ, and not by a little. Tact also belongs to the middle state. It is characteristic of the tactful person to say and listen to the sort of things that suit a decent and free-spirited person; for there are things that it is fitting for such a person to say and hear by way of amusement, and the amusement of a free-spirited person differs from that of a slavish one, and that of an educated person from that of an uneducated one.[12]
	ἴδοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἐκ τῶν κωμῳδιῶν τῶν παλαιῶν καὶ τῶν καινῶν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ ἦν γελοῖον ἡ αἰσχρολογία, τοῖς δὲ μᾶλλον ἡ ὑπόνοια· διαφέρει δ' οὐ μικρὸν ταῦτα πρὸς εὐσχημοσύνην. πότερον οὖν τὸν εὖ σκώπτοντα ὁριστέον τῷ λέγειν μὴ ἀπρεπῆ ἐλευθερίῳ, ἢ τῷ μὴ λυπεῖν τὸν ἀκούοντα ἢ καὶ τέρπειν; ἢ καὶ τό γε τοιοῦτον ἀόριστον; ἄλλο γὰρ ἄλλῳ μισητόν τε καὶ ἡδύ. τοιαῦτα δὲ καὶ ἀκούσεται· ἃ γὰρ ὑπομένει ἀκούων, ταῦτα καὶ ποιεῖν δοκεῖ. οὐ δὴ πᾶν ποιήσει· τὸ γὰρ σκῶμμα λοιδόρημά τι ἐστίν, οἱ δὲ νομοθέται ἔνια λοιδορεῖν κωλύουσιν· ἔδει δ'	One can see this from the old comedies and the new ones: in the former, obscenity was what made things funny, in the latter it is rather innuendo; and these differ not a little in point of decorum. Should we define the person who jokes well, then, by his saying what isn't unbecoming to a free-spirited person, or by his not causing pain to his listener, or even delighting him? Or is that, at any rate, indeterminate, since different things are hateful or pleasant to different people? He will

12 "Witty" renders *eutrapeloi*, which Aristotle links to *eutropoi*, "turning well" or nimble.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ἴσως καὶ σκώπτειν. ὁ δὴ χαρίεις καὶ ἐλευθέριος οὕτως ἕξει, οἷον νόμος ὢν ἑαυτῷ. τοιοῦτος μὲν οὖν ὁ μέσος ἐστίν, εἴτ' ἐπιδέξιος εἴτ' εὐτράπελος λέγεται.	also listen to the same sort of things, since the jokes a person puts up with hearing are the ones he seems to make himself. So he won't make every kind of joke; for a joke is a kind of abuse, and lawgivers forbid certain kinds of abuse—perhaps they should have forbidden certain kinds of joke too. The refined and free-spirited person, then, will conduct himself in this way, being a law to himself, as it were. Such is the person in the middle, whether he is called tactful or witty.[13]
	ὁ δὲ βωμολόχος ἥττων ἐστὶ τοῦ γελοίου, καὶ οὔτε ἑαυτοῦ οὔτε τῶν ἄλλων ἀπεχόμενος εἰ γέλωτα ποιήσει, καὶ τοιαῦτα λέγων 1128b ὧν οὐδὲν ἂν εἴποι ὁ χαρίεις, ἔνια δ' οὐδ' ἂν ἀκούσαι. ὁ δ' ἄγροικος εἰς τὰς τοιαύτας ὁμιλίας ἀχρεῖος· οὐθὲν γὰρ συμβαλλόμενος πᾶσι δυσχεραίνει. δοκεῖ δὲ ἡ ἀνάπαυσις καὶ ἡ παιδιὰ ἐν τῷ βίῳ εἶναι ἀναγκαῖον. τρεῖς οὖν αἱ εἰρημέναι ἐν τῷ βίῳ μεσότητες, εἰσὶ δὲ πᾶσαι περὶ λόγων τινῶν καὶ πράξεων κοινωνίαν. διαφέρουσι δ' ὅτι ἡ μὲν περὶ ἀλήθειάν ἐστιν, αἱ δὲ περὶ τὸ ἡδύ. τῶν δὲ περὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἡ μὲν ἐν ταῖς παιδιαῖς, ἡ δ' ἐν ταῖς κατὰ τὸν ἄλλον βίον ὁμιλίαις.	The buffoon, on the other hand, is a slave to the laugh, and spares neither himself nor anyone else if he can raise a laugh, saying things 1128b none of which a refined person would say, and some of which he wouldn't even listen to. The boor is useless for such social exchanges, since he contributes nothing and objects to everything. Yet rest and amusement are thought to be necessary in life. The means we have described in life, then, are three, and they are all concerned with sharing in certain kinds of conversation and activity. They differ in that one is concerned with truth, the others with what is pleasant. Of those concerned with pleasure, one is found in amusement, the other in social exchanges in the rest of life.
1128b	περὶ δὲ αἰδοῦς ὥς τινος ἀρετῆς οὐ προσήκει λέγειν· πάθει γὰρ μᾶλλον ἔοικεν ἢ ἕξει. ὁρίζεται γοῦν φόβος τις ἀδοξίας, καὶ ἀποτελεῖται τῷ περὶ τὰ δεινὰ φόβῳ παραπλήσιον· ἐρυθραίνονται γὰρ οἱ αἰσχυνόμενοι, οἱ δὲ τὸν θάνατον φοβούμενοι ὠχριῶσιν. σωματικὰ δὴ φαίνεταί πως εἶναι ἀμφότερα, ὅπερ δοκεῖ πάθους μᾶλλον ἢ ἕξεως εἶναι. οὐ πάσῃ δ' ἡλικίᾳ τὸ πάθος ἁρμόζει, ἀλλὰ τῇ νέᾳ. οἰόμεθα γὰρ δεῖν τοὺς τηλικούτους αἰδήμονας εἶναι διὰ τὸ πάθει ζῶντας πολλὰ ἁμαρτάνειν, ὑπὸ τῆς αἰδοῦς δὲ κωλύεσθαι· καὶ ἐπαινοῦμεν τῶν μὲν νέων τοὺς αἰδήμονας, πρεσβύτερον δ' οὐδεὶς ἂν ἐπαινέσειεν ὅτι αἰσχυντηλός· οὐδὲν γὰρ οἰόμεθα δεῖν αὐτὸν πράττειν ἐφ' οἷς ἐστὶν αἰσχύνη.	It isn't appropriate to speak of shame as an excellence, since it seems more like a feeling than a state. At any rate, it is defined as a kind of fear of disrepute, and its effects resemble those of the fear of terrible things: people who are ashamed blush, while those who fear death turn pale. Both, then, appear to be in a way bodily, which is thought to be characteristic of a feeling rather than a state. The feeling is not fitting at every age, but only in youth. For we think young people should be prone to shame, because they live by feeling and so make many mistakes, but are held back by shame; and we praise young people who are prone to shame, but no one would praise an older person for being given to shame, since we think he shouldn't do anything that gives cause for shame.
	οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶν ἡ αἰσχύνη, εἴπερ γίνεται ἐπὶ τοῖς φαύλοις (οὐ γὰρ πρακτέον τὰ τοιαῦτα· εἰ δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν κατ' ἀλήθειαν αἰσχρὰ τὰ δὲ κατὰ δόξαν, οὐδὲν διαφέρει· οὐδέτερα γὰρ πρακτέα, ὥστ' οὐκ αἰσχυντέον)· φαύλου δὲ καὶ τὸ εἶναι τοιοῦτον οἷον πράττειν τι τῶν αἰσχρῶν. τὸ δ'	For shame is not characteristic of a decent person either, since it arises from bad actions (and such actions shouldn't be done at all; and whether some things are shameful in truth and others only by

13 Athenian "old" comedy (e.g. Aristophanes) was freely obscene; the comedy of Aristotle's own day was more restrained.

GREEK	ENGLISH
οὕτως ἔχειν ὥστ᾽ εἰ πράξαι τι τῶν τοιούτων αἰσχύνεσθαι, καὶ διὰ τοῦτ᾽ οἴεσθαι ἐπιεικῆ εἶναι, ἄτοπον· ἐπὶ τοῖς ἑκουσίοις γὰρ ἡ αἰδώς, ἑκὼν δ᾽ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς οὐδέποτε πράξει τὰ φαῦλα. εἴη δ᾽ ἂν ἡ αἰδὼς ἐξ ὑποθέσεως ἐπιεικές· εἰ γὰρ πράξαι, αἰσχύνοιτ᾽ ἄν· οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο περὶ τὰς ἀρετάς. εἰ δ᾽ ἡ ἀναισχυντία φαῦλον καὶ τὸ μὴ αἰδεῖσθαι τὰ αἰσχρὰ πράττειν, οὐδὲν μᾶλλον τὸν τὰ τοιαῦτα πράττοντα αἰσχύνεσθαι ἐπιεικές.	reputation makes no difference, since neither sort should be done, so one shouldn't have cause for shame). It belongs to a base person even to be the sort of person who does something shameful. And to be so disposed that one would be ashamed if one did something of the kind, and to think oneself decent on that account, is absurd. For shame concerns voluntary actions, and the decent person will never voluntarily do bad things. Shame might be something decent on a hypothesis: if he were to do such a thing, he would be ashamed. But this doesn't apply to the excellences. And if shamelessness—not being ashamed to do shameful things—is bad, it doesn't follow that it is decent to be ashamed when one does such things.
οὐκ ἔστι δ᾽ οὐδ᾽ ἡ ἐγκράτεια ἀρετή, ἀλλά τις μικτή· δειχθήσεται δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς ἐν τοῖς ὕστερον. νῦν δὲ περὶ δικαιοσύνης εἴπωμεν.	Nor is self-control an excellence, but a kind of mixed state; we will discuss it later. Now let us speak about justice.

Book V

Justice

Aristotle distinguishes kinds of justice, including distributive and corrective justice, and discusses equity.

GREEK

ENGLISH

1129a περὶ δὲ δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀδικίας σκεπτέον, περὶ ποίας τε τυγχάνουσιν οὖσαι πράξεις, καὶ ποία μεσότης ἐστὶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ τὸ δίκαιον τίνων μέσον. ἡ δὲ σκέψις ἡμῖν ἔστω κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν μέθοδον τοῖς προειρημένοις. ὁρῶμεν δὴ πάντας τὴν τοιαύτην ἕξιν βουλομένους λέγειν δικαιοσύνην, ἀφ' ἧς πρακτικοὶ τῶν δικαίων εἰσὶ καὶ ἀφ' ἧς δικαιοπραγοῦσι καὶ βούλονται τὰ δίκαια· τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας, ἀφ' ἧς ἀδικοῦσι καὶ βούλονται τὰ ἄδικα. διὸ καὶ ἡμῖν πρῶτον ὡς ἐν τύπῳ ὑποκείσθω ταῦτα. οὐδὲ γὰρ τὸν αὐτὸν ἔχει τρόπον ἐπί τε τῶν ἐπιστημῶν καὶ δυνάμεων καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἕξεων.

With regard to justice and injustice, we must consider what sort of actions they are concerned with, what sort of mean justice is, and between what things the just is a mean. Let our inquiry follow the same method as our earlier discussions. We see that everyone means by justice the sort of state that makes people disposed to do what is just, and makes them act justly and wish for what is just; and in the same way by injustice the state that makes people act unjustly and wish for what is unjust. So let us too first lay these down as an outline. For what holds of sciences and capacities does not hold of states.

δύναμις μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἐπιστήμη δοκεῖ τῶν ἐναντίων ἡ αὐτὴ εἶναι, ἕξις δ' ἡ ἐναντία τῶν ἐναντίων οὔ, οἷον ἀπὸ τῆς ὑγιείας οὐ πράττεται τὰ ἐναντία, ἀλλὰ τὰ ὑγιεινὰ μόνον· λέγομεν γὰρ ὑγιεινῶς βαδίζειν, ὅταν βαδίζῃ ὡς ἂν ὁ ὑγιαίνων. πολλάκις μὲν οὖν γνωρίζεται ἡ ἐναντία ἕξις ἀπὸ τῆς ἐναντίας, πολλάκις δὲ αἱ ἕξεις ἀπὸ τῶν ὑποκειμένων· ἐάν τε γὰρ ἡ εὐεξία ᾖ φανερά, καὶ ἡ καχεξία φανερὰ γίνεται, καὶ ἐκ τῶν εὐεκτικῶν ἡ εὐεξία καὶ ἐκ ταύτης τὰ εὐεκτικά. εἰ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ εὐεξία πυκνότης σαρκός, ἀνάγκη καὶ τὴν καχεξίαν εἶναι μανότητα σαρκὸς καὶ τὸ εὐεκτικὸν τὸ ποιητικὸν πυκνότητος ἐν σαρκί. ἀκολουθεῖ δ' ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ, ἐὰν θάτερον πλεοναχῶς λέγηται, καὶ θάτερον πλεοναχῶς λέγεσθαι, οἷον εἰ τὸ δίκαιον, καὶ τὸ ἄδικον.

A capacity or a science seems to be the same for opposites, but a state that is one of a pair of opposites does not produce the opposite results. For example, health doesn't give rise to the opposite of healthy actions, only to healthy ones; for we say someone walks healthily when he walks as a healthy person would. Often, then, a state is recognized from its opposite, and often states are recognized from what they are found in. For if good bodily condition is evident, poor condition also becomes evident; and good condition is recognized from what produces it, and what produces it from good condition. If good condition is firmness of flesh, then poor condition must be flabbiness of flesh, and what produces good condition must be what produces firmness in the flesh. And it follows for the most part that if one of a pair of opposites is said in more than one way, so is the other; for example, if "just" is, so is "unjust."

ἔοικε δὲ πλεοναχῶς λέγεσθαι ἡ δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἡ ἀδικία, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ σύνεγγυς εἶναι τὴν ὁμωνυμίαν αὐτῶν λανθάνει καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν πόρρω δήλη μᾶλλον, (ἡ γὰρ διαφορὰ πολλὴ ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἰδέαν) οἷον ὅτι καλεῖται κλεὶς ὁμωνύμως ἥ τε ὑπὸ τὸν αὐχένα τῶν ζῴων καὶ ᾗ τὰς θύρας κλείουσιν. εἰλήφθω δὴ ὁ ἄδικος ποσαχῶς λέγεται. δοκεῖ δὴ ὅ τε παράνομος ἄδικος εἶναι καὶ ὁ πλεονέκτης καὶ ἄνισος, ὥστε δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ὁ δίκαιος ἔσται ὅ τε

Justice and injustice seem to be said in more than one way, but because their different meanings are close together, the ambiguity goes unnoticed, and it isn't as obvious as it is where the meanings are far apart (for there the difference in form is great) —as, for example, the fact that *kleis* is used ambiguously both for the collarbone of animals and

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	νόμιμος καὶ ὁ ἴσος. τὸ μὲν δίκαιον ἄρα τὸ νόμιμον καὶ τὸ ἴσον, τὸ δ' ἄδικον τὸ παράνομον καὶ τὸ ἄνισον.	for what we lock doors with. Let us grasp, then, in how many ways someone is called unjust. The lawless person is thought to be unjust, and so is the grasping, unfair person; so clearly the just person will be both the law-abiding and the fair person. The just, then, is the lawful and the fair, and the unjust is the unlawful and the unfair.[1]
1129b	ἐπεὶ δὲ πλεονέκτης ὁ ἄδικος, περὶ τἀγαθὰ ἔσται, οὐ πάντα, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὅσα εὐτυχία καὶ ἀτυχία, ἃ ἐστὶ μὲν ἁπλῶς ἀεὶ ἀγαθά, τινὶ δ' οὐκ ἀεί. οἱ δ' ἄνθρωποι ταῦτα εὔχονται καὶ διώκουσιν· δεῖ δ' οὔ, ἀλλ' εὔχεσθαι μὲν τὰ ἁπλῶς ἀγαθὰ καὶ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθὰ εἶναι, αἱρεῖσθαι δὲ τὰ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθά. ὁ δ' ἄδικος οὐκ ἀεὶ τὸ πλέον αἱρεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον ἐπὶ τῶν ἁπλῶς κακῶν· ἀλλ' ὅτι δοκεῖ καὶ τὸ μεῖον κακὸν ἀγαθόν πως εἶναι, τοῦ δ' ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶν ἡ πλεονεξία, διὰ τοῦτο δοκεῖ πλεονέκτης εἶναι. ἔστι δ' ἄνισος· τοῦτο γὰρ περιέχει καὶ κοινόν.	Since the unjust person is grasping, he will be concerned with goods—not all goods, but those that good and bad fortune concern, which are always good without qualification, but not always good for a particular person. Human beings pray for these and pursue them; but they shouldn't. They should pray that what is good without qualification will also be good for them, and choose what is good for them. The unjust person doesn't always choose the larger share: in the case of things bad without qualification he chooses the smaller. But because the lesser evil too seems in a way to be good, and grasping is for the good, he seems to be grasping. He is unfair, since this includes both and is common to both.
	ἐπεὶ δ' ὁ παράνομος ἄδικος ἦν ὁ δὲ νόμιμος δίκαιος, δῆλον ὅτι πάντα τὰ νόμιμά ἐστί πως δίκαια· τά τε γὰρ ὡρισμένα ὑπὸ τῆς νομοθετικῆς νόμιμά ἐστι, καὶ ἕκαστον τούτων δίκαιον εἶναί φαμεν. οἱ δὲ νόμοι ἀγορεύουσι περὶ ἁπάντων, στοχαζόμενοι ἢ τοῦ κοινῇ συμφέροντος πᾶσιν ἢ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἢ τοῖς κυρίοις κατ' ἀρετὴν ἢ κατ' ἄλλον τινὰ τρόπον τοιοῦτον· ὥστε ἕνα μὲν τρόπον δίκαια λέγομεν τὰ ποιητικὰ καὶ φυλακτικὰ εὐδαιμονίας καὶ τῶν μορίων αὐτῆς τῇ πολιτικῇ κοινωνίᾳ.	Since the lawless person was unjust and the law-abiding person just, clearly everything lawful is in a way just. For what is laid down by legislation is lawful, and we say that each of these things is just. The laws pronounce on everything, aiming at the common advantage of all, or of the best, or of those in power, whether on the basis of excellence or in some other such way. So in one way we call just whatever produces and preserves happiness and its parts for the political community.
	προστάττει δ' ὁ νόμος καὶ τὰ τοῦ ἀνδρείου ἔργα ποιεῖν, οἷον μὴ λείπειν τὴν τάξιν μηδὲ φεύγειν μηδὲ ῥιπτεῖν τὰ ὅπλα, καὶ τὰ τοῦ σώφρονος, οἷον μὴ μοιχεύειν μηδ' ὑβρίζειν, καὶ τὰ τοῦ πράου, οἷον μὴ τύπτειν μηδὲ κακηγορεῖν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετὰς καὶ μοχθηρίας τὰ μὲν κελεύων τὰ δ' ἀπαγορεύων, ὀρθῶς μὲν ὁ κείμενος ὀρθῶς, χεῖρον δ' ὁ ἀπεσχεδιασμένος. αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη ἀρετὴ μέν ἐστι τελεία, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἁπλῶς ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἕτερον. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πολλάκις κρατίστη τῶν ἀρετῶν εἶναι δοκεῖ ἡ δικαιοσύνη, καὶ οὔθ' ἕσπερος οὔθ' ἑῷος οὕτω θαυμαστός· καὶ παροιμιαζόμενοί φαμεν ἐν δὲ δικαιοσύνῃ συλλήβδην πᾶσ' ἀρετὴ ἔνι καὶ τελεία μάλιστα ἀρετή, ὅτι τῆς τελείας ἀρετῆς χρῆσίς ἐστιν.	The law also commands us to do what a courageous person does—for example, not to desert our post, or run away, or throw down our arms; and what a moderate person does—for example, not to commit adultery or assault; and what a gentle person does—for example, not to strike or slander anyone; and similarly with the other excellences and vices, commanding some things and forbidding others. A correctly framed law does this correctly, a hastily improvised one less well. This justice, then, is complete excellence, though not without qualification, but in relation to another. And for this reason justice is often thought to be the greatest of the excellences, and "neither the evening nor the morning star is so wonderful";

1 The Greek *kleis* means both "key" and "collarbone."

GREEK	ENGLISH
	and we say in the proverb, "In justice all excellence is summed up." And it is complete excellence in the fullest sense, because it is the exercise of complete excellence.[2]
τελεία δ' ἐστίν, ὅτι ὁ ἔχων αὐτὴν καὶ πρὸς ἕτερον δύναται τῇ ἀρετῇ χρῆσθαι, ἀλλ' οὐ μόνον καθ' αὑτόν· πολλοὶ γὰρ ἐν μὲν τοῖς οἰκείοις τῇ ἀρετῇ δύνανται χρῆσθαι, ἐν δὲ τοῖς πρὸς ἕτερον ἀδυνατοῦσιν. 1130a καὶ διὰ τοῦτο εὖ δοκεῖ ἔχειν τὸ τοῦ Βίαντος, ὅτι ἀρχὴ ἄνδρα δείξει· πρὸς ἕτερον γὰρ καὶ ἐν κοινωνίᾳ ἤδη ὁ ἄρχων. διὰ δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ τοῦτο καὶ ἀλλότριον ἀγαθὸν δοκεῖ εἶναι ἡ δικαιοσύνη μόνη τῶν ἀρετῶν, ὅτι πρὸς ἕτερόν ἐστιν· ἄλλῳ γὰρ τὰ συμφέροντα πράττει, ἢ ἄρχοντι ἢ κοινωνῷ. κάκιστος μὲν οὖν ὁ καὶ πρὸς αὑτὸν καὶ πρὸς τοὺς φίλους χρώμενος τῇ μοχθηρίᾳ, ἄριστος δ' οὐχ ὁ πρὸς αὑτὸν τῇ ἀρετῇ ἀλλὰ πρὸς ἕτερον· τοῦτο γὰρ ἔργον χαλεπόν.	It is complete because the person who has it can exercise his excellence toward another, and not only by himself; for many people can exercise excellence in their own affairs but are unable to in their dealings with another. 1130a And that is why the saying of Bias seems right, that "office will reveal the man," since one who holds office is by that very fact related to others and in a community. For this same reason justice alone of the excellences is thought to be another's good, because it is related to another: it does what benefits someone else, whether a ruler or a partner. The worst person, then, is the one who exercises his vice both toward himself and toward his friends; and the best is not the one who exercises his excellence toward himself, but the one who exercises it toward another, since that is a difficult task.[3]
1130a αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ δικαιοσύνη οὐ μέρος ἀρετῆς ἀλλ' ὅλη ἀρετή ἐστιν, οὐδ' ἡ ἐναντία ἀδικία μέρος κακίας ἀλλ' ὅλη κακία. τί δὲ διαφέρει ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη αὕτη, δῆλον ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων· ἔστι μὲν γὰρ ἡ αὐτή, τὸ δ' εἶναι οὐ τὸ αὐτό, ἀλλ' ᾗ μὲν πρὸς ἕτερον, δικαιοσύνη, ᾗ δὲ τοιάδε ἕξις ἁπλῶς, ἀρετή.	This justice, then, is not a part of excellence but the whole of excellence, and the injustice opposed to it is not a part of vice but the whole of vice. What the difference is between excellence and this justice is clear from what has been said: they are the same state, but what it is to be each is not the same. Insofar as it is related to another, it is justice; insofar as it is a certain kind of state without qualification, it is excellence.

PARTICULAR JUSTICE

Aristotle identifies a particular justice concerned with fair shares and divides it into kinds.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ζητοῦμεν δέ γε τὴν ἐν μέρει ἀρετῆς δικαιοσύνην· ἔστι γάρ τις, ὡς φαμέν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ ἀδικίας τῆς κατὰ μέρος. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι ἔστιν· κατὰ μὲν γὰρ τὰς ἄλλας μοχθηρίας ὁ ἐνεργῶν ἀδικεῖ μέν, πλεονεκτεῖ δ' οὐδέν, οἷον ὁ ῥίψας τὴν ἀσπίδα διὰ δειλίαν ἢ κακῶς εἰπὼν διὰ χαλεπότητα ἢ οὐ βοηθήσας χρήμασι δι' ἀνελευθερίαν· ὅταν δὲ πλεονεκτῇ, πολλάκις κατ' οὐδεμίαν τῶν τοιούτων, ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ κατὰ πάσας, κατὰ πονηρίαν δέ γε τινά (ψέγομεν γάρ) καὶ κατ' ἀδικίαν. ἔστιν ἄρ' ἄλλη τις ἀδικία ὡς μέρος τῆς ὅλης, καὶ ἄδικόν τι ἐν μέρει τοῦ ὅλου ἀδίκου τοῦ παρὰ τὸν νόμον.	But what we are looking for is the justice that is a part of excellence—for there is such a thing, as we say—and likewise the injustice that is a part of vice. Here is a sign that it exists. Someone who acts in accordance with the other vices does wrong, but does not grasp for more than his share: for example, a man who throws away his shield out of cowardice, or speaks abusively out of bad temper, or fails to help a friend with money out of stinginess. But when someone does grasp for more, it is often in accordance with none of these

2 The first quotation is thought to come from a lost play of Euripides; the proverb is a line of the poet Theognis.
3 Bias of Priene, sixth century BC, was counted among the Seven Sages.

GREEK

ENGLISH

vices—and certainly not all of them—and yet it is in accordance with some kind of wickedness (for we blame him), namely injustice. So there is another kind of injustice, a part of injustice as a whole, and something unjust that is a part of the whole unjust, the unjust that is contrary to law.

ἔτι εἰ ὃ μὲν τοῦ κερδαίνειν ἕνεκα μοιχεύει καὶ προσλαμβάνων, ὃ δὲ προστιθεὶς καὶ ζημιούμενος δι' ἐπιθυμίαν, οὗτος μὲν ἀκόλαστος δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι μᾶλλον ἢ πλεονέκτης, ἐκεῖνος δ' ἄδικος, ἀκόλαστος δ' οὔ· δῆλον ἄρα ὅτι διὰ τὸ κερδαίνειν. ἔτι περὶ μὲν τἆλλα πάντα ἀδικήματα γίνεται ἡ ἐπαναφορὰ ἐπί τινα μοχθηρίαν ἀεί, οἷον εἰ ἐμοίχευσεν, ἐπ' ἀκολασίαν, εἰ ἐγκατέλιπε τὸν παραστάτην, ἐπὶ δειλίαν, εἰ ἐπάταξεν, ἐπ' ὀργήν· εἰ δ' ἐκέρδανεν, ἐπ' οὐδεμίαν μοχθηρίαν ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπ' ἀδικίαν.

Again, suppose one man commits adultery for profit and makes money by it, while another does so because of appetite, spending money and losing by it. The second would seem to be self-indulgent rather than grasping, the first unjust but not self-indulgent. Clearly, then, it is because of the profit. Again, all other wrongful acts are always traced back to some particular vice: if someone committed adultery, to self-indulgence; if he deserted his comrade in the battle line, to cowardice; if he struck someone, to anger. But if he made a profit, it is traced back to no vice other than injustice.

ὥστε φανερὸν ὅτι ἔστι τις ἀδικία παρὰ τὴν ὅλην ἄλλη ἐν μέρει, συνώνυμος, ὅτι ὁ ὁρισμὸς ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ γένει· 1130b ἄμφω γὰρ ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἕτερον ἔχουσι τὴν δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν περὶ τιμὴν ἢ χρήματα ἢ σωτηρίαν, ἢ εἴ τινι ἔχοιμεν ἑνὶ ὀνόματι περιλαβεῖν ταῦτα πάντα, καὶ δι' ἡδονὴν τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ κέρδους, ἡ δὲ περὶ ἅπαντα περὶ ὅσα ὁ σπουδαῖος.

So it is evident that besides injustice as a whole there is another, particular injustice, which shares its name, because its definition falls within the same genus: 1130b both have their force in relation to another person. But the one is concerned with honor, or money, or safety—or whatever single name we might have that would cover all of these—and is motivated by the pleasure that comes from gain, while the other is concerned with everything that the excellent person is concerned with.

1130b ὅτι μὲν οὖν εἰσὶν αἱ δικαιοσύναι πλείους, καὶ ὅτι ἔστι τις καὶ ἑτέρα παρὰ τὴν ὅλην ἀρετήν, δῆλον· τίς δὲ καὶ ποία τις, ληπτέον. διώρισται δὴ τὸ ἄδικον τό τε παράνομον καὶ τὸ ἄνισον, τὸ δὲ δίκαιον τό τε νόμιμον καὶ τὸ ἴσον. κατὰ μὲν οὖν τὸ παράνομον ἡ πρότερον εἰρημένη ἀδικία ἐστίν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἄνισον καὶ τὸ παράνομον οὐ ταὐτὸν ἀλλ' ἕτερον ὡς μέρος πρὸς ὅλον (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἄνισον ἅπαν παράνομον, τὸ δὲ παράνομον οὐχ ἅπαν ἄνισον), καὶ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ ἡ ἀδικία οὐ ταὐτὰ ἀλλ' ἕτερα ἐκείνων, τὰ μὲν ὡς μέρη τὰ δ' ὡς ὅλα· μέρος γὰρ αὕτη ἡ ἀδικία τῆς ὅλης ἀδικίας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ δικαιοσύνη τῆς δικαιοσύνης.

It is clear, then, that there is more than one kind of justice, and that there is one distinct from the justice that is the whole of excellence. We must now grasp what it is and what sort of thing it is. The unjust has been divided into the unlawful and the unequal, and the just into the lawful and the equal. The injustice described earlier corresponds to the unlawful. But the unequal and the unlawful are not the same; they differ as part from whole (everything unequal is unlawful, but not everything unlawful is unequal). So too the unjust and injustice in the present sense are not the same as in that sense, but differ from them, as parts from wholes. For this injustice is a part of injustice as a whole, and likewise this justice is a part of justice as a whole.

ὥστε καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν μέρει δικαιοσύνης καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν μέρει ἀδικίας λεκτέον, καὶ τοῦ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου ὡσαύτως. ἡ μὲν οὖν κατὰ τὴν ὅλην ἀρετὴν τεταγμένη

So we must discuss particular justice and particular injustice, and in the same way the just and the unjust in this sense. Let us set aside, then, the

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	δικαιοσύνη καὶ ἀδικία, ἣ μὲν τῆς ὅλης ἀρετῆς οὖσα χρῆσις πρὸς ἄλλον ἡ δὲ τῆς κακίας, ἀφείσθω. καὶ τὸ δίκαιον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἄδικον τὸ κατὰ ταύτας φανερὸν ὡς διοριστέον· σχεδὸν γὰρ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν νομίμων τὰ ἀπὸ τῆς ὅλης ἀρετῆς προσταττόμενά ἐστιν· καθ' ἑκάστην γὰρ ἀρετὴν προστάττει ζῆν καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην μοχθηρίαν κωλύει ὁ νόμος. τὰ δὲ ποιητικὰ τῆς ὅλης ἀρετῆς ἐστὶ τῶν νομίμων ὅσα νενομοθέτηται περὶ παιδείαν τὴν πρὸς τὸ κοινόν.	justice and injustice that correspond to excellence as a whole—the one being the exercise of excellence as a whole toward another person, the other the exercise of vice as a whole. It is also evident how the just and the unjust that correspond to these are to be marked out. For, roughly speaking, most lawful acts are those prescribed on the basis of excellence as a whole: the law commands us to live in accordance with each excellence and forbids us to live in accordance with each vice. And what produces excellence as a whole are those lawful measures that have been enacted concerning education for life in the community.
	περὶ δὲ τῆς καθ' ἕκαστον παιδείας, καθ' ἣν ἁπλῶς ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ἐστι, πότερον τῆς πολιτικῆς ἐστὶν ἢ ἑτέρας, ὕστερον διοριστέον· οὐ γὰρ ἴσως ταὐτὸν ἀνδρί τ' ἀγαθῷ εἶναι καὶ πολίτῃ παντί. τῆς δὲ κατὰ μέρος δικαιοσύνης καὶ τοῦ κατ' αὐτὴν δικαίου ἓν μέν ἐστιν εἶδος τὸ ἐν ταῖς διανομαῖς τιμῆς ἢ χρημάτων ἢ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα μεριστὰ τοῖς κοινωνοῦσι τῆς πολιτείας (ἐν τούτοις γὰρ ἔστι καὶ ἄνισον ἔχειν καὶ ἴσον ἕτερον ἑτέρου),	As for the education of the individual, which makes someone a good man without qualification, we must determine later whether it belongs to political science or to some other discipline; for perhaps being a good man is not the same as being a good citizen of every city. Of particular justice, and of what is just in its sense, one kind is found in distributions of honor or money or anything else that can be divided among those who share in the political community (for in these it is possible for one person to have a share unequal or equal to another's);
1131a	ἓν δὲ τὸ ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι διορθωτικόν.	1131a another kind is corrective, in transactions.
1131a	τούτου δὲ μέρη δύο· τῶν γὰρ συναλλαγμάτων τὰ μὲν ἑκούσιά ἐστι τὰ δ' ἀκούσια, ἑκούσια μὲν τὰ τοιάδε οἷον πρᾶσις ὠνὴ δανεισμὸς ἐγγύη χρῆσις παρακαταθήκη μίσθωσις (ἑκούσια δὲ λέγεται, ὅτι ἡ ἀρχὴ τῶν συναλλαγμάτων τούτων ἑκούσιος), τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων τὰ μὲν λαθραῖα, οἷον κλοπὴ μοιχεία φαρμακεία προαγωγεία δουλαπατία δολοφονία ψευδομαρτυρία, τὰ δὲ βίαια, οἷον αἰκία δεσμὸς θάνατος ἁρπαγὴ πήρωσις κακηγορία προπηλακισμός.	This second kind has two parts, since some transactions are voluntary and others involuntary. The voluntary ones are such things as sale, purchase, lending at interest, giving security, lending for use, deposit, and hire (they are called voluntary because the origin of these transactions is voluntary). Of the involuntary ones, some are clandestine—theft, adultery, poisoning, procuring, enticing away slaves, assassination, false witness—and others are violent—assault, imprisonment, murder, robbery with violence, maiming, verbal abuse, and insulting treatment.

DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE

Aristotle explains that distributive justice assigns shares in proportion to merit.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ἐπεὶ δ' ὅ τ' ἄδικος ἄνισος καὶ τὸ ἄδικον ἄνισον, δῆλον ὅτι καὶ μέσον τι ἔστι τοῦ ἀνίσου. τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ ἴσον· ἐν ὁποίᾳ γὰρ πράξει ἔστι τὸ πλέον καὶ τὸ ἔλαττον, ἔστι καὶ τὸ ἴσον. εἰ οὖν τὸ ἄδικον ἄνισον, τὸ δίκαιον ἴσον· ὅπερ καὶ ἄνευ λόγου δοκεῖ πᾶσιν. ἐπεὶ δὲ τὸ ἴσον μέσον, τὸ δίκαιον μέσον τι ἂν εἴη. ἔστι δὲ τὸ ἴσον ἐν ἐλαχίστοις δυσίν.	Since the unjust person is unequal and the unjust is unequal, there is clearly also some midpoint of the unequal. This is the equal: for in any action where there is a more and a less, there is also an equal. If, then, the unjust is unequal, the just is equal—which everyone believes even without ar-

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀνάγκη τοίνυν τὸ δίκαιον μέσον τε καὶ ἴσον εἶναι καὶ πρός τι καὶ τισίν, καὶ ᾗ μὲν μέσον, τινῶν (ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ πλεῖον καὶ ἔλαττον), ᾗ δ' ἴσον, δυοῖν, ᾗ δὲ δίκαιον, τισίν. ἀνάγκη ἄρα τὸ δίκαιον ἐν ἐλαχίστοις εἶναι τέτταρσιν· οἷς τε γὰρ δίκαιον τυγχάνει ὄν, δύο ἐστί, καὶ ἐν οἷς, τὰ πράγματα, δύο.

gument. And since the equal is a mean, the just would be a kind of mean. The equal involves at least two things. So the just must be both a mean and equal, and also relative to something and for certain people. As a mean, it is between certain things (namely, more and less); as equal, it involves two things; and as just, it is for certain people. The just, then, must involve at least four terms: the persons for whom it is just are two, and the things in which it consists—the goods in question—are two.

καὶ ἡ αὐτὴ ἔσται ἰσότης, οἷς καὶ ἐν οἷς· ὡς γὰρ ἐκεῖνα ἔχει, τὰ ἐν οἷς, οὕτω κἀκεῖνα ἔχει· εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἴσοι, οὐκ ἴσα ἕξουσιν, ἀλλ' ἐντεῦθεν αἱ μάχαι καὶ τὰ ἐγκλήματα, ὅταν ἢ μὴ ἴσα ἴσοι ἢ μὴ ἴσοι ἴσα ἔχωσι καὶ νέμωνται. ἔτι ἐκ τοῦ κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦτο δῆλον· τὸ γὰρ δίκαιον ἐν ταῖς νομαῖς ὁμολογοῦσι πάντες κατ' ἀξίαν τινὰ δεῖν εἶναι, τὴν μέντοι ἀξίαν οὐ τὴν αὐτὴν λέγουσι πάντες ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλ' οἱ μὲν δημοκρατικοὶ ἐλευθερίαν, οἱ δ' ὀλιγαρχικοὶ πλοῦτον, οἳ δ' εὐγένειαν, οἱ δ' ἀριστοκρατικοὶ ἀρετήν. ἔστιν ἄρα τὸ δίκαιον ἀνάλογόν τι. τὸ γὰρ ἀνάλογον οὐ μόνον ἐστὶ μοναδικοῦ ἀριθμοῦ ἴδιον, ἀλλ' ὅλως ἀριθμοῦ· ἡ γὰρ ἀναλογία ἰσότης ἐστὶ λόγων, καὶ ἐν τέτταρσιν ἐλαχίστοις.

And the equality will be the same for the persons as for the things: as the things stand to each other, so the persons stand. If the persons are not equal, they will not have equal shares; this is the source of quarrels and complaints—when equals have or are assigned unequal shares, or unequals equal ones. This is also clear from the principle of distribution according to worth. Everyone agrees that what is just in distributions must accord with worth of some kind, but not everyone means the same kind of worth: democrats mean free birth, oligarchs wealth, others good birth, and aristocrats excellence. The just, then, is something proportional. For proportion is a property not only of numbers made up of units, but of number in general: proportion is an equality of ratios, and involves at least four terms.

ἡ μὲν οὖν διῃρημένη ὅτι ἐν τέτταρσι, δῆλον. ἀλλὰ καὶ ἡ συνεχής· τῷ γὰρ ἑνὶ ὡς δυσὶ χρῆται καὶ δὶς λέγει, 1131b οἷον ὡς ἡ τοῦ α πρὸς τὴν τοῦ β, οὕτως ἡ τοῦ β πρὸς τὴν τοῦ γ. δὶς οὖν ἡ τοῦ β εἴρηται· ὥστ' ἐὰν ἡ τοῦ β τεθῇ δίς, τέτταρα ἔσται τὰ ἀνάλογα. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐν τέτταρσιν ἐλαχίστοις, καὶ ὁ λόγος ὁ αὐτός· διῄρηται γὰρ ὁμοίως οἷς τε καὶ ἅ. ἔσται ἄρα ὡς ὁ α ὅρος πρὸς τὸν β, οὕτως ὁ γ πρὸς τὸν δ, καὶ ἐναλλὰξ ἄρα, ὡς ὁ α πρὸς τὸν γ, ὁ β πρὸς τὸν δ. ὥστε καὶ τὸ ὅλον πρὸς τὸ ὅλον· ὅπερ ἡ νομὴ συνδυάζει, κἂν οὕτω συντεθῇ, δικαίως συνδυάζει.

That discrete proportion involves four terms is clear. But so does continuous proportion, since it uses one term as two and states it twice: 1131b for example, as line A is to line B, so B is to C. B has been stated twice, so if B is posited twice, the proportional terms will be four. The just, too, involves at least four terms, and the ratio is the same, since the persons and the things are divided in the same way. So as term A is to B, so C will be to D; and therefore, alternating, as A is to C, so B is to D. Hence the whole also stands to the whole in the same ratio. This is the pairing the distribution makes, and if the terms are combined in this way, it pairs them justly.

1131b ἡ ἄρα τοῦ α ὅρου τῷ γ καὶ ἡ τοῦ β τῷ δ σύζευξις τὸ ἐν διανομῇ δίκαιόν ἐστι, καὶ μέσον τὸ δίκαιον τοῦτ' ἐστί, τὸ δ' ἄδικον τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον· τὸ γὰρ ἀνάλογον μέσον, τὸ δὲ δίκαιον ἀνάλογον. καλοῦσι δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ἀναλογίαν γεωμετρικὴν οἱ μαθηματικοί· ἐν γὰρ τῇ γεωμετρικῇ συμβαίνει καὶ τὸ ὅλον πρὸς τὸ ὅλον ὅπερ ἑκάτερον πρὸς ἑκάτερον. ἔστι δ' οὐ συνεχὴς αὕτη ἡ

The conjunction of term A with C and of B with D, then, is what is just in distribution. This just is a mean, and the unjust is what violates the proportion; for the proportional is a mean, and the just is proportional. Mathematicians call this kind of proportion geometrical, since in geometrical proportion it follows that the whole is to the whole as

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀναλογία· οὐ γὰρ γίνεται εἷς ἀριθμῷ ὅρος, ᾧ καὶ ὅ. τὸ μὲν οὖν δίκαιον τοῦτο, τὸ ἀνάλογον· τὸ δ' ἄδικον τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον. γίνεται ἄρα τὸ μὲν πλέον τὸ δ' ἔλαττον, ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἔργων συμβαίνει· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀδικῶν πλέον ἔχει, ὁ δ' ἀδικούμενος ἔλαττον τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ.	each term is to its counterpart. But this proportion is not continuous, since no single term numerically serves as both person and thing. This, then, is the just: the proportional. The unjust is what violates the proportion. So one share becomes too great and the other too small—which is exactly what happens in practice: the person who does wrong has too much of the good, and the person wronged too little.
ἐπὶ δὲ τοῦ κακοῦ ἀνάπαλιν· ἐν ἀγαθοῦ γὰρ λόγῳ γίνεται τὸ ἔλαττον κακὸν πρὸς τὸ μεῖζον κακόν· ἔστι γὰρ τὸ ἔλαττον κακὸν μᾶλλον αἱρετὸν τοῦ μείζονος, τὸ δ' αἱρετὸν ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸ μᾶλλον μεῖζον. τὸ μὲν οὖν ἓν εἶδος τοῦ δικαίου τοῦτ' ἐστίν.	With what is bad it is the reverse: the lesser evil counts as a good compared with the greater evil, since the lesser evil is more choiceworthy than the greater, and what is choiceworthy is good, and what is more choiceworthy is a greater good. This, then, is one kind of the just.

CORRECTIVE JUSTICE

Aristotle explains that corrective justice restores equality between parties to a transaction.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν ἓν τὸ διορθωτικόν, ὃ γίνεται ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι καὶ τοῖς ἑκουσίοις καὶ τοῖς ἀκουσίοις. τοῦτο δὲ τὸ δίκαιον ἄλλο εἶδος ἔχει τοῦ πρότερον. τὸ μὲν γὰρ διανεμητικὸν δίκαιον τῶν κοινῶν ἀεὶ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐστὶ τὴν εἰρημένην· καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ χρημάτων κοινῶν ἐὰν γίνηται ἡ διανομή, ἔσται κατὰ τὸν λόγον τὸν αὐτὸν ὅνπερ ἔχουσι πρὸς ἄλληλα τὰ εἰσενεχθέντα· καὶ τὸ ἄδικον τὸ ἀντικείμενον τῷ δικαίῳ τούτῳ τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογόν ἐστιν. τὸ δ' ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι δίκαιον ἐστὶ μὲν ἴσον τι, καὶ τὸ ἄδικον ἄνισον, [1132a] ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἐκείνην ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀριθμητικήν.	The one remaining kind is the corrective, which arises in transactions, both voluntary and involuntary. This kind of just has a different form from the previous one. The just that distributes common goods always accords with the proportion we have described: even when the distribution is made from common funds, it will follow the same ratio as the contributions bear to one another; and the unjust that is opposed to this kind of just is what violates the proportion. The just in transactions, on the other hand, is a kind of equality, and the unjust a kind of inequality, [1132a] but not according to that proportion—rather according to arithmetical proportion.
1132a οὐδὲν γὰρ διαφέρει, εἰ ἐπιεικὴς φαῦλον ἀπεστέρησεν ἢ φαῦλος ἐπιεικῆ, οὐδ' εἰ ἐμοίχευσεν ἐπιεικὴς ἢ φαῦλος· ἀλλὰ πρὸς τοῦ βλάβους τὴν διαφορὰν μόνον βλέπει ὁ νόμος, καὶ χρῆται ὡς ἴσοις, εἰ ὃ μὲν ἀδικεῖ ὃ δ' ἀδικεῖται, καὶ εἰ ἔβλαψεν ὃ δὲ βέβλαπται. ὥστε τὸ ἄδικον τοῦτο ἄνισον ὂν ἰσάζειν πειρᾶται ὁ δικαστής· καὶ γὰρ ὅταν ὃ μὲν πληγῇ ὃ δὲ πατάξῃ, ἢ καὶ κτείνῃ ὃ δ' ἀποθάνῃ, διῄρηται τὸ πάθος καὶ ἡ πρᾶξις εἰς ἄνισα· ἀλλὰ πειρᾶται τῇ ζημίᾳ ἰσάζειν, ἀφαιρῶν τοῦ κέρδους. λέγεται γὰρ ὡς ἁπλῶς εἰπεῖν ἐπὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις, κἂν εἰ μή τισιν οἰκεῖον ὄνομα εἴη, τὸ κέρδος, οἷον τῷ πατάξαντι, καὶ ἡ ζημία τῷ παθόντι· ἀλλ' ὅταν γε μετρηθῇ τὸ πάθος, καλεῖται τὸ μὲν ζημία τὸ δὲ κέρδος.	For it makes no difference whether a decent person has defrauded a bad one or a bad person a decent one, nor whether it was a decent or a bad person who committed adultery. The law looks only at the difference made by the harm, and treats the parties as equals, asking only whether one did wrong and the other was wronged, and whether one inflicted harm and the other suffered it. So the judge tries to equalize this unjust thing, since it is unequal. When one person is struck and the other strikes, or when one kills and the other dies, the suffering and the action have been divided into unequal parts; but the judge tries to equalize them by means of the penalty, taking away from the gain. For in such cases the term "gain" is used,

GREEK

ENGLISH

speaking generally—even if it isn't the appropriate word in some cases, for instance for the person who struck the blow—and "loss" for the one who suffered. At any rate, once the suffering has been measured, one side is called loss and the other gain.

ὥστε τοῦ μὲν πλείονος καὶ ἐλάττονος τὸ ἴσον μέσον, τὸ δὲ κέρδος καὶ ἡ ζημία τὸ μὲν πλέον τὸ δ' ἔλαττον ἐναντίως, τὸ μὲν τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ πλέον τοῦ κακοῦ δ' ἔλαττον κέρδος, τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ζημία· ὧν ἦν μέσον τὸ ἴσον, ὃ λέγομεν εἶναι δίκαιον· ὥστε τὸ ἐπανορθωτικὸν δίκαιον ἂν εἴη τὸ μέσον ζημίας καὶ κέρδους. διὸ καὶ ὅταν ἀμφισβητῶσιν, ἐπὶ τὸν δικαστὴν καταφεύγουσιν· τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τὸν δικαστὴν ἰέναι ἰέναι ἐστὶν ἐπὶ τὸ δίκαιον· ὁ γὰρ δικαστὴς βούλεται εἶναι οἷον δίκαιον ἔμψυχον· καὶ ζητοῦσι δικαστὴν μέσον, καὶ καλοῦσιν ἔνιοι μεσιδίους, ὡς ἐὰν τοῦ μέσου τύχωσι, τοῦ δικαίου τευξόμενοι. μέσον ἄρα τι τὸ δίκαιον, εἴπερ καὶ ὁ δικαστής.

So the equal is a mean between the more and the less, while gain and loss are more and less in opposite ways: more of the good and less of the bad is gain, and the opposite is loss. The mean between them, as we saw, is the equal, which we say is just. So the corrective just would be the mean between loss and gain. That is why, when people are in dispute, they take refuge with a judge; and going to the judge is going to the just, since the judge means to be, as it were, justice ensouled. People seek a judge who is in the middle, and some call judges "mediators," on the thought that if they hit on the mean they will obtain what is just. The just, then, is a kind of mean, since the judge is too.

ὁ δὲ δικαστὴς ἐπανισοῖ, καὶ ὥσπερ γραμμῆς εἰς ἄνισα τετμημένης, ᾧ τὸ μεῖζον τμῆμα τῆς ἡμισείας ὑπερέχει, τοῦτ' ἀφεῖλε καὶ τῷ ἐλάττονι τμήματι προσέθηκεν. ὅταν δὲ δίχα διαιρεθῇ τὸ ὅλον, τότε φασὶν ἔχειν τὸ αὑτοῦ ὅταν λάβωσι τὸ ἴσον. τὸ δ' ἴσον μέσον ἐστὶ τῆς μείζονος καὶ ἐλάττονος κατὰ τὴν ἀριθμητικὴν ἀναλογίαν. διὰ τοῦτο καὶ ὀνομάζεται δίκαιον, ὅτι δίχα ἐστίν, ὥσπερ ἂν εἴ τις εἴποι δίχαιον, καὶ ὁ δικαστὴς διχαστής. ἐπὰν γὰρ δύο ἴσων ἀφαιρεθῇ ἀπὸ θατέρου, πρὸς θάτερον δὲ προστεθῇ, δυσὶ τούτοις ὑπερέχει θάτερον· εἰ γὰρ ἀφῃρέθη μέν, μὴ προσετέθη δέ, ἑνὶ ἂν μόνον ὑπερεῖχεν. [1132b] τοῦ μέσου ἄρα ἑνί, καὶ τὸ μέσον, ἀφ' οὗ ἀφῃρέθη, ἑνί.

The judge restores equality. It is as though a line had been cut into unequal parts: he takes away the amount by which the larger segment exceeds the half and adds it to the smaller segment. And when the whole has been divided into two halves, people say they "have what is their own," when they get what is equal. The equal is a mean between the greater and the lesser according to arithmetical proportion. This is also why it is called *dikaion* (just): because it is *dicha* (in two), as if one were to say *dichaion*; and the judge (*dikastēs*) is a *dichastēs*, a divider. For when something is taken from one of two equal quantities and added to the other, the other exceeds the first by twice that amount; if it had been taken from the one but not added to the other, the other would exceed it by that amount only. [1132b] So the larger exceeds the mean by one such amount, and the mean exceeds the one from which something was taken by one such amount.[4]

1132b τούτῳ ἄρα γνωριοῦμεν τί τε ἀφελεῖν δεῖ ἀπὸ τοῦ πλέον ἔχοντος, καὶ τί προσθεῖναι τῷ ἔλαττον ἔχοντι· ᾧ μὲν γὰρ τὸ μέσον ὑπερέχει, τοῦτο προσθεῖναι δεῖ τῷ ἔλαττον ἔχοντι, ᾧ δ' ὑπερέχεται, ἀφελεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ μεγίστου. ἴσαι αἱ ἐφ' ὧν αα ββ γγ ἀλλήλαις· ἀπὸ τῆς αα ἀφῃρήσθω τὸ αε, καὶ προσκείσθω τῇ γγ τὸ ἐφ' ᾧ γδ, ὥστε ὅλη ἡ δγγ τῆς εα

By this, then, we shall recognize what must be taken from the one who has more and what must be added to the one who has less: the amount by which the mean exceeds the lesser must be added to the one who has less, and the amount by which the mean is exceeded must be taken from the

4 Aristotle is playing on words: *dikaion* (just) is not actually derived from *dicha* (in two).

GREEK

ὑπερέχει τῷ γδ καὶ τῷ γζ· τῆς ἄρα ββ τῷ γδ. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν· ἀνῃροῦντο γὰρ ἄν, εἰ μὴ ἐποίει τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ ὅσον καὶ οἷον, καὶ τὸ πάσχον ἔπασχε τοῦτο καὶ τοσοῦτον καὶ τοιοῦτον.

ἐλήλυθε δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα, ἥ τε ζημία καὶ τὸ κέρδος, ἐκ τῆς ἑκουσίου ἀλλαγῆς· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πλέον ἔχειν ἢ τὰ αὑτοῦ κερδαίνειν λέγεται, τὸ δ' ἔλαττον τῶν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ζημιοῦσθαι, οἷον ἐν τῷ ὠνεῖσθαι καὶ πωλεῖν καὶ ἐν ὅσοις ἄλλοις ἄδειαν δέδωκεν ὁ νόμος· ὅταν δὲ μήτε πλέον μήτ' ἔλαττον ἀλλ' αὐτὰ τὰ δι' αὐτῶν γένηται, τὰ αὑτῶν φασὶν ἔχειν καὶ οὔτε ζημιοῦσθαι οὔτε κερδαίνειν. ὥστε κέρδους τινὸς καὶ ζημίας μέσον τὸ δίκαιόν ἐστι τῶν παρὰ τὸ ἑκούσιον, τὸ ἴσον ἔχειν καὶ πρότερον καὶ ὕστερον.

ENGLISH

greatest. Let the lines AA, BB, and CC be equal to one another. From AA let AE be taken away, and to CC let CD be added, so that the whole line DCC exceeds EA by CD and CZ; therefore it exceeds BB by CD. This holds in the other crafts too: they would be destroyed if what the producer produced, in quantity and quality, were not matched by what the recipient received, of that amount and of that kind.

These terms, "loss" and "gain," have come from voluntary exchange. Having more than one's own is called gaining, and having less than one started with is called losing—as in buying and selling, and in all other dealings in which the law has granted freedom. But when people end up with neither more nor less, but with just what they had, through the exchange itself, they say they have what is their own and neither lose nor gain. So the just is a mean between a kind of gain and a kind of loss in transactions that are not voluntary: it is having an equal amount both before and after.

RECIPROCITY AND MONEY

Aristotle discusses reciprocity in exchange and how money makes goods commensurable.

GREEK

δοκεῖ δέ τισι καὶ τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς εἶναι ἁπλῶς δίκαιον, ὥσπερ οἱ Πυθαγόρειοι ἔφασαν· ὡρίζοντο γὰρ ἁπλῶς τὸ δίκαιον τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς ἄλλῳ. τὸ δ' ἀντιπεπονθὸς οὐκ ἐφαρμόττει οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ νεμητικὸν δίκαιον οὔτ' ἐπὶ τὸ διορθωτικόν—καίτοι βούλονταί γε τοῦτο λέγειν καὶ τὸ Ῥαδαμάνθυος δίκαιον· εἴ κε πάθοι τά τ' ἔρεξε, δίκη κ' ἰθεῖα γένοιτο —πολλαχοῦ γὰρ διαφωνεῖ· οἷον εἰ ἀρχὴν ἔχων ἐπάταξεν, οὐ δεῖ ἀντιπληγῆναι, καὶ εἰ ἄρχοντα ἐπάταξεν, οὐ πληγῆναι μόνον δεῖ ἀλλὰ καὶ κολασθῆναι. ἔτι τὸ ἑκούσιον καὶ τὸ ἀκούσιον διαφέρει πολύ. ἀλλ' ἐν μὲν ταῖς κοινωνίαις ταῖς ἀλλακτικαῖς συνέχει τὸ τοιοῦτον δίκαιον, τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς κατ' ἀναλογίαν καὶ μὴ κατ' ἰσότητα. τῷ ἀντιποιεῖν γὰρ ἀνάλογον συμμένει ἡ πόλις.

ἢ γὰρ τὸ κακῶς ζητοῦσιν· 1133a εἰ δὲ μή, δουλεία δοκεῖ εἶναι εἰ μὴ ἀντιποιήσει· ἢ τὸ εὖ· εἰ δὲ μή, μετάδοσις οὐ γίνεται, τῇ μεταδόσει δὲ συμμένουσιν. διὸ καὶ Χαρίτων

ENGLISH

Some people think that reciprocity is simply what is just, as the Pythagoreans said; for they defined the just simply as suffering in return what one has done to another. But reciprocity fits neither distributive justice nor corrective justice—even though people want to read this into the justice of Rhadamanthys: "If a man should suffer what he did, straight justice would be done"—for in many cases the two conflict. For example, if an official strikes someone, he should not be struck in return; and if someone strikes an official, he should not only be struck but punished as well. Further, the voluntary and the involuntary make a great difference. But in communities of exchange this kind of justice does hold people together—reciprocity in accordance with proportion, not with equality. For it is by proportional reciprocal action that the city holds together.[5]

People seek to return either harm for harm— 1133a otherwise it seems like slavery, if one is not to retaliate—or good for good; otherwise there is no ex-

5 Rhadamanthys was a mythical judge of the dead; the line is attributed to Hesiod.

GREEK

ἱερὸν ἐμποδὼν ποιοῦνται, ἵν' ἀνταπόδοσις ᾖ· τοῦτο γὰρ ἴδιον χάριτος· ἀνθυπηρετῆσαι γὰρ δεῖ τῷ χαρισαμένῳ, καὶ πάλιν αὐτὸν ἄρξαι χαριζόμενον. ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν ἀντίδοσιν τὴν κατ' ἀναλογίαν ἡ κατὰ διάμετρον σύζευξις. οἰκοδόμος ἐφ' ᾧ α, σκυτοτόμος ἐφ' ᾧ β, οἰκία ἐφ' ᾧ γ, ὑπόδημα ἐφ' ᾧ δ. δεῖ οὖν λαμβάνειν τὸν οἰκοδόμον παρὰ τοῦ σκυτοτόμου τὸ ἐκείνου ἔργον, καὶ αὐτὸν ἐκείνῳ μεταδιδόναι τὸ αὑτοῦ. ἐὰν οὖν πρῶτον ᾖ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν ἴσον, εἶτα τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς γένηται, ἔσται τὸ λεγόμενον.

1133a εἰ δὲ μή, οὐκ ἴσον, οὐδὲ συμμένει· οὐθὲν γὰρ κωλύει κρεῖττον εἶναι τὸ θατέρου ἔργον ἢ τὸ θατέρου· δεῖ οὖν ταῦτα ἰσασθῆναι. ἔστι δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων τεχνῶν· ἀνῃροῦντο γὰρ ἄν, εἰ μὴ ὃ ἐποίει τὸ ποιοῦν καὶ ὅσον καὶ οἷον, καὶ τὸ πάσχον ἔπασχε τοῦτο καὶ τοσοῦτον καὶ τοιοῦτον. οὐ γὰρ ἐκ δύο ἰατρῶν γίνεται κοινωνία, ἀλλ' ἐξ ἰατροῦ καὶ γεωργοῦ, καὶ ὅλως ἑτέρων καὶ οὐκ ἴσων· ἀλλὰ τούτους δεῖ ἰσασθῆναι. διὸ πάντα συμβλητὰ δεῖ πως εἶναι, ὧν ἐστὶν ἀλλαγή. ἐφ' ὃ τὸ νόμισμ' ἐλήλυθε, καὶ γίνεταί πως μέσον· πάντα γὰρ μετρεῖ, ὥστε καὶ τὴν ὑπεροχὴν καὶ τὴν ἔλλειψιν, πόσα ἄττα δὴ ὑποδήματ' ἴσον οἰκίᾳ ἢ τροφῇ. δεῖ τοίνυν ὅπερ οἰκοδόμος πρὸς σκυτοτόμον, τοσαδὶ ὑποδήματα πρὸς οἰκίαν ἢ τροφήν.

εἰ γὰρ μὴ τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔσται ἀλλαγὴ οὐδὲ κοινωνία. τοῦτο δ', εἰ μὴ ἴσα εἴη πως, οὐκ ἔσται. δεῖ ἄρα ἑνί τινι πάντα μετρεῖσθαι, ὥσπερ ἐλέχθη πρότερον. τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τῇ μὲν ἀληθείᾳ ἡ χρεία, ἣ πάντα συνέχει· εἰ γὰρ μηθὲν δέοιντο ἢ μὴ ὁμοίως, ἢ οὐκ ἔσται ἀλλαγὴ ἢ οὐχ ἡ αὐτή· οἷον δ' ὑπάλλαγμα τῆς χρείας τὸ νόμισμα γέγονε κατὰ συνθήκην· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τοὔνομα ἔχει νόμισμα, ὅτι οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ ἐστί, καὶ ἐφ' ἡμῖν μεταβαλεῖν καὶ ποιῆσαι ἄχρηστον. ἔσται δὴ ἀντιπεπονθός, ὅταν ἰσασθῇ, ὥστε ὅπερ γεωργὸς πρὸς σκυτοτόμον, τὸ ἔργον τὸ τοῦ σκυτοτόμου πρὸς τὸ τοῦ γεωργοῦ.

ENGLISH

change, and it is through exchange that they hold together. That is why people set up a shrine of the Graces in a prominent place, so that there may be repayment; for this is the special mark of grace: one should serve in return someone who has done one a favor, and in turn take the lead in doing a favor oneself. Proportional exchange is brought about by cross-conjunction. Let A be a builder, B a shoemaker, C a house, and D a shoe. The builder must get from the shoemaker the shoemaker's product, and give him his own in return. If, then, there is first proportional equality, and then reciprocity takes place, the result we described will follow.[6]

If not, the exchange is not equal and does not hold together; for nothing prevents the product of one from being worth more than that of the other, and so these must be equalized. This holds in the other crafts too: they would be destroyed if what the producer produced, in quantity and quality, were not matched by what the recipient received, of that amount and of that kind. For a community is not formed from two doctors, but from a doctor and a farmer, and in general from people who are different and not equal; but they must be equalized. That is why all things that are exchanged must somehow be comparable. It is for this that money has come in, and it becomes in a way a middle term, since it measures everything—and so measures excess and deficiency too—how many shoes are equal to a house or to a quantity of food. So as builder is to shoemaker, so must so many shoes be to a house or to food.

For without this there will be no exchange and no community. And this will not happen unless the goods are somehow equal. So everything must be measured by some one thing, as was said before. In truth this is need, which holds everything together: if people needed nothing, or did not need things in a similar way, there would either be no exchange or not the same exchange. But money has become, by convention, a kind of stand-in for need. And that is why it has the name *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 be reciprocity, then, when the goods have been equalized, so that as farmer is to

6 The Graces (*Charites*) were goddesses of charm and favor; the Greek word *charis* means both a favor and gratitude for it.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	shoemaker, so the shoemaker's product is to the farmer's.
1133b εἰς σχῆμα δ' ἀναλογίας οὐ δεῖ ἄγειν, ὅταν ἀλλάξωνται (εἰ δὲ μή, ἀμφοτέρας ἕξει τὰς ὑπεροχὰς τὸ ἕτερον ἄκρον), ἀλλ' ὅταν ἔχωσι τὰ αὑτῶν. οὕτως ἴσοι καὶ κοινωνοί, ὅτι αὕτη ἡ ἰσότης δύναται ἐπ' αὐτῶν γίνεσθαι. γεωργὸς α, τροφὴ γ, σκυτοτόμος β, τὸ ἔργον αὐτοῦ τὸ ἰσασμένον δ. εἰ δ' οὕτω μὴ ἦν ἀντιπεπονθέναι, οὐκ ἂν ἦν κοινωνία. ὅτι δ' ἡ χρεία συνέχει ὥσπερ ἕν τι ὄν, δηλοῖ ὅτι ὅταν μὴ ἐν χρείᾳ ὦσιν ἀλλήλων, ἢ ἀμφότεροι ἢ ἄτερος, οὐκ ἀλλάττονται, †ὥσπερ ὅταν οὗ ἔχει αὐτὸς δέηταί τις, οἷον οἴνου, διδόντες σίτου ἐξαγωγήν.† δεῖ ἄρα τοῦτο ἰσασθῆναι. ὑπὲρ δὲ τῆς μελλούσης ἀλλαγῆς, εἰ νῦν μηδὲν δεῖται, ὅτι ἔσται ἂν δεηθῇ, τὸ νόμισμα οἷον ἐγγυητής ἐσθ' ἡμῖν· δεῖ γὰρ τοῦτο φέροντι εἶναι λαβεῖν.	But we must not bring them into the form of a proportion once they have made the exchange (otherwise one extreme will have both excesses), but while they still have their own goods. In this way they are equals and partners, because this equality can be established in their case. Let A be a farmer, C food, B a shoemaker, and D his product, equalized with C. If reciprocity were not possible in this way, there would be no community. That need holds things together as a single unit is shown by the fact that when people are not in need of each other—both of them, or one—they do not exchange—as when someone needs what one has oneself, wine for example, and people give leave for the export of grain. So this must be equalized. And for a future exchange—in case someone needs nothing now—money serves us as a kind of guarantor that the exchange will be there if he does need something; for someone who brings money must be able to get what he wants.[7]
πάσχει μὲν οὖν καὶ τοῦτο τὸ αὐτό· οὐ γὰρ ἀεὶ ἴσον δύναται· ὅμως δὲ βούλεται μένειν μᾶλλον. διὸ δεῖ πάντα τετιμῆσθαι· οὕτω γὰρ ἀεὶ ἔσται ἀλλαγή, εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, κοινωνία. τὸ δὴ νόμισμα ὥσπερ μέτρον σύμμετρα ποιῆσαν ἰσάζει· οὔτε γὰρ ἂν μὴ οὔσης ἀλλαγῆς κοινωνία ἦν, οὔτ' ἀλλαγὴ ἰσότητος μὴ οὔσης, οὔτ' ἰσότης μὴ οὔσης συμμετρίας. τῇ μὲν οὖν ἀληθείᾳ ἀδύνατον τὰ τοσοῦτον διαφέροντα σύμμετρα γενέσθαι, πρὸς δὲ τὴν χρείαν ἐνδέχεται ἱκανῶς. ἓν δή τι δεῖ εἶναι, τοῦτο δ' ἐξ ὑποθέσεως· διὸ νόμισμα καλεῖται· τοῦτο γὰρ πάντα ποιεῖ σύμμετρα· μετρεῖται γὰρ πάντα νομίσματι. οἰκία α, μναῖ δέκα β, κλίνη γ.	Money, it is true, is subject to the same thing: its value is not always equal. Still, it tends to be more stable. That is why everything should have a price set on it; for in this way there will always be exchange, and if there is exchange, community. Money, then, acting like a measure, makes things commensurable and equalizes them. For there would be no community without exchange, no exchange without equality, and no equality without commensurability. In truth it is impossible for things that differ so much to become commensurable, but with reference to need they can become so sufficiently. There must, then, be some one unit, fixed by agreement—which is why it is called *nomisma*. For this makes all things commensurable, since all things are measured by money. Let A be a house, B ten minas, C a bed.[8]
τὸ α τοῦ β ἥμισυ, εἰ πέντε μνῶν ἀξία ἡ οἰκία, ἢ ἴσον· ἡ δὲ κλίνη δέκατον μέρος, τὸ γ τοῦ β· δῆλον τοίνυν πόσαι κλῖναι ἴσον οἰκίᾳ, ὅτι πέντε. ὅτι δ' οὕτως ἡ ἀλλαγὴ ἦν πρὶν τὸ νόμισμα εἶναι, δῆλον· διαφέρει γὰρ οὐδὲν ἢ κλῖναι πέντε ἀντὶ οἰκίας, ἢ ὅσου αἱ πέντε κλῖναι.	A is half of B, if the house is worth five minas, or equal to that; and the bed, C, is a tenth of B. It is clear, then, how many beds are equal to a house: five. And it is clear that exchange took place in this way before there was money; for it makes no difference whether five beds are given for a house or the value of five beds.

7 The Greek text of the wine-and-grain example is corrupt; the translation is tentative.
8 The mina was a sum of money, equal to a hundred drachmas.

GREEK

τί μὲν οὖν τὸ ἄδικον καὶ τί τὸ δίκαιόν ἐστιν, εἴρηται. διωρισμένων δὲ τούτων δῆλον ὅτι ἡ δικαιοπραγία μέσον ἐστὶ τοῦ ἀδικεῖν καὶ ἀδικεῖσθαι· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πλέον ἔχειν τὸ δ' ἔλαττόν ἐστιν. ἡ δὲ δικαιοσύνη μεσότης τίς ἐστιν, οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ταῖς ἄλλαις ἀρεταῖς, ἀλλ' ὅτι μέσου ἐστίν· ἡ δ' ἀδικία τῶν ἄκρων. [1134a] καὶ ἡ μὲν δικαιοσύνη ἐστὶ καθ' ἣν ὁ δίκαιος λέγεται πρακτικὸς κατὰ προαίρεσιν τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ διανεμητικὸς καὶ αὐτῷ πρὸς ἄλλον καὶ ἑτέρῳ πρὸς ἕτερον οὐχ οὕτως ὥστε τοῦ μὲν αἱρετοῦ πλέον αὐτῷ ἔλαττον δὲ τῷ πλησίον, τοῦ βλαβεροῦ δ' ἀνάπαλιν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἴσου τοῦ κατ' ἀναλογίαν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἄλλῳ πρὸς ἄλλον. ἡ δ' ἀδικία τοὐναντίον τοῦ ἀδίκου.

ENGLISH

We have said, then, what the unjust and the just are. With these distinctions drawn, it is clear that just action is a mean between doing wrong and being wronged; for the one is having too much and the other having too little. Justice is a kind of mean, but not in the same way as the other excellences: rather, it is a mean because it is concerned with a mean, while injustice is concerned with the extremes. [1134a] Justice is that in virtue of which the just person is said to do what is just by decision, and to distribute—whether between himself and another or between two others—not so as to give himself more of what is choiceworthy and his neighbor less (and the reverse with what is harmful), but so as to give what is proportionally equal; and likewise when distributing between two others. Injustice, conversely, is concerned with the unjust.

1134a τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις τοῦ ὠφελίμου ἢ βλαβεροῦ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον. διὸ ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἔλλειψις ἡ ἀδικία, ὅτι ὑπερβολῆς καὶ ἐλλείψεώς ἐστιν, ἐφ' αὑτοῦ μὲν ὑπερβολῆς μὲν τοῦ ἁπλῶς ὠφελίμου, ἐλλείψεως δὲ τοῦ βλαβεροῦ· ἐπὶ δὲ τῶν ἄλλων τὸ μὲν ὅλον ὁμοίως, τὸ δὲ παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον, ὁποτέρως ἔτυχεν. τοῦ δὲ ἀδικήματος τὸ μὲν ἔλαττον ἀδικεῖσθαί ἐστι, τὸ δὲ μεῖζον τὸ ἀδικεῖν. περὶ μὲν οὖν δικαιοσύνης καὶ ἀδικίας, τίς ἑκατέρας ἐστὶν ἡ φύσις, εἰρήσθω τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ δικαίου καὶ ἀδίκου καθόλου.

The unjust is excess and deficiency of what is beneficial or harmful, contrary to proportion. That is why injustice is excess and deficiency: because it is concerned with excess and deficiency—in one's own case, excess of what is beneficial without qualification and deficiency of what is harmful; in the case of others, the result as a whole is similar, but the violation of proportion may go either way. Of the unjust act, the lesser part is being wronged, and the greater part is doing wrong. Let this be our account of justice and injustice and the nature of each, and likewise of the just and the unjust in general.

POLITICAL JUSTICE

Aristotle distinguishes political justice among free equals and divides it into natural and legal.

GREEK

ἐπεὶ δ' ἔστιν ἀδικοῦντα μήπω ἄδικον εἶναι, ὁ ποῖα ἀδικήματα ἀδικῶν ἤδη ἄδικός ἐστιν ἑκάστην ἀδικίαν, οἷον κλέπτης ἢ μοιχὸς ἢ λῃστής; ἢ οὕτω μὲν οὐδὲν διοίσει; καὶ γὰρ ἂν συγγένοιτο γυναικὶ εἰδὼς τὸ ᾗ, ἀλλ' οὐ διὰ προαιρέσεως ἀρχὴν ἀλλὰ διὰ πάθος. ἀδικεῖ μὲν οὖν, ἄδικος δ' οὐκ ἔστιν, οἷον οὐ κλέπτης, ἔκλεψε δέ, οὐδὲ μοιχός, ἐμοίχευσε δέ· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων. πῶς μὲν οὖν ἔχει τὸ ἀντιπεπονθὸς πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον, εἴρηται πρότερον· δεῖ δὲ μὴ λανθάνειν ὅτι τὸ ζητούμενόν ἐστι καὶ τὸ ἁπλῶς δίκαιον καὶ τὸ πολιτικὸν δίκαιον.

ENGLISH

Since it is possible to do wrong without yet being unjust, what sort of wrongs must one commit to be already unjust with respect to each kind of injustice—a thief, say, or an adulterer, or a bandit? Or will it make no difference in this way? For a man might have sex with a woman knowing who she is, yet not with decision as the starting point, but because of feeling. He does wrong, then, but he is not unjust: he is not a thief, though he stole, nor an adulterer, though he committed adultery; and likewise in the other cases. We have said before how reciprocity is related to the just. But we

GREEK	ENGLISH
	must not forget that what we are looking for is both the just without qualification and political justice.
τοῦτο δ' ἔστιν ἐπὶ κοινωνῶν βίου πρὸς τὸ εἶναι αὐτάρκειαν, ἐλευθέρων καὶ ἴσων ἢ κατ' ἀναλογίαν ἢ κατ' ἀριθμόν· ὥστε ὅσοις μή ἐστι τοῦτο, οὐκ ἔστι τούτοις πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ πολιτικὸν δίκαιον, ἀλλά τι δίκαιον καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα. ἔστι γὰρ δίκαιον, οἷς καὶ νόμος πρὸς αὐτούς· νόμος δ', ἐν οἷς ἀδικία· ἡ γὰρ δίκη κρίσις τοῦ δικαίου καὶ τοῦ ἀδίκου. ἐν οἷς δ' ἀδικία, καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν ἐν τούτοις (ἐν οἷς δὲ τὸ ἀδικεῖν, οὐ πᾶσιν ἀδικία), τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶ τὸ πλέον αὑτῷ νέμειν τῶν ἁπλῶς ἀγαθῶν, ἔλαττον δὲ τῶν ἁπλῶς κακῶν. διὸ οὐκ ἐῶμεν ἄρχειν ἄνθρωπον, ἀλλὰ τὸν λόγον, ὅτι ἑαυτῷ τοῦτο ποιεῖ 1134b καὶ γίνεται τύραννος. ἔστι δ' ὁ ἄρχων φύλαξ τοῦ δικαίου, εἰ δὲ τοῦ δικαίου, καὶ τοῦ ἴσου.	Political justice exists among people who share a life aimed at self-sufficiency, people who are free and equal, whether proportionally or numerically. So among those for whom this is not the case, there is no political justice in their relations with one another, but only justice of a sort, by resemblance. For there is justice among those whose relations are governed by law; and there is law among those between whom there is injustice, since a legal judgment is a discrimination of the just and the unjust. Where there is injustice there is also doing wrong (though where there is doing wrong there is not always injustice), and injustice is assigning oneself too much of what is good without qualification and too little of what is bad without qualification. That is why we do not allow a human being to rule, but reason, since a human being does this for himself 1134b and becomes a tyrant. The ruler is a guardian of the just, and if of the just, then of the equal too.
1134b ἐπεὶ δ' οὐθὲν αὐτῷ πλέον εἶναι δοκεῖ, εἴπερ δίκαιος (οὐ γὰρ νέμει πλέον τοῦ ἁπλῶς ἀγαθοῦ αὑτῷ, εἰ μὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἀνάλογόν ἐστιν· διὸ ἑτέρῳ πονεῖ· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἀλλότριον εἶναί φασιν ἀγαθὸν τὴν δικαιοσύνην, καθάπερ ἐλέχθη καὶ πρότερον)· μισθὸς ἄρα τις δοτέος, τοῦτο δὲ τιμὴ καὶ γέρας· ὅτῳ δὲ μὴ ἱκανὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα, οὗτοι γίνονται τύραννοι.	Since the ruler seems to get nothing extra for himself, if he is just (for he does not assign himself more of what is good without qualification unless it is proportional to him; that is why he labors for another, and why people say justice is "another's good," as was said before), some reward must be given him, and this is honor and privilege. Those for whom such things are not enough become tyrants.
τὸ δὲ δεσποτικὸν δίκαιον καὶ τὸ πατρικὸν οὐ ταὐτὸν τούτοις ἀλλ' ὅμοιον· οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἀδικία πρὸς τὰ αὑτοῦ ἁπλῶς, τὸ δὲ κτῆμα καὶ τὸ τέκνον, ἕως ἂν ᾖ πηλίκον καὶ χωρισθῇ, ὥσπερ μέρος αὑτοῦ, αὑτὸν δ' οὐδεὶς προαιρεῖται βλάπτειν· διὸ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία πρὸς αὑτόν· οὐδ' ἄρα ἄδικον οὐδὲ δίκαιον τὸ πολιτικόν· κατὰ νόμον γὰρ ἦν, καὶ ἐν οἷς ἐπεφύκει εἶναι νόμος, οὗτοι δ' ἦσαν οἷς ὑπάρχει ἰσότης τοῦ ἄρχειν καὶ ἄρχεσθαι. διὸ μᾶλλον πρὸς γυναῖκά ἐστι δίκαιον ἢ πρὸς τέκνα καὶ κτήματα· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ οἰκονομικὸν δίκαιον· ἕτερον δὲ καὶ τοῦτο τοῦ πολιτικοῦ.	The justice of a master and that of a father are not the same as these, though they are similar. For there is no injustice without qualification toward what is one's own; and a piece of property, or a child until it reaches a certain age and becomes independent, is as it were a part of oneself, and no one decides to harm himself. That is why there is no injustice toward oneself, and therefore nothing politically just or unjust either. For that, as we saw, is according to law, and exists among those who are naturally subject to law, and these, as we saw, are people who share equally in ruling and being ruled. That is why justice exists more toward a wife than toward children and property; for this is household justice. But this too is different from political justice.[9]

GREEK

τοῦ δὲ πολιτικοῦ δικαίου τὸ μὲν φυσικόν ἐστι τὸ δὲ νομικόν, φυσικὸν μὲν τὸ πανταχοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχον δύναμιν, καὶ οὐ τῷ δοκεῖν ἢ μή, νομικὸν δὲ ὃ ἐξ ἀρχῆς μὲν οὐδὲν διαφέρει οὕτως ἢ ἄλλως, ὅταν δὲ θῶνται, διαφέρει, οἷον τὸ μνᾶς λυτροῦσθαι, ἢ τὸ αἶγα θύειν ἀλλὰ μὴ δύο πρόβατα, ἔτι ὅσα ἐπὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα νομοθετοῦσιν, οἷον τὸ θύειν Βρασίδᾳ, καὶ τὰ ψηφισματώδη. δοκεῖ δ' ἐνίοις εἶναι πάντα τοιαῦτα, ὅτι τὸ μὲν φύσει ἀκίνητον καὶ πανταχοῦ τὴν αὐτὴν ἔχει δύναμιν, ὥσπερ τὸ πῦρ καὶ ἐνθάδε καὶ ἐν Πέρσαις καίει, τὰ δὲ δίκαια κινούμενα ὁρῶσιν.

ENGLISH

Of political justice, part is natural and part is legal. The natural is what has the same force everywhere, and does not depend on whether people think it so or not. The legal is what originally makes no difference whether it is done this way or otherwise, but once people have laid it down, it does make a difference—for example, that a prisoner's ransom is a mina, or that a goat is to be sacrificed rather than two sheep; and further, the laws passed for particular cases, such as sacrificing to Brasidas, and provisions made by decree. Some people think all justice is of this kind, because what is by nature is unchangeable and has the same force everywhere—fire burns both here and in Persia—whereas they see just things changing.[10]

τοῦτο δ' οὐκ ἔστιν οὕτως ἔχον, ἀλλ' ἔστιν ὡς· καίτοι παρά γε τοῖς θεοῖς ἴσως οὐδαμῶς, παρ' ἡμῖν δ' ἔστι μέν τι καὶ φύσει, κινητὸν μέντοι πᾶν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἐστὶ τὸ μὲν φύσει τὸ δ' οὐ φύσει. ποῖον δὲ φύσει τῶν ἐνδεχομένων καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν, καὶ ποῖον οὗ ἀλλὰ νομικὸν καὶ συνθήκῃ, εἴπερ ἄμφω κινητὰ ὁμοίως, δῆλον. καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁ αὐτὸς ἁρμόσει διορισμός· φύσει γὰρ ἡ δεξιὰ κρείττων, καίτοι ἐνδέχεται πάντας ἀμφιδεξίους γενέσθαι. τὰ δὲ κατὰ συνθήκην καὶ τὸ συμφέρον τῶν δικαίων 1135a ὅμοιά ἐστι τοῖς μέτροις· οὐ γὰρ πανταχοῦ ἴσα τὰ οἰνηρὰ καὶ σιτηρὰ μέτρα, ἀλλ' οὗ μὲν ὠνοῦνται, μείζω, οὗ δὲ πωλοῦσιν, ἐλάττω.

This is not so, though it is so in a way. Among the gods, perhaps, it is not so at all; but among us there is something that is by nature, even though all of it is changeable. Nevertheless, some is by nature and some not by nature. Among things that can be otherwise, which kind is by nature, and which is not by nature but legal and conventional, given that both are equally changeable, is clear. And the same distinction will fit other cases too: by nature the right hand is stronger, and yet it is possible for everyone to become ambidextrous. The just things that rest on convention and expediency 1135a are like measures: measures of wine and grain are not equal everywhere, but larger where people buy and smaller where they sell.

1135a ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰ μὴ φυσικὰ ἀλλ' ἀνθρώπινα δίκαια οὐ ταὐτὰ πανταχοῦ, ἐπεὶ οὐδ' αἱ πολιτεῖαι, ἀλλὰ μία μόνον πανταχοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἡ ἀρίστη. τῶν δὲ δικαίων καὶ νομίμων ἕκαστον ὡς τὰ καθόλου πρὸς τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα ἔχει· τὰ μὲν γὰρ πραττόμενα πολλά, ἐκείνων δ' ἕκαστον ἕν· καθόλου γάρ. διαφέρει δὲ τὸ ἀδίκημα καὶ τὸ ἄδικον καὶ τὸ δικαίωμα καὶ τὸ δίκαιον· ἄδικον μὲν γάρ ἐστι τῇ φύσει ἢ τάξει· αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο, ὅταν πραχθῇ, ἀδίκημά ἐστι, πρὶν δὲ πραχθῆναι, οὔπω, ἀλλ' ἄδικον. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δικαίωμα· καλεῖται δὲ μᾶλλον δικαιοπράγημα τὸ κοινόν, δικαίωμα δὲ τὸ ἐπανόρθωμα τοῦ ἀδικήματος. καθ' ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν, ποῖά τε εἴδη καὶ πόσα καὶ περὶ ποῖα τυγχάνει ὄντα, ὕστερον ἐπισκεπτέον.

Likewise, the things that are just not by nature but by human arrangement are not the same everywhere, since constitutions are not the same either; yet only one constitution is everywhere by nature the best. Each of the things that are just and lawful is related to actions as universals are to particulars: the things done are many, but each of those is one, since it is universal. There is a difference between an unjust act and what is unjust, and between a just act and what is just. Something is unjust by nature or by ordinance; and this same thing, once it has been done, is an unjust act, but before it is done it is not yet that—only something unjust. Likewise with a just act; though the general term is rather "just action" (*dikaiopragēma*),

9 The master's "property" here includes slaves.
10 Brasidas was a Spartan general killed at Amphipolis in 422 BC; the people of that city honored him with sacrifices as a hero.

GREEK

ENGLISH

while *dikaiōma* means the correction of an unjust act. As for each of these, what kinds there are, how many, and what they are concerned with, we must examine later.

VOLUNTARY AND INVOLUNTARY WRONGDOING

Aristotle examines when harmful acts count as unjust, and whether one can be wronged voluntarily.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ὄντων δὲ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων τῶν εἰρημένων, ἀδικεῖ μὲν καὶ δικαιοπραγεῖ ὅταν ἑκών τις αὐτὰ πράττῃ· ὅταν δ' ἄκων, οὔτ' ἀδικεῖ οὔτε δικαιοπραγεῖ ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ συμβεβηκός· οἷς γὰρ συμβέβηκε δικαίοις εἶναι ἢ ἀδίκοις, πράττουσιν. ἀδίκημα δὲ καὶ δικαιοπράγημα ὥρισται τῷ ἑκουσίῳ καὶ ἀκουσίῳ· ὅταν γὰρ ἑκούσιον ᾖ, ψέγεται, ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἀδίκημα τότ' ἐστίν· ὥστ' ἔσται τι ἄδικον μὲν ἀδίκημα δ' οὔπω, ἂν μὴ τὸ ἑκούσιον προσῇ.

Given that the just and unjust things are as we have described, a person does wrong or acts justly when he does them voluntarily. When he does them involuntarily, he neither does wrong nor acts justly, except incidentally; for he does things that happen to be just or unjust. An unjust act and a just action are marked off by the voluntary and the involuntary: when an act is voluntary it is blamed, and at the same time it is then an unjust act. So there will be something that is unjust but not yet an unjust act, unless voluntariness is also present.

λέγω δ' ἑκούσιον μέν, ὥσπερ καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται, ὃ ἄν τις τῶν ἐφ' αὑτῷ ὄντων εἰδὼς καὶ μὴ ἀγνοῶν πράττῃ μήτε ὃν μήτε ᾧ μήτε οὗ ἕνεκα, οἷον τίνα τύπτει καὶ τίνι καὶ τίνος ἕνεκα, κἀκείνων ἕκαστον μὴ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς μηδὲ βίᾳ (ὥσπερ εἴ τις λαβὼν τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ τύπτοι ἕτερον, οὐχ ἑκών· οὐ γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ)· ἐνδέχεται δὲ τὸν τυπτόμενον πατέρα εἶναι, τὸν δ' ὅτι μὲν ἄνθρωπος ἢ τῶν παρόντων τις γινώσκειν, ὅτι δὲ πατὴρ ἀγνοεῖν· ὁμοίως δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον διωρίσθω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ οὗ ἕνεκα, καὶ περὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν ὅλην. τὸ δὴ ἀγνοούμενον, ἢ μὴ ἀγνοούμενον μὲν μὴ ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ὄν, ἢ βίᾳ, ἀκούσιον.

By voluntary I mean, as was also said before, whatever a person does among the things that are up to him, knowingly and not in ignorance of the person affected, the instrument, or the purpose—for example, whom he is striking, with what, and for what purpose—and each of these not incidentally, nor by force (as when someone takes his hand and strikes another with it, he does not do so voluntarily, since it was not up to him). It is possible for the person struck to be one's father, and for the striker to know that he is a human being, or one of those present, but not know that he is his father. Let the same distinction be drawn in the case of the purpose, and with regard to the action as a whole. What is done in ignorance, then, or not in ignorance but not up to the agent, or by force, is involuntary.

πολλὰ γὰρ καὶ τῶν φύσει ὑπαρχόντων [1135b] εἰδότες καὶ πράττομεν καὶ πάσχομεν, ὧν οὐθὲν οὔθ' ἑκούσιον οὔτ' ἀκούσιόν ἐστιν, οἷον τὸ γηρᾶν ἢ ἀποθνήσκειν. ἔστι δ' ὁμοίως ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων καὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ τὸ κατὰ συμβεβηκός· καὶ γὰρ ἂν τὴν παρακαταθήκην ἀποδοίη τις ἄκων καὶ διὰ φόβον, ὃν οὔτε δίκαια πράττειν οὔτε δικαιοπραγεῖν φατέον ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ συμβεβηκός. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸν ἀναγκαζόμενον καὶ ἄκοντα τὴν παρακαταθήκην μὴ ἀποδιδόντα κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς φατέον ἀδικεῖν καὶ τὰ ἄδικα πράττειν. τῶν δὲ ἑκουσίων τὰ μὲν προελόμενοι πράττομεν τὰ δ' οὐ προελόμενοι,

For there are many natural processes, too, [1135b] that we do or undergo knowingly, none of which is either voluntary or involuntary—growing old, for example, or dying. And with unjust and just acts alike there is also the incidental. Someone might return a deposit involuntarily and out of fear; he should not be said to do just things or to act justly, except incidentally. Likewise, someone who under compulsion and involuntarily fails to return a deposit should be said to do wrong and do unjust things only incidentally. Of voluntary actions,

GREEK

προελόμενοι μὲν ὅσα προβουλευσάμενοι, ἀπροαίρετα δὲ ὅσ' ἀπροβούλευτα.

1135b τριῶν δὴ οὐσῶν βλαβῶν τῶν ἐν ταῖς κοινωνίαις, τὰ μὲν μετ' ἀγνοίας ἁμαρτήματά ἐστιν, ὅταν μήτε ὃν μήτε ὃ μήτε ᾧ μήτε οὗ ἕνεκα ὑπέλαβε πράξῃ· ἢ γὰρ οὐ βάλλειν ἢ οὐ τούτῳ ἢ οὐ τοῦτον ἢ οὐ τούτου ἕνεκα ᾠήθη, ἀλλὰ συνέβη οὐχ οὗ ἕνεκα ᾠήθη, οἷον οὐχ ἵνα τρώσῃ ἀλλ' ἵνα κεντήσῃ, ἢ οὐχ ὅν, ἢ οὐχ ᾧ.

ὅταν μὲν οὖν παραλόγως ἡ βλάβη γένηται, ἀτύχημα· ὅταν δὲ μὴ παραλόγως, ἄνευ δὲ κακίας, ἁμάρτημα (ἁμαρτάνει μὲν γὰρ ὅταν ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν αὐτῷ ᾖ τῆς αἰτίας, ἀτυχεῖ δ' ὅταν ἔξωθεν)· ὅταν δὲ εἰδὼς μὲν μὴ προβουλεύσας δέ, ἀδίκημα, οἷον ὅσα τε διὰ θυμὸν καὶ ἄλλα πάθη, ὅσα ἀναγκαῖα ἢ φυσικὰ συμβαίνει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ταῦτα γὰρ βλάπτοντες καὶ ἁμαρτάνοντες ἀδικοῦσι μέν, καὶ ἀδικήματά ἐστιν, οὐ μέντοι πω ἄδικοι διὰ ταῦτα οὐδὲ πονηροί· οὐ γὰρ διὰ μοχθηρίαν ἡ βλάβη· ὅταν δ' ἐκ προαιρέσεως, ἄδικος καὶ μοχθηρός. διὸ καλῶς τὰ ἐκ θυμοῦ οὐκ ἐκ προνοίας κρίνεται· οὐ γὰρ ἄρχει ὁ θυμῷ ποιῶν, ἀλλ' ὁ ὀργίσας. ἔτι δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἢ μὴ ἀμφισβητεῖται, ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ δικαίου· ἐπὶ φαινομένῃ γὰρ ἀδικίᾳ ἡ ὀργή ἐστιν.

οὐ γὰρ ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς συναλλάγμασι περὶ τοῦ γενέσθαι ἀμφισβητοῦσιν, ὧν ἀνάγκη τὸν ἕτερον εἶναι μοχθηρόν, ἂν μὴ διὰ λήθην αὐτὸ δρῶσιν· ἀλλ' ὁμολογοῦντες περὶ τοῦ πράγματος, περὶ δὲ τοῦ ποτέρως δίκαιον ἀμφισβητοῦσιν (ὁ δ' ἐπιβουλεύσας οὐκ ἀγνοεῖ), ὥστε ὃ μὲν οἴεται ἀδικεῖσθαι, ὃ δ' οὔ. 1136a ἐὰν δ' ἐκ προαιρέσεως βλάψῃ, ἀδικεῖ· καὶ κατὰ ταῦτ' ἤδη τὰ ἀδικήματα ὁ ἀδικῶν ἄδικος, ὅταν παρὰ τὸ ἀνάλογον ἢ ἢ παρὰ τὸ ἴσον. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ δίκαιος, ὅταν προελόμενος δικαιοπραγῇ· δικαιοπραγεῖ δέ, ἂν μόνον ἑκὼν πράττῃ. τῶν δ' ἀκουσίων τὰ μέν ἐστι συγγνωμονικὰ τὰ δ' οὐ συγγνωμονικά. ὅσα μὲν γὰρ μὴ μόνον ἀγνοοῦντες ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ἄγνοιαν ἁμαρτάνουσι, συγγνωμονικά, ὅσα δὲ μὴ δι' ἄγνοιαν, ἀλλ'

ENGLISH

some we do by decision and others not by decision: by decision, those we have deliberated about beforehand; not by decision, those we have not deliberated about beforehand.

There are, then, three kinds of harm that occur in dealings between people. Those done in ignorance are mistakes, when the person affected, the act, the instrument, or the purpose is not what the agent supposed. He thought he was not throwing at all, or not with this, or not at this person, or not for this purpose; but the result was not what he intended—for instance, he threw not to wound but only to prick—or it was not the person he thought, or not with the instrument he thought.

When the harm occurs contrary to reasonable expectation, it is a misfortune. When it is not contrary to reasonable expectation, but occurs without vice, it is a mistake (for a person makes a mistake when the origin of the cause lies in himself, and suffers misfortune when it lies outside him). When someone acts knowingly but without prior deliberation, it is an unjust act—for instance, acts done through anger or other feelings that are necessary or natural to human beings. For in doing these harms and making these mistakes people do wrong, and the acts are unjust acts; yet the agents are not thereby unjust or wicked, since the harm is not due to vice. But when the act comes from decision, the agent is unjust and wicked. That is why acts done from anger are rightly judged not to be premeditated; for the one who starts it is not the person acting in anger but the one who made him angry. Further, the dispute is not about whether the thing happened but about whether it was just; for anger is a response to apparent injustice.

It isn't like disputes over contracts, where the parties argue about whether the thing happened at all; there one of the two must be wicked, unless they act out of forgetfulness. Here they agree about the facts and dispute which side is in the right (whereas someone who has plotted against another knows perfectly well what he is doing), so that one thinks he is being wronged and the other doesn't. 1136a But if someone does harm by decision, he does wrong; and it is when he commits wrongs of this kind, which violate proportion or equality, that the wrongdoer is at last an unjust person. Similarly a person is just when he acts

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀγνοοῦντες μὲν διὰ πάθος δὲ μήτε φυσικὸν μήτ' ἀνθρώπινον, οὐ συγγνωμονικά.

justly by decision; if he merely acts voluntarily, he only does just things. Of involuntary acts, some are forgivable and others are not. Errors people make not only in ignorance but because of ignorance are forgivable; those they make not because of ignorance, but in ignorance that stems from a feeling neither natural nor human, are not forgivable.

1136a ἀπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις, εἰ ἱκανῶς διώρισται περὶ τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι καὶ ἀδικεῖν, πρῶτον μὲν εἰ ἔστιν ὥσπερ Εὐριπίδης εἴρηκε, λέγων ἀτόπως μητέρα κατέκταν τὴν ἐμήν, βραχὺς λόγος. ἑκὼν ἑκοῦσαν, ἢ οὐχ ἑκοῦσαν οὐχ ἑκών; πότερον γὰρ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἔστιν ἑκόντα ἀδικεῖσθαι, ἢ οὔ ἀλλ' ἀκούσιον ἅπαν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν πᾶν ἑκούσιον; καὶ ἆρα πᾶν οὕτως ἢ ἐκείνως, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν πᾶν ἑκούσιον, ἢ τὸ μὲν ἑκούσιον τὸ δ' ἀκούσιον; ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαιοῦσθαι· τὸ γὰρ δικαιοπραγεῖν πᾶν ἑκούσιον· ὥστ' εὔλογον ἀντικεῖσθαι ὁμοίως καθ' ἑκάτερον, τό τ' ἀδικεῖσθαι καὶ δικαιοῦσθαι ἢ ἑκούσιον ἢ ἀκούσιον εἶναι. ἄτοπον δ' ἂν δόξειε καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαιοῦσθαι, εἰ πᾶν ἑκούσιον· ἔνιοι γὰρ δικαιοῦνται οὐχ ἑκόντες.

One might raise a difficulty about whether we have adequately defined being wronged and doing wrong. First, is it as Euripides says, putting it strangely: "I killed my mother—the tale is short. / Willing, and she willing? Or neither of us willing?" Is it truly possible to be wronged voluntarily, or is being wronged always involuntary, just as doing wrong is always voluntary? And is it always one way or always the other—as doing wrong is always voluntary—or is it sometimes voluntary and sometimes involuntary? The same question arises for being treated justly, since acting justly is always voluntary. So it would be reasonable for the two pairs to be opposed in the same way, and for being wronged and being treated justly alike to be either voluntary or involuntary. But it would seem odd, in the case of being treated justly too, if it were always voluntary; for some people are treated justly against their will.[11]

ἔπειτα καὶ τόδε διαπορήσειεν ἄν τις, πότερον ὁ τὸ ἄδικον πεπονθὼς ἀδικεῖται πᾶς, ἢ ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πράττειν, καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ πάσχειν ἐστίν· κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς γὰρ ἐνδέχεται ἐπ' ἀμφοτέρων μεταλαμβάνειν τῶν δικαίων· ὁμοίως δὲ δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀδίκων· οὐ γὰρ ταὐτὸν τὸ τἄδικα πράττειν τῷ ἀδικεῖν οὐδὲ τὸ ἄδικα πάσχειν τῷ ἀδικεῖσθαι· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ δικαιοπραγεῖν καὶ δικαιοῦσθαι· ἀδύνατον γὰρ ἀδικεῖσθαι μὴ ἀδικοῦντος ἢ δικαιοῦσθαι μὴ δικαιοπραγοῦντος. εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἁπλῶς τὸ ἀδικεῖν τὸ βλάπτειν ἑκόντα τινά, τὸ δ' ἑκόντα εἰδότα καὶ ὃν καὶ ᾧ καὶ ὥς, ὁ δ' ἀκρατὴς ἑκὼν βλάπτει αὐτὸς αὑτόν, ἑκών τ' ἂν ἀδικοῖτο κἂν ἐνδέχοιτο αὐτὸς αὑτὸν ἀδικεῖν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ τοῦτο ἓν τῶν ἀπορουμένων, 1136b εἰ ἐνδέχεται αὐτὸν αὑτὸν ἀδικεῖν.

Next, one might also raise this difficulty: is everyone who has suffered something unjust thereby wronged, or is it with suffering as it is with doing? For in both cases it is possible to have a share in just things incidentally, and clearly the same holds for unjust things. Doing unjust things is not the same as doing wrong, and suffering unjust things is not the same as being wronged; and likewise with acting justly and being treated justly. For it is impossible to be wronged unless someone does wrong, or to be treated justly unless someone acts justly. Now if doing wrong is simply harming someone voluntarily, and "voluntarily" means knowing whom one affects, with what, and how, and the uncontrolled person voluntarily harms himself, then he would be wronged voluntarily, and it would be possible to wrong oneself. This too is one of the open questions: 1136b whether it is possible to wrong oneself.

1136b

11 Probably spoken by Alcmaeon in Euripides' lost play about him.

GREEK

ἔτι ἑκὼν ἄν τις δι' ἀκρασίαν ὑπ' ἄλλου βλάπτοιτο ἑκόντος, ὥστ' εἴη ἂν ἑκόντ' ἀδικεῖσθαι. ἢ οὐκ ὀρθὸς ὁ διορισμός, ἀλλὰ προσθετέον τῷ βλάπτειν εἰδότα καὶ ὃν καὶ ᾧ καὶ ὡς τὸ παρὰ τὴν ἐκείνου βούλησιν; βλάπτεται μὲν οὖν τις ἑκὼν καὶ τἄδικα πάσχει, ἀδικεῖται δ' οὐδεὶς ἑκών· οὐδεὶς γὰρ βούλεται, οὐδ' ὁ ἀκρατής, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν βούλησιν πράττει· οὔτε γὰρ βούλεται οὐδεὶς ὃ μὴ οἴεται εἶναι σπουδαῖον, ὅ τε ἀκρατὴς οὐχ ἃ οἴεται δεῖν πράττειν πράττει. ὁ δὲ τὰ αὑτοῦ διδούς, ὥσπερ Ὅμηρός φησι δοῦναι τὸν Γλαῦκον τῷ Διομήδει χρύσεα χαλκείων, ἑκατόμβοι' ἐννεαβοίων, οὐκ ἀδικεῖται· ἐπ' αὐτῷ γάρ ἐστι τὸ διδόναι, τὸ δ' ἀδικεῖσθαι οὐκ ἐπ' αὐτῷ, ἀλλὰ τὸν ἀδικοῦντα δεῖ ὑπάρχειν. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ ἀδικεῖσθαι, ὅτι οὐχ ἑκούσιον, δῆλον.

ἔτι δ' ὧν προειλόμεθα δύ' ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, πότερόν ποτ' ἀδικεῖ ὁ νείμας παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν τὸ πλέον ἢ ὁ ἔχων, καὶ εἰ ἔστιν αὐτὸν αὑτὸν ἀδικεῖν. εἰ γὰρ ἐνδέχεται τὸ πρότερον λεχθὲν καὶ ὁ διανέμων ἀδικεῖ ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ ἔχων τὸ πλέον, εἴ τις πλέον αὑτοῦ ἑτέρῳ νέμει εἰδὼς καὶ ἑκών, οὗτος αὐτὸς αὑτὸν ἀδικεῖ· ὅπερ δοκοῦσιν οἱ μέτριοι ποιεῖν· ὁ γὰρ ἐπιεικὴς ἐλαττωτικός ἐστιν. ἢ οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἁπλοῦν; ἑτέρου γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ, εἰ ἔτυχεν, πλεονεκτεῖ, οἷον δόξης ἢ τοῦ ἁπλῶς καλοῦ. ἔτι λύεται κατὰ τὸν διορισμὸν τοῦ ἀδικεῖν· οὐδὲν γὰρ παρὰ τὴν αὑτοῦ πάσχει βούλησιν, ὥστε οὐκ ἀδικεῖται διά γε τοῦτο, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, βλάπτεται μόνον.

φανερὸν δὲ ὅτι καὶ ὁ διανέμων ἀδικεῖ, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὁ τὸ πλέον ἔχων ἀεί· οὐ γὰρ ᾧ τὸ ἄδικον ὑπάρχει ἀδικεῖ, ἀλλ' ᾧ τὸ ἑκόντα τοῦτο ποιεῖν· τοῦτο δ' ὅθεν ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς πράξεως, ἥ ἐστιν ἐν τῷ διανέμοντι ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν τῷ λαμβάνοντι. ἔτι ἐπεὶ πολλαχῶς τὸ ποιεῖν λέγεται, καὶ ἔστιν ὡς τὰ ἄψυχα κτείνει καὶ ἡ χεὶρ καὶ ὁ οἰκέτης ἐπιτάξαντος, οὐκ ἀδικεῖ μέν, ποιεῖ δὲ τὰ ἄδικα. ἔτι εἰ μὲν ἀγνοῶν ἔκρινεν, οὐκ ἀδικεῖ κατὰ τὸ νομικὸν δίκαιον οὐδ' ἄδικος ἡ κρίσις ἐστίν, ἔστι δ' ὡς ἄδικος· ἕτερον γὰρ τὸ

ENGLISH

Again, through lack of self-control someone might voluntarily be harmed by another who acts voluntarily, so that it would be possible to be wronged voluntarily. Or is the definition incorrect, and must we add to "harming someone knowing whom, with what, and how" the words "against his wish"? Someone may, then, be harmed voluntarily and suffer unjust things, but no one is wronged voluntarily. For no one wishes it, not even the uncontrolled person; he acts against his wish. No one wishes for what he doesn't think worthwhile, and the uncontrolled person does what he doesn't think he ought to do. And someone who gives away what is his own—as Homer says Glaucus gave Diomedes "gold for bronze, a hundred oxen's worth for nine"—is not wronged. Giving is up to him, but being wronged is not up to him: there has to be someone who wrongs him. So it is clear that being wronged is not voluntary.[12]

Of the questions we set ourselves, two remain to be discussed: whether it is the one who has distributed more than someone deserves who does wrong, or the one who has it; and whether it is possible to wrong oneself. For if the first alternative is possible, and it is the distributor who does wrong and not the one who has more, then if someone knowingly and voluntarily distributes more to another than to himself, he wrongs himself. And this is what moderate people seem to do, since the decent person tends to take less than his share. Or is this too not so simple? For he may perhaps be getting more of some other good, such as reputation or what is fine without qualification. The difficulty is also solved by our definition of doing wrong: he suffers nothing against his own wish, so he is not wronged, at least not on this account; if anything, he is only harmed.

It is evident, too, that the distributor does wrong, but the one who has more does not always do so. For it is not the person who ends up with the unjust thing who does wrong, but the person who voluntarily does it; and that is the one in whom the action originates, which is the distributor, not the recipient. Again, since "doing" is said in many ways, and in one sense inanimate things kill, or a hand does, or a servant acting on orders, these do

12 In the *Iliad* (Book 6) the warriors Glaucus and Diomedes exchange armor, and Glaucus gets much the worse of the bargain.

GREEK

νομικὸν δίκαιον καὶ τὸ πρῶτον· εἰ δὲ γινώσκων ἔκρινεν ἀδίκως, 1137a πλεονεκτεῖ καὶ αὐτὸς ἢ χάριτος ἢ τιμωρίας.

1137a ὥσπερ οὖν κἂν εἴ τις μερίσαιτο τοῦ ἀδικήματος, καὶ ὁ διὰ ταῦτα κρίνας ἀδίκως πλέον ἔχει· καὶ γὰρ ἐπ' ἐκείνῳ τὸν ἀγρὸν κρίνας οὐκ ἀγρὸν ἀλλ' ἀργύριον ἔλαβεν. οἱ δ' ἄνθρωποι ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς οἴονται εἶναι τὸ ἀδικεῖν· διὸ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον εἶναι ῥᾴδιον. τὸ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· συγγενέσθαι μὲν γὰρ τῇ τοῦ γείτονος καὶ πατάξαι τὸν πλησίον καὶ δοῦναι τῇ χειρὶ τὸ ἀργύριον ῥᾴδιον καὶ ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὡδὶ ἔχοντας ταῦτα ποιεῖν οὔτε ῥᾴδιον οὔτ' ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.

ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὸ γνῶναι τὰ δίκαια καὶ τὰ ἄδικα οὐδὲν οἴονται σοφὸν εἶναι, ὅτι περὶ ὧν οἱ νόμοι λέγουσιν οὐ χαλεπὸν συνιέναι (ἀλλ' οὐ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ τὰ δίκαια ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ συμβεβηκός)· ἀλλὰ πῶς πραττόμενα καὶ πῶς νεμόμενα δίκαια, τοῦτο δὴ πλέον ἔργον ἢ τὰ ὑγιεινὰ εἰδέναι· ἐπεὶ κἀκεῖ μέλι καὶ οἶνον καὶ ἐλλέβορον καὶ καῦσιν καὶ τομὴν εἰδέναι ῥᾴδιον, ἀλλὰ πῶς δεῖ νεῖμαι πρὸς ὑγίειαν καὶ τίνι καὶ πότε, τοσοῦτον ἔργον ὅσον ἰατρὸν εἶναι. δι' αὐτὸ δὲ τοῦτο καὶ τοῦ δικαίου οἴονται εἶναι οὐδὲν ἧττον τὸ ἀδικεῖν, ὅτι οὐχ ἧττον ὁ δίκαιος ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον δύναιτ' ἂν ἕκαστον πρᾶξαι τούτων· καὶ γὰρ συγγενέσθαι γυναικὶ καὶ πατάξαι· καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος τὴν ἀσπίδα ἀφεῖναι καὶ στραφεὶς ἐφ' ὁποτεραοῦν τρέχειν.

ἀλλὰ τὸ δειλαίνειν καὶ ἀδικεῖν οὐ τὸ ταῦτα ποιεῖν ἐστί, πλὴν κατὰ συμβεβηκός, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὡδὶ ἔχοντα ταῦτα ποιεῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ ἰατρεύειν καὶ τὸ ὑγιάζειν οὐ τὸ τέμνειν ἢ μὴ τέμνειν ἢ φαρμακεύειν ἢ μὴ φαρμακεύειν ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ὡδί. ἔστι δὲ τὰ δίκαια ἐν τούτοις οἷς μέτεστι τῶν ἁπλῶς ἀγαθῶν, ἔχουσι δ' ὑπερβολὴν ἐν τούτοις καὶ ἔλλειψιν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ὑπερβολὴ αὐτῶν, οἷον ἴσως τοῖς θεοῖς, τοῖς δ' οὐδὲν μόριον ὠφέλιμον, τοῖς ἀνιάτως κακοῖς, ἀλλὰ πάντα βλάπτει, τοῖς δὲ μέχρι τοῦ· διὰ τοῦτ' ἀνθρώπινόν ἐστιν.

ENGLISH

not do wrong, though they do unjust things. Again, if a judge gave his verdict in ignorance, he does not do wrong according to legal justice, nor is his verdict unjust—though in a way it is unjust, since legal justice is different from justice in the primary sense. But if he knowingly judged unjustly, 1137a he too is getting more than his share, either of gratitude or of revenge.

So the man who judges unjustly for these reasons has more, just as if he had taken a share of the proceeds of the wrong; for someone who awards the field on those terms gets not a field but money. People think that doing wrong is up to them, and so they think that being just is easy too. But it isn't. Sleeping with the neighbor's wife, hitting the man next to you, handing over the bribe—these are easy and up to us; but doing them from a certain state of character is neither easy nor up to us.

Similarly, people think it takes no wisdom to know what is just and what is unjust, because it isn't hard to understand what the laws say (though these are not the just things, except incidentally). But how actions must be done and distributions made in order to be just—that is a bigger task than knowing what is healthy. Even there it is easy to know about honey, wine, hellebore, cautery and surgery; but knowing how to dispense them to produce health, and to whom, and when, is as big a task as being a doctor. For this very reason people think that doing wrong belongs no less to the just person, since the just person would be no less able, and in fact more able, to do each of these things: to sleep with a woman, to hit someone; and the brave person could throw away his shield, turn, and run in any direction.[13]

But being a coward or doing wrong is not doing these things, except incidentally; it is doing them from a certain state—just as practicing medicine and healing is not cutting or not cutting, giving drugs or not giving them, but doing so in a certain way. Just things exist among those who have a share in things good without qualification, and who can have too much or too little of them. For some beings can have no excess of these goods—the gods, perhaps; for others, the incurably bad, no portion of them is beneficial, but all of it does

13 Hellebore is a plant used in Greek medicine as a powerful purge.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	harm; and for others they are beneficial up to a point. That is why justice is something human.

EQUITY

Aristotle explains equity as a correction of law where its general rules fall short.

GREEK	ENGLISH
περὶ δὲ ἐπιεικείας καὶ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς, πῶς ἔχει ἡ μὲν ἐπιείκεια πρὸς δικαιοσύνην τὸ δ' ἐπιεικὲς πρὸς τὸ δίκαιον, ἐχόμενόν ἐστιν εἰπεῖν. οὔτε γὰρ ὡς ταὐτὸν ἁπλῶς οὔθ' ὡς ἕτερον τῷ γένει φαίνεται σκοπουμένοις· καὶ ὁτὲ μὲν τὸ ἐπιεικὲς ἐπαινοῦμεν καὶ ἄνδρα τὸν τοιοῦτον, ὥστε καὶ ἐπὶ τὰ ἄλλα 1137b ἐπαινοῦντες μεταφέρομεν ἀντὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ, τὸ ἐπιεικέστερον ὅτι βέλτιον δηλοῦντες· ὁτὲ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ ἀκολουθοῦσι φαίνεται ἄτοπον εἰ τὸ ἐπιεικὲς παρὰ τὸ δίκαιόν τι ὂν ἐπαινετόν ἐστιν· ἢ γὰρ τὸ δίκαιον οὐ σπουδαῖον, ἢ τὸ ἐπιεικὲς οὐ δίκαιον, εἰ ἄλλο· ἢ εἰ ἄμφω σπουδαῖα, ταὐτόν ἐστιν.	Next we should discuss equity and the equitable: how equity is related to justice, and the equitable to the just. For when we examine them, they appear neither simply the same nor different in kind. Sometimes we praise the equitable, and the man who is equitable, so much that we even carry the word over to other things 1137b when we praise them, using it in place of "good" and signaling by "more equitable" that something is better. At other times, when we follow the argument through, it seems odd if the equitable, being something apart from the just, is praiseworthy. For either the just is not excellent, or the equitable is not just, if it is something different; or, if both are excellent, they are the same.[14]
1137b ἡ μὲν οὖν ἀπορία σχεδὸν συμβαίνει διὰ ταῦτα περὶ τὸ ἐπιεικές, ἔχει δ' ἅπαντα τρόπον τινὰ ὀρθῶς καὶ οὐδὲν ὑπεναντίον ἑαυτοῖς· τό τε γὰρ ἐπιεικὲς δικαίου τινὸς ὂν βέλτιόν ἐστι δίκαιον, καὶ οὐχ ὡς ἄλλο τι γένος ὂν βέλτιόν ἐστι τοῦ δικαίου. ταὐτὸν ἄρα δίκαιον καὶ ἐπιεικές, καὶ ἀμφοῖν σπουδαίοιν ὄντοιν κρεῖττον τὸ ἐπιεικές. ποιεῖ δὲ τὴν ἀπορίαν ὅτι τὸ ἐπιεικὲς δίκαιον μέν ἐστιν, οὐ τὸ κατὰ νόμον δέ, ἀλλ' ἐπανόρθωμα νομίμου δικαίου. αἴτιον δ' ὅτι ὁ μὲν νόμος καθόλου πᾶς, περὶ ἐνίων δ' οὐχ οἷόν τε ὀρθῶς εἰπεῖν καθόλου. ἐν οἷς οὖν ἀνάγκη μὲν εἰπεῖν καθόλου, μὴ οἷόν τε δὲ ὀρθῶς, τὸ ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πλέον λαμβάνει ὁ νόμος, οὐκ ἀγνοῶν τὸ ἁμαρτανόμενον.	These, roughly, are the considerations that create the difficulty about the equitable. Yet all of them are in a way correct, and none contradicts the others. The equitable, while better than one kind of just, is just; it is not better than the just by being something of a different kind. So the just and the equitable are the same, and while both are excellent, the equitable is superior. What creates the difficulty is that the equitable is just, but not just according to law; it is a correction of legal justice. The reason is that all law is universal, but about some things it is not possible to speak correctly in universal terms. So in cases where it is necessary to speak universally but not possible to do so correctly, the law takes what holds for the most part, not unaware of the error this involves.
καὶ ἔστιν οὐδὲν ἧττον ὀρθός· τὸ γὰρ ἁμάρτημα οὐκ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ οὐδ' ἐν τῷ νομοθέτῃ ἀλλ' ἐν τῇ φύσει τοῦ πράγματός ἐστιν· εὐθὺς γὰρ τοιαύτη ἡ τῶν πρακτῶν ὕλη ἐστίν. ὅταν οὖν λέγῃ μὲν ὁ νόμος καθόλου, συμβῇ δ' ἐπὶ τούτου παρὰ τὸ καθόλου, τότε ὀρθῶς ἔχει, ᾗ παραλείπει ὁ νομοθέτης καὶ ἥμαρτεν ἁπλῶς εἰπών, ἐπανορθοῦν τὸ ἐλλειφθέν, ὃ κἂν ὁ νομοθέτης αὐτὸς ἂν εἶπεν ἐκεῖ παρών, καὶ εἰ ᾔδει, ἐνομοθέτησεν. διὸ δίκαιον μέν ἐστι, καὶ	And it is no less correct for that. The error lies not in the law, nor in the lawmaker, but in the nature of the thing, since the material of practical matters is simply like that. So when the law speaks universally, and a case arises that falls outside the universal, then it is right—where the lawmaker has left a gap and erred by speaking without qualification—to correct the omission: to say what the

14 The Greek word (*epieikeia*) also means decency or reasonableness in general; here Aristotle discusses the sense in which it corrects the rigidity of law.

GREEK	ENGLISH
βέλτιόν τινος δικαίου, οὐ τοῦ ἁπλῶς δὲ ἀλλὰ τοῦ διὰ τὸ ἁπλῶς ἁμαρτήματος. καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ φύσις ἡ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς, ἐπανόρθωμα νόμου, ᾗ ἐλλείπει διὰ τὸ καθόλου. τοῦτο γὰρ αἴτιον καὶ τοῦ μὴ πάντα κατὰ νόμον εἶναι, ὅτι περὶ ἐνίων ἀδύνατον θέσθαι νόμον, ὥστε ψηφίσματος δεῖ.	lawmaker himself would have said had he been present, and would have written into law had he known. That is why the equitable is just, and better than one kind of just—not better than the just without qualification, but than the error that arises from its being stated without qualification. And this is the nature of the equitable: a correction of law where it falls short because of its universality. This is also the reason why not everything is governed by law: about some things it is impossible to lay down a law, so that a decree is needed.
τοῦ γὰρ ἀορίστου ἀόριστος καὶ ὁ κανών ἐστιν, ὥσπερ καὶ τῆς Λεσβίας οἰκοδομίας ὁ μολίβδινος κανών· πρὸς γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ λίθου μετακινεῖται καὶ οὐ μένει ὁ κανών, καὶ τὸ ψήφισμα πρὸς τὰ πράγματα. τί μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπιεικές, καὶ ὅτι δίκαιον καὶ τινὸς βέλτιον δικαίου, δῆλον. φανερὸν δ' ἐκ τούτου καὶ ὁ ἐπιεικὴς τίς ἐστιν· ὁ γὰρ τῶν τοιούτων προαιρετικὸς καὶ πρακτικός, καὶ 1138a ὁ μὴ ἀκριβοδίκαιος ἐπὶ τὸ χεῖρον ἀλλ' ἐλαττωτικός, καίπερ ἔχων τὸν νόμον βοηθόν, ἐπιεικής ἐστι, καὶ ἡ ἕξις αὕτη ἐπιείκεια, δικαιοσύνη τις οὖσα καὶ οὐχ ἑτέρα τις ἕξις.	For when a thing is indefinite, the rule for it is indefinite too, like the lead rule used in Lesbian building: the rule shifts to fit the shape of the stone and does not stay fixed, and so the decree adapts to the facts. So it is clear what the equitable is, and that it is just and better than one kind of just. From this it is also evident who the equitable person is: someone who decides on and does such things, and 1138a who does not insist on the strict letter of justice to the detriment of others but tends to take less, even though he has the law on his side, is equitable; and this state is equity, which is a kind of justice and not some different state.[15]
1138a πότερον δ' ἐνδέχεται ἑαυτὸν ἀδικεῖν ἢ οὔ, φανερὸν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων. τὰ μὲν γάρ ἐστι τῶν δικαίων τὰ κατὰ πᾶσαν ἀρετὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου τεταγμένα, οἷον οὐ κελεύει ἀποκτιννύναι ἑαυτὸν ὁ νόμος, ἃ δὲ μὴ κελεύει, ἀπαγορεύει. ἔτι ὅταν παρὰ τὸν νόμον βλάπτῃ μὴ ἀντιβλάπτων ἑκών, ἀδικεῖ, ἑκὼν δὲ ὁ εἰδὼς καὶ ὧν καὶ ᾧ· ὁ δὲ δι' ὀργὴν ἑαυτὸν σφάττων ἑκὼν τοῦτο δρᾷ παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον, ὃ οὐκ ἐᾷ ὁ νόμος· ἀδικεῖ ἄρα. ἀλλὰ τίνα; ἢ τὴν πόλιν, αὐτὸν δ' οὔ; ἑκὼν γὰρ πάσχει, ἀδικεῖται δ' οὐδεὶς ἑκών. διὸ καὶ ἡ πόλις ζημιοῖ, καί τις ἀτιμία πρόσεστι τῷ ἑαυτὸν διαφθείραντι ὡς τὴν πόλιν ἀδικοῦντι.	Whether or not it is possible to wrong oneself is evident from what has been said. One class of just things consists of those, in accordance with each excellence, that are prescribed by law; for example, the law does not command anyone to kill himself, and what it does not command, it forbids. Again, when someone voluntarily does harm contrary to the law, not in retaliation, he does wrong—and a voluntary agent is one who knows both whom he affects and with what. Now someone who cuts his own throat in anger does this voluntarily, contrary to correct reason, which the law does not permit; so he does wrong. But to whom? To the city, surely, not to himself? For he suffers voluntarily, and no one is wronged voluntarily. That is why the city also penalizes him, and a certain dishonor attaches to someone who has destroyed himself, as one who wrongs the city.
ἔτι καθ' ὃ ἄδικος μόνον ὁ ἀδικῶν καὶ μὴ ὅλως φαῦλος, οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικῆσαι ἑαυτόν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἄλλος ἐκείνου· ἔστι γάρ πως ὁ ἄδικος οὕτω πονηρὸς ὥσπερ ὁ δειλός, οὐχ ὡς	Again, in the sense in which someone who does wrong is merely unjust, and not bad in every way,

15 Lesbian masonry used irregular, many-sided blocks; a flexible lead ruler could be bent to take the contour of each stone.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ὅλην ἔχων τὴν πονηρίαν, ὥστ' οὐδὲ κατὰ ταύτην ἀδικεῖ)· ἅμα γὰρ ἂν τῷ αὐτῷ εἴη ἀφῃρῆσθαι καὶ προσκεῖσθαι τὸ αὐτό· τοῦτο δὲ ἀδύνατον, ἀλλ' ἀεὶ ἐν πλείοσιν ἀνάγκη εἶναι τὸ δίκαιον καὶ τὸ ἄδικον. ἔτι δὲ ἑκούσιόν τε καὶ ἐκ προαιρέσεως καὶ πρότερον· ὁ γὰρ διότι ἔπαθε καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἀντιποιῶν οὐ δοκεῖ ἀδικεῖν· αὐτὸς δ' αὑτόν, ταὐτὰ ἅμα καὶ πάσχει καὶ ποιεῖ. ἔτι εἴη ἂν ἑκόντα ἀδικεῖσθαι. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις, ἄνευ τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἀδικημάτων οὐδεὶς ἀδικεῖ, μοιχεύει δ' οὐδεὶς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ οὐδὲ τοιχωρυχεῖ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τοῖχον οὐδὲ κλέπτει τὰ αὑτοῦ.

it is not possible to wrong oneself. (This sense is different from the other: the unjust person is in a way bad in the same manner as the coward, not as having badness as a whole, so it is not in respect of badness as a whole that he does wrong either.) For then the same thing would at the same time have been taken from and added to the same person, and this is impossible; the just and the unjust always require more than one person. Again, doing wrong is voluntary, by decision, and comes first; someone who does the same thing back because he has suffered it is not thought to do wrong. But someone who wrongs himself suffers and does the same things at the same time. Again, it would then be possible to be wronged voluntarily. Besides, no one does wrong without committing some particular kind of wrong; but no one commits adultery with his own wife, or breaks through his own wall, or steals his own property.

ὅλως δὲ λύεται τὸ αὐτὸν ἀδικεῖν καὶ κατὰ τὸν διορισμὸν τὸν περὶ τοῦ ἑκουσίως ἀδικεῖσθαι. φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι ἄμφω μὲν φαῦλα, καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀδικεῖν (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἔλαττον τὸ δὲ πλέον ἔχειν ἐστὶ τοῦ μέσου καὶ ὥσπερ ὑγιεινὸν μὲν ἐν ἰατρικῇ, εὐεκτικὸν δὲ ἐν γυμναστικῇ)· ἀλλ' ὅμως χεῖρον τὸ ἀδικεῖν· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀδικεῖν μετὰ κακίας καὶ ψεκτόν, καὶ κακίας ἢ τῆς τελείας καὶ ἁπλῶς ἢ ἐγγύς (οὐ γὰρ ἅπαν τὸ ἑκούσιον μετὰ ἀδικίας), τὸ δ' ἀδικεῖσθαι ἄνευ κακίας καὶ ἀδικίας. καθ' αὐτὸ μὲν οὖν τὸ ἀδικεῖσθαι ἧττον φαῦλον, [1138b] κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς δ' οὐδὲν κωλύει μεῖζον εἶναι κακόν.

In general, the question of wronging oneself is also resolved by the distinction we drew about being wronged voluntarily. It is evident, too, that both are bad, being wronged and doing wrong (for one is having less and the other having more than the mean, as with what is healthy in medicine and what makes for fitness in athletic training). Still, doing wrong is worse. Doing wrong involves badness and is blameworthy—badness that is either complete and unqualified or close to it (for not every voluntary act involves injustice)—while being wronged involves no badness or injustice. In itself, then, being wronged is less bad, [1138b] but nothing prevents it from being incidentally a greater evil.

1138b ἀλλ' οὐδὲν μέλει τῇ τέχνῃ, ἀλλὰ πλευρῖτιν λέγει μείζω νόσον προσπταίσματος· καίτοι γένοιτ' ἄν ποτε θάτερον κατὰ συμβεβηκός, εἰ προσπταίσαντα διὰ τὸ πεσεῖν συμβαίη ὑπὸ τῶν πολεμίων ληφθῆναι ἢ ἀποθανεῖν. κατὰ μεταφορὰν δὲ καὶ ὁμοιότητα ἔστιν οὐκ αὐτῷ πρὸς αὐτὸν δίκαιον ἀλλὰ τῶν αὐτοῦ τισίν, οὐ πᾶν δὲ δίκαιον ἀλλὰ τὸ δεσποτικὸν ἢ τὸ οἰκονομικόν. ἐν τούτοις γὰρ τοῖς λόγοις διέστηκε τὸ λόγον ἔχον μέρος τῆς ψυχῆς πρὸς τὸ ἄλογον· εἰς ἃ δὴ βλέπουσι καὶ δοκεῖ εἶναι ἀδικία πρὸς αὐτόν, ὅτι ἐν τούτοις ἔστι πάσχειν τι παρὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ὀρέξεις· ὥσπερ οὖν ἄρχοντι καὶ ἀρχομένῳ εἶναι πρὸς ἄλληλα δίκαιόν τι καὶ τούτοις. περὶ μὲν οὖν δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, τῶν ἠθικῶν ἀρετῶν, διωρίσθω τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον.

But the craft doesn't concern itself with that: it calls pleurisy a worse illness than a stumble, even though the stumble might sometimes turn out incidentally worse—if, say, a man stumbled, fell, and as a result was captured by the enemy or killed. By metaphor and resemblance there is a justice not between a person and himself but between certain parts of him—not every kind of justice, but the kind between master and slave, or within a household. For in these discussions the part of the soul that has reason is set apart from the non-rational part. It is with these parts in view that there seems to be such a thing as injustice toward oneself, because they can suffer something contrary to their own desires; so there is thought to be a kind of

GREEK	ENGLISH
	justice between them, as between ruler and ruled. Let this, then, be our account of justice and the other excellences, those of character.

Book VI

The intellectual excellences; practical wisdom
Aristotle examines the excellences of thought, especially practical wisdom and its relation to character.

GREEK

ἐπεὶ δὲ τυγχάνομεν πρότερον εἰρηκότες ὅτι δεῖ τὸ μέσον αἱρεῖσθαι, μὴ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν μηδὲ τὴν ἔλλειψιν, τὸ δὲ μέσον ἐστὶν ὡς ὁ λόγος ὁ ὀρθὸς λέγει, τοῦτο διέλωμεν. ἐν πάσαις γὰρ ταῖς εἰρημέναις ἕξεσι, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, ἔστι τις σκοπὸς πρὸς ὃν ἀποβλέπων ὁ τὸν λόγον ἔχων ἐπιτείνει καὶ ἀνίησιν, καί τις ἔστιν ὅρος τῶν μεσοτήτων, ἃς μεταξύ φαμεν εἶναι τῆς ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῆς ἐλλείψεως, οὔσας κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον.

ἔστι δὲ τὸ μὲν εἰπεῖν οὕτως ἀληθὲς μέν, οὐθὲν δὲ σαφές· καὶ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις ἐπιμελείαις, περὶ ὅσας ἐστὶν ἐπιστήμη, τοῦτ' ἀληθὲς μὲν εἰπεῖν, ὅτι οὔτε πλείω οὔτε ἐλάττω δεῖ πονεῖν οὐδὲ ῥᾳθυμεῖν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μέσα καὶ ὡς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος· τοῦτο δὲ μόνον ἔχων ἄν τις οὐδὲν ἂν εἰδείη πλέον, οἷον ποῖα δεῖ προσφέρεσθαι πρὸς τὸ σῶμα, εἴ τις εἴπειεν ὅτι ὅσα ἡ ἰατρικὴ κελεύει καὶ ὡς ὁ ταύτην ἔχων. διὸ δεῖ καὶ περὶ τὰς τῆς ψυχῆς ἕξεις μὴ μόνον ἀληθῶς εἶναι τοῦτ' εἰρημένον, ἀλλὰ καὶ διωρισμένον τίς ἐστιν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος καὶ τούτου τίς ὅρος.

ENGLISH

Since we said earlier that one should choose the mean, not the excess or the deficiency, and that the mean is as correct reason says, let us analyze this. In all the states we have discussed, as in other matters too, there is a target which the person who has reason keeps his eye on as he tightens or relaxes; and there is a standard that marks out the means, which we say lie between excess and deficiency, being in accordance with correct reason.

To put it like this is true, but not at all clear. In other pursuits too, those governed by scientific knowledge, it is true to say that one should exert oneself or take it easy neither more nor less than one should, but to the intermediate degree and as correct reason says. But someone who had only this would be none the wiser—about what treatments to apply to the body, for example, if he were told "whatever medicine prescribes, and as the person who has it prescribes." So with the states of the soul too, it is not enough for this to have been said truly; we must also define what correct reason is, and what its standard is.

THE PARTS OF THE SOUL THAT HAVE REASON

Aristotle divides the rational soul into scientific and calculative parts, each aiming at truth.

GREEK

τὰς δὴ τῆς ψυχῆς ἀρετὰς διελόμενοι [1139a] τὰς μὲν εἶναι τοῦ ἤθους ἔφαμεν τὰς δὲ τῆς διανοίας. περὶ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἠθικῶν διεληλύθαμεν, περὶ δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν, περὶ ψυχῆς πρῶτον εἰπόντες, λέγωμεν οὕτως. πρότερον μὲν οὖν ἐλέχθη δύ' εἶναι μέρη τῆς ψυχῆς, τό τε λόγον ἔχον καὶ τὸ ἄλογον· νῦν δὲ περὶ τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον διαιρετέον. καὶ ὑποκείσθω δύο τὰ λόγον ἔχοντα, ἓν μὲν ᾧ θεωροῦμεν τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ὄντων ὅσων αἱ ἀρχαὶ μὴ ἐνδέχονται ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἓν δὲ ᾧ τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα· πρὸς γὰρ τὰ τῷ γένει ἕτερα καὶ τῶν τῆς ψυχῆς μορίων ἕτερον τῷ γένει τὸ πρὸς ἑκάτερον πεφυκός, εἴπερ καθ' ὁμοιότητά τινα καὶ οἰκειότητα ἡ γνῶσις ὑπάρχει αὐτοῖς.

ENGLISH

When we divided the excellences of the soul, [1139a] we said that some are excellences of character and others of thought. We have gone through the excellences of character; let us discuss the rest as follows, first saying something about the soul. It was said before that the soul has two parts, the part that has reason and the non-rational part. Now we must divide the part that has reason in the same way. Let us take it that there are two parts that have reason: one by which we contemplate the kinds of things whose principles cannot be otherwise, and one by which we contemplate things

GREEK

ENGLISH

that can. For where objects differ in kind, the parts of the soul naturally suited to each also differ in kind—if, that is, they come to know their objects through a certain likeness and kinship with them.

1139a λεγέσθω δὲ τούτων τὸ μὲν ἐπιστημονικὸν τὸ δὲ λογιστικόν· τὸ γὰρ βουλεύεσθαι καὶ λογίζεσθαι ταὐτόν, οὐδεὶς δὲ βουλεύεται περὶ τῶν μὴ ἐνδεχομένων ἄλλως ἔχειν. ὥστε τὸ λογιστικόν ἐστιν ἕν τι μέρος τοῦ λόγον ἔχοντος. ληπτέον ἄρ' ἑκατέρου τούτων τίς ἡ βελτίστη ἕξις· αὕτη γὰρ ἀρετὴ ἑκατέρου, ἡ δ' ἀρετὴ πρὸς τὸ ἔργον τὸ οἰκεῖον. τρία δή ἐστιν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ τὰ κύρια πράξεως καὶ ἀληθείας, αἴσθησις νοῦς ὄρεξις. τούτων δ' ἡ αἴσθησις οὐδεμιᾶς ἀρχὴ πράξεως· δῆλον δὲ τῷ τὰ θηρία αἴσθησιν μὲν ἔχειν πράξεως δὲ μὴ κοινωνεῖν.

Let us call one of these the scientific part and the other the calculative part; for deliberating and calculating are the same, and no one deliberates about what cannot be otherwise. So the calculative part is one part of the part that has reason. We must grasp, then, what the best state of each of these is; for that is the excellence of each, and the excellence is relative to its proper function. There are three things in the soul that govern action and truth: perception, intellect, desire. Of these, perception is not the origin of any action; this is clear from the fact that beasts have perception but have no share in action.

ἔστι δ' ὅπερ ἐν διανοίᾳ κατάφασις καὶ ἀπόφασις, τοῦτ' ἐν ὀρέξει δίωξις καὶ φυγή· ὥστ' ἐπειδὴ ἡ ἠθικὴ ἀρετὴ ἕξις προαιρετική, ἡ δὲ προαίρεσις ὄρεξις βουλευτική, δεῖ διὰ ταῦτα μὲν τόν τε λόγον ἀληθῆ εἶναι καὶ τὴν ὄρεξιν ὀρθήν, εἴπερ ἡ προαίρεσις σπουδαία, καὶ τὰ αὐτὰ τὸν μὲν φάναι τὴν δὲ διώκειν. αὕτη μὲν οὖν ἡ διάνοια καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια πρακτική· τῆς δὲ θεωρητικῆς διανοίας καὶ μὴ πρακτικῆς μηδὲ ποιητικῆς τὸ εὖ καὶ κακῶς τἀληθές ἐστι καὶ ψεῦδος (τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι παντὸς διανοητικοῦ ἔργον)· τοῦ δὲ πρακτικοῦ καὶ διανοητικοῦ ἀλήθεια ὁμολόγως ἔχουσα τῇ ὀρέξει τῇ ὀρθῇ. πράξεως μὲν οὖν ἀρχὴ προαίρεσις—ὅθεν ἡ κίνησις ἀλλ' οὐχ οὗ ἕνεκα—προαιρέσεως δὲ ὄρεξις καὶ λόγος ὁ ἕνεκά τινος.

What affirmation and denial are in thought, pursuit and avoidance are in desire. So, since excellence of character is a state that issues in decisions, and decision is deliberative desire, the reasoning must be true and the desire correct if the decision is to be excellent, and the desire must pursue what the reasoning asserts. This, then, is practical thought and practical truth. For thought that is contemplative, and neither practical nor productive, doing well and badly consist in truth and falsehood (for that is the function of everything that thinks); but for what is practical and thinks, the good state is truth in agreement with correct desire. The origin of action—its source of motion, not its end—is decision; and the origin of decision is desire and reasoning directed toward some end.

διὸ οὔτ' ἄνευ νοῦ καὶ διανοίας οὔτ' ἄνευ ἠθικῆς ἐστὶν ἕξεως ἡ προαίρεσις· εὐπραξία γὰρ καὶ τὸ ἐναντίον ἐν πράξει ἄνευ διανοίας καὶ ἤθους οὐκ ἔστιν. διάνοια δ' αὐτὴ οὐθὲν κινεῖ, ἀλλ' ἡ ἕνεκά του καὶ πρακτική· 1139b αὕτη γὰρ καὶ τῆς ποιητικῆς ἄρχει· ἕνεκα γάρ του ποιεῖ πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν, καὶ οὐ τέλος ἁπλῶς (ἀλλὰ πρός τι καὶ τινός) τὸ ποιητόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ πρακτόν· ἡ γὰρ εὐπραξία τέλος, ἡ δ' ὄρεξις τούτου. διὸ ἢ ὀρεκτικὸς νοῦς ἡ προαίρεσις ἢ ὄρεξις διανοητική, καὶ ἡ τοιαύτη ἀρχὴ ἄνθρωπος.

That is why decision requires intellect and thought, and also a state of character; for acting well and its opposite cannot exist in action without thought and character. Thought by itself moves nothing; only thought that aims at something and is practical does. 1139b This kind also governs productive thought, since everyone who makes something makes it for the sake of something, and what is made is not an end without qualification (it is an end relative to something, and belongs to someone), whereas what is done is; for acting well is the end, and desire aims at that. So decision is either desiring intellect or thinking

GREEK	ENGLISH
	desire, and an origin of this kind is a human being.
1139b οὐκ ἔστι δὲ προαιρετὸν οὐδὲν γεγονός, οἷον οὐδεὶς προαιρεῖται Ἴλιον πεπορθηκέναι· οὐδὲ γὰρ βουλεύεται περὶ τοῦ γεγονότος ἀλλὰ περὶ τοῦ ἐσομένου καὶ ἐνδεχομένου, τὸ δὲ γεγονὸς οὐκ ἐνδέχεται μὴ γενέσθαι· διὸ ὀρθῶς Ἀγάθων μόνου γὰρ αὐτοῦ καὶ θεὸς στερίσκεται, ἀγένητα ποιεῖν ἅσσ' ἂν ᾖ πεπραγμένα. ἀμφοτέρων δὴ τῶν νοητικῶν μορίων ἀλήθεια τὸ ἔργον. καθ' ἃς οὖν μάλιστα ἕξεις ἀληθεύσει ἑκάτερον, αὗται ἀρεταὶ ἀμφοῖν.	Nothing that has already happened is an object of decision; no one decides to have sacked Troy. For no one deliberates about the past, but about what will be and can be, and what has happened cannot not have happened. So Agathon is right: "Of this alone even a god is deprived: / to make undone whatever has been done." The function of both thinking parts, then, is truth. So the states in which each part will best attain truth are the excellences of both.[1]

SCIENTIFIC KNOWLEDGE AND CRAFT

Aristotle defines scientific knowledge as demonstration about the necessary and craft as reasoned making.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἀρξάμενοι οὖν ἄνωθεν περὶ αὐτῶν πάλιν λέγωμεν. ἔστω δὴ οἷς ἀληθεύει ἡ ψυχὴ τῷ καταφάναι ἢ ἀποφάναι, πέντε τὸν ἀριθμόν· ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶ τέχνη ἐπιστήμη φρόνησις σοφία νοῦς· ὑπολήψει γὰρ καὶ δόξῃ ἐνδέχεται διαψεύδεσθαι. ἐπιστήμη μὲν οὖν τί ἐστιν, ἐντεῦθεν φανερόν, εἰ δεῖ ἀκριβολογεῖσθαι καὶ μὴ ἀκολουθεῖν ταῖς ὁμοιότησιν. πάντες γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνομεν, ὃ ἐπιστάμεθα, μηδ' ἐνδέχεσθαι ἄλλως ἔχειν· τὰ δ' ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως, ὅταν ἔξω τοῦ θεωρεῖν γένηται, λανθάνει εἰ ἔστιν ἢ μή. ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἄρα ἐστὶ τὸ ἐπιστητόν. ἀίδιον ἄρα· τὰ γὰρ ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄντα ἁπλῶς πάντα ἀίδια, τὰ δ' ἀίδια ἀγένητα καὶ ἄφθαρτα. ἔτι διδακτὴ ἅπασα ἐπιστήμη δοκεῖ εἶναι, καὶ τὸ ἐπιστητὸν μαθητόν. ἐκ προγινωσκομένων δὲ πᾶσα διδασκαλία, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀναλυτικοῖς λέγομεν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ δι' ἐπαγωγῆς, ἡ δὲ συλλογισμῷ.	Let us, then, start again from the beginning and discuss these once more. Let us say that the things by which the soul attains truth in affirming or denying are five in number: craft, scientific knowledge, practical wisdom, wisdom, intellect; for in supposition and opinion one can be mistaken. What scientific knowledge is becomes evident from the following, if we are to speak precisely and not be led by mere resemblances. We all suppose that what we know scientifically cannot be otherwise; whereas with things that can be otherwise, once they are out of our view, we can't tell whether they are the case or not. So what is scientifically known exists of necessity. So it is eternal; for things that exist of necessity without qualification are all eternal, and eternal things neither come into being nor pass away. Again, all scientific knowledge seems to be teachable, and what is scientifically known learnable. But all teaching starts from what is already known, as we say in the *Analytics* too; some teaching proceeds by induction, some by deduction.[2]
ἡ μὲν δὴ ἐπαγωγὴ ἀρχή ἐστι καὶ τοῦ καθόλου, ὁ δὲ συλλογισμὸς ἐκ τῶν καθόλου. εἰσὶν ἄρα ἀρχαὶ ἐξ ὧν ὁ συλλογισμός, ὧν οὐκ ἔστι συλλογισμός· ἐπαγωγὴ ἄρα. ἡ μὲν ἄρα ἐπιστήμη ἐστὶν ἕξις ἀποδεικτική, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα προσδιοριζόμεθα ἐν τοῖς ἀναλυτικοῖς· ὅταν γάρ πως πιστεύῃ καὶ γνώριμοι αὐτῷ ὦσιν αἱ ἀρχαί, ἐπίσταται· εἰ γὰρ μὴ μᾶλλον τοῦ συμπεράσματος, κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς	Induction supplies starting points, including the universal, while deduction proceeds from universals. So there are principles from which deduction proceeds, and of which there is no deduction; they come, then, by induction. Scientific knowledge is a state that demonstrates, together with the further qualifications we add in the *Analytics*. For a

1 Agathon was an Athenian tragic poet of the late fifth century BC; his plays survive only in fragments.
2 The *Analytics* are Aristotle's treatises on logic, deduction and demonstration.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἕξει τὴν ἐπιστήμην. περὶ μὲν οὖν ἐπιστήμης διωρίσθω τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον.

person has scientific knowledge when he is convinced in a certain way and the principles are known to him; if he does not know them better than the conclusion, he will have scientific knowledge only incidentally. Let this be our account of scientific knowledge.

1140a τοῦ δ' ἐνδεχομένου ἄλλως ἔχειν ἔστι τι καὶ ποιητὸν καὶ πρακτόν· ἕτερον δ' ἐστὶ ποίησις καὶ πρᾶξις (πιστεύομεν δὲ περὶ αὐτῶν καὶ τοῖς ἐξωτερικοῖς λόγοις)· ὥστε καὶ ἡ μετὰ λόγου ἕξις πρακτικὴ ἕτερόν ἐστι τῆς μετὰ λόγου ποιητικῆς ἕξεως. διὸ οὐδὲ περιέχεται ὑπ' ἀλλήλων· οὔτε γὰρ ἡ πρᾶξις ποίησις οὔτε ἡ ποίησις πρᾶξίς ἐστιν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ οἰκοδομικὴ τέχνη τίς ἐστι καὶ ὅπερ ἕξις τις μετὰ λόγου ποιητική, καὶ οὐδεμία οὔτε τέχνη ἐστὶν ἥτις οὐ μετὰ λόγου ποιητικὴ ἕξις ἐστίν, οὔτε τοιαύτη ἣ οὐ τέχνη, ταὐτὸν ἂν εἴη τέχνη καὶ ἕξις μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς ποιητική.

What can be otherwise includes both what is made and what is done; making and doing are different (on this we can rely on our more popular discussions too). So the state involving reason that is concerned with doing is different from the state involving reason that is concerned with making. Hence neither includes the other: doing is not making, nor is making doing. Now building is a craft, and is precisely a certain state involving reason concerned with making; and there is no craft that is not a state involving reason concerned with making, nor any such state that is not a craft. So craft would be the same as a state involving true reason concerned with making.

ἔστι δὲ τέχνη πᾶσα περὶ γένεσιν καὶ τὸ τεχνάζειν καὶ θεωρεῖν ὅπως ἂν γένηταί τι τῶν ἐνδεχομένων καὶ εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι, καὶ ὧν ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν τῷ ποιοῦντι ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐν τῷ ποιουμένῳ· οὔτε γὰρ τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄντων ἢ γινομένων ἡ τέχνη ἐστίν, οὔτε τῶν κατὰ φύσιν· ἐν αὑτοῖς γὰρ ἔχουσι ταῦτα τὴν ἀρχήν. ἐπεὶ δὲ ποίησις καὶ πρᾶξις ἕτερον, ἀνάγκη τὴν τέχνην ποιήσεως ἀλλ' οὐ πράξεως εἶναι. καὶ τρόπον τινὰ περὶ τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν ἡ τύχη καὶ ἡ τέχνη, καθάπερ καὶ Ἀγάθων φησὶ τέχνη τύχην ἔστερξε καὶ τύχη τέχνην. ἡ μὲν οὖν τέχνη, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, ἕξις τις μετὰ λόγου ἀληθοῦς ποιητική ἐστιν, ἡ δ' ἀτεχνία τοὐναντίον μετὰ λόγου ψευδοῦς ποιητικὴ ἕξις,περὶ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἄλλως ἔχειν.

All craft is concerned with bringing something into being, that is, with contriving and considering how something may come to be among the things that can either be or not be, and whose origin is in the maker, not in the thing made. For there is no craft of things that are or come to be of necessity, or of things that are by nature, since these have their origin in themselves. And since making and doing are different, craft must be concerned with making, not doing. In a way, chance and craft are concerned with the same things, as Agathon too says: "Craft loves chance, and chance loves craft." Craft, then, as we have said, is a state involving true reason concerned with making; and its opposite, lack of craft, is a state involving false reason concerned with making, in the sphere of what can be otherwise.

PRACTICAL WISDOM

Aristotle defines practical wisdom as a true reasoned state concerned with action about human goods.

GREEK

ENGLISH

περὶ δὲ φρονήσεως οὕτως ἂν λάβοιμεν, θεωρήσαντες τίνας λέγομεν τοὺς φρονίμους. δοκεῖ δὴ φρονίμου εἶναι τὸ δύνασθαι καλῶς βουλεύσασθαι περὶ τὰ αὑτῷ ἀγαθὰ καὶ συμφέροντα, οὐ κατὰ μέρος, οἷον ποῖα πρὸς ὑγίειαν, πρὸς ἰσχύν, ἀλλὰ ποῖα πρὸς τὸ εὖ ζῆν ὅλως. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι καὶ τοὺς περί τι φρονίμους λέγομεν, ὅταν πρὸς τέλος τι

As for practical wisdom, we may grasp it by considering whom we call practically wise. It seems to be characteristic of the practically wise person to be able to deliberate well about what is good and beneficial for himself—not in some particular respect, such as what makes for health or

GREEK

σπουδαῖον εὖ λογίσωνται, ὧν μή ἐστι τέχνη. ὥστε καὶ ὅλως ἂν εἴη φρόνιμος ὁ βουλευτικός. βουλεύεται δ' οὐθεὶς περὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἄλλως ἔχειν, οὐδὲ τῶν μὴ ἐνδεχομένων αὐτῷ πρᾶξαι.

ὥστ' εἴπερ ἐπιστήμη μὲν μετ' ἀποδείξεως, ὧν δ' αἱ ἀρχαὶ ἐνδέχονται ἄλλως ἔχειν, τούτων μή ἐστιν ἀπόδειξις (πάντα γὰρ ἐνδέχεται καὶ ἄλλως ἔχειν), 1140b καὶ οὐκ ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι περὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄντων, οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἡ φρόνησις ἐπιστήμη οὐδὲ τέχνη, ἐπιστήμη μὲν ὅτι ἐνδέχεται τὸ πρακτὸν ἄλλως ἔχειν, τέχνη δ' ὅτι ἄλλο τὸ γένος πράξεως καὶ ποιήσεως. λείπεται ἄρα αὐτὴν εἶναι ἕξιν ἀληθῆ μετὰ λόγου πρακτικὴν περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀγαθὰ καὶ κακά. τῆς μὲν γὰρ ποιήσεως ἕτερον τὸ τέλος, τῆς δὲ πράξεως οὐκ ἂν εἴη· ἔστι γὰρ αὐτὴ ἡ εὐπραξία τέλος. διὰ τοῦτο Περικλέα καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους φρονίμους οἰόμεθα εἶναι, ὅτι τὰ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις δύνανται θεωρεῖν· εἶναι δὲ τοιούτους ἡγούμεθα τοὺς οἰκονομικοὺς καὶ τοὺς πολιτικούς.

1140b ἔνθεν καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην τούτῳ προσαγορεύομεν τῷ ὀνόματι, ὡς σῴζουσαν τὴν φρόνησιν. σῴζει δὲ τὴν τοιαύτην ὑπόληψιν. οὐ γὰρ ἅπασαν ὑπόληψιν διαφθείρει οὐδὲ διαστρέφει τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ λυπηρόν, οἷον ὅτι τὸ τρίγωνον δύο ὀρθὰς ἔχει ἢ οὐκ ἔχει, ἀλλὰ τὰς περὶ τὸ πρακτόν. αἱ μὲν γὰρ ἀρχαὶ τῶν πρακτῶν τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα τὰ πρακτά· τῷ δὲ διεφθαρμένῳ δι' ἡδονὴν ἢ λύπην εὐθὺς οὐ φαίνεται ἀρχή, οὐδὲ δεῖν τούτου ἕνεκεν οὐδὲ διὰ τοῦθ' αἱρεῖσθαι πάντα καὶ πράττειν· ἔστι γὰρ ἡ κακία φθαρτικὴ ἀρχῆς. ὥστ' ἀνάγκη τὴν φρόνησιν ἕξιν εἶναι μετὰ λόγου ἀληθῆ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀγαθὰ πρακτικήν. ἀλλὰ μὴν τέχνης μὲν ἔστιν ἀρετή, φρονήσεως δ' οὐκ ἔστιν· καὶ ἐν μὲν τέχνῃ ὁ ἑκὼν ἁμαρτάνων αἱρετώτερος, περὶ δὲ φρόνησιν ἧττον, ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀρετάς.

ENGLISH

strength, but what makes for living well as a whole. A sign of this is that we also call people practically wise in some particular respect when they calculate well toward some worthwhile end in a matter where there is no craft. So in general the practically wise person would be the one who is good at deliberating. But no one deliberates about what cannot be otherwise, or about things he cannot do.

So if scientific knowledge involves demonstration, and there is no demonstration of things whose principles can be otherwise (since all of them can also be otherwise), 1140b and it is not possible to deliberate about things that are of necessity, then practical wisdom would be neither scientific knowledge nor craft: not scientific knowledge, because what is done can be otherwise, and not craft, because doing and making are different in kind. It remains, then, that it is a true state involving reason, concerned with action about what is good and bad for a human being. For making has an end other than itself, but doing would not; acting well is itself the end. That is why we think Pericles and people like him are practically wise: they can see what is good for themselves and for human beings generally; and we think that people who can manage households and cities are like this.[3]

This is also why we call moderation by its name, as "preserving practical wisdom." What it preserves is a supposition of this kind. For pleasure and pain do not destroy or distort every supposition—that a triangle does or doesn't have angles equal to two right angles, for example—but only suppositions about action. The principles of actions are what the actions are done for; but to someone corrupted by pleasure or pain, the principle does not appear straightaway, nor does it appear that he should choose and do everything for its sake and because of it; for vice destroys the principle. So practical wisdom must be a true state involving reason, concerned with action about human goods. Moreover, there is such a thing as excellence in a craft, but not in practical wisdom; and in a craft someone who errs voluntarily is preferable, but with practical wisdom he is worse, as with the excellences too.[4]

3 Pericles was the leading Athenian statesman of the mid-fifth century BC.

GREEK	ENGLISH
δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ἀρετή τις ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ τέχνη. δυοῖν δ' ὄντοιν μεροῖν τῆς ψυχῆς τῶν λόγον ἐχόντων, θατέρου ἂν εἴη ἀρετή, τοῦ δοξαστικοῦ· ἥ τε γὰρ δόξα περὶ τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον ἄλλως ἔχειν καὶ ἡ φρόνησις. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' ἕξις μετὰ λόγου μόνον· σημεῖον δ' ὅτι λήθη μὲν τῆς τοιαύτης ἕξεως ἔστι, φρονήσεως δ' οὐκ ἔστιν.	Clearly, then, it is an excellence and not a craft. And since there are two parts of the soul that have reason, it would be the excellence of one of them, the part that forms opinions; for opinion is concerned with what can be otherwise, and so is practical wisdom. But it is not merely a state involving reason either. A sign of this is that such a state can be forgotten, but practical wisdom cannot.

INTELLECT AND WISDOM

Aristotle explains intellect as grasping first principles and wisdom as the highest knowledge, and compares practical wisdom.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ ἐπιστήμη περὶ τῶν καθόλου ἐστὶν ὑπόληψις καὶ τῶν ἐξ ἀνάγκης ὄντων, εἰσὶ δ' ἀρχαὶ τῶν ἀποδεικτῶν καὶ πάσης ἐπιστήμης (μετὰ λόγου γὰρ ἡ ἐπιστήμη), τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ ἐπιστητοῦ οὔτ' ἂν ἐπιστήμη εἴη οὔτε τέχνη οὔτε φρόνησις· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστητὸν ἀποδεικτόν, [1141a] αἳ δὲ τυγχάνουσιν οὖσαι περὶ τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως ἔχειν. οὐδὲ δὴ σοφία τούτων ἐστίν· τοῦ γὰρ σοφοῦ περὶ ἐνίων ἔχειν ἀπόδειξίν ἐστιν. εἰ δὴ οἷς ἀληθεύομεν καὶ μηδέποτε διαψευδόμεθα περὶ τὰ μὴ ἐνδεχόμενα ἢ καὶ ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως ἔχειν, ἐπιστήμη καὶ φρόνησίς ἐστι καὶ σοφία καὶ νοῦς, τούτων δὲ τῶν τριῶν μηδὲν ἐνδέχεται εἶναι (λέγω δὲ τρία φρόνησιν ἐπιστήμην σοφίαν), λείπεται νοῦν εἶναι τῶν ἀρχῶν.	Scientific knowledge is supposition about universals and things that are of necessity, and there are principles of what is demonstrated and of all scientific knowledge (since scientific knowledge involves reasoning). So the principle of what is scientifically known cannot be the object of scientific knowledge, or of craft, or of practical wisdom. For what is scientifically known is demonstrable, [1141a] while craft and practical wisdom are concerned with what can be otherwise. Nor is wisdom of these principles, since it is characteristic of the wise person to have demonstrations about some things. So if the things by which we attain truth and are never deceived, about what cannot or even about what can be otherwise, are scientific knowledge, practical wisdom, wisdom and intellect, and it cannot be any of the three (by the three I mean practical wisdom, scientific knowledge and wisdom), it remains that intellect is of the principles.
1141a τὴν δὲ σοφίαν ἔν τε ταῖς τέχναις τοῖς ἀκριβεστάτοις τὰς τέχνας ἀποδίδομεν, οἷον Φειδίαν λιθουργὸν σοφὸν καὶ Πολύκλειτον ἀνδριαντοποιόν, ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν οὐθὲν ἄλλο σημαίνοντες τὴν σοφίαν ἢ ὅτι ἀρετὴ τέχνης ἐστίν· εἶναι δέ τινας σοφοὺς οἰόμεθα ὅλως οὐ κατὰ μέρος οὐδ' ἄλλο τι σοφούς, ὥσπερ Ὅμηρός φησιν ἐν τῷ Μαργίτῃ τὸν δ' οὔτ' ἄρ σκαπτῆρα θεοὶ θέσαν οὔτ' ἀροτῆρα οὔτ' ἄλλως τι σοφόν. ὥστε δῆλον ὅτι ἀκριβεστάτη ἂν τῶν ἐπιστημῶν εἴη ἡ σοφία. δεῖ ἄρα τὸν σοφὸν μὴ μόνον τὰ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχῶν εἰδέναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀληθεύειν. ὥστ' εἴη ἂν ἡ σοφία νοῦς καὶ ἐπιστήμη, ὥσπερ κεφαλὴν ἔχουσα ἐπιστήμη τῶν τιμιωτάτων.	In the crafts, we attribute wisdom to those who are most exact in their craft; we call Phidias a wise sculptor in stone, for example, and Polyclitus a wise maker of statues, and here we mean nothing by wisdom except excellence in a craft. But we think some people are wise in general, not in some particular field or wise in anything else, as Homer says in the *Margites*: "Him the gods made neither a digger nor a plowman, / nor wise in anything else." So it is clear that wisdom would be the most exact of the kinds of scientific knowledge. The wise person, then, must not only know what follows from the principles but also attain truth

4 The pun is on the Greek words: *sōphrosynē* (moderation) as *sōzousa tēn phronēsin* ("preserving practical wisdom").

GREEK	ENGLISH
	about the principles themselves. So wisdom would be intellect together with scientific knowledge: scientific knowledge of the most honorable things, with a head on it, as it were.[5]
ἄτοπον γὰρ εἴ τις τὴν πολιτικὴν ἢ τὴν φρόνησιν σπουδαιοτάτην οἴεται εἶναι, εἰ μὴ τὸ ἄριστον τῶν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν. εἰ δὴ ὑγιεινὸν μὲν καὶ ἀγαθὸν ἕτερον ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἰχθύσι, τὸ δὲ λευκὸν καὶ εὐθὺ ταὐτὸν ἀεί, καὶ τὸ σοφὸν ταὐτὸ πάντες ἂν εἴποιεν, φρόνιμον δὲ ἕτερον· τὰ γὰρ περὶ αὑτὸ ἕκαστα τὸ εὖ θεωροῦν φησὶν εἶναι φρόνιμον, καὶ τούτῳ ἐπιτρέψει αὐτά. διὸ καὶ τῶν θηρίων ἔνια φρόνιμά φασιν εἶναι, ὅσα περὶ τὸν αὑτῶν βίον ἔχοντα φαίνεται δύναμιν προνοητικήν.	For it is odd if anyone thinks political expertise or practical wisdom is the most excellent kind of knowledge, unless a human being is the best thing in the cosmos. Now if what is healthy or good is different for human beings and for fish, but what is white or straight is always the same, then everyone would say that what is wise is the same, but what is practically wise differs. For people call a being practically wise if it looks well after its own particular concerns, and they will entrust such matters to it. That is why they even say that some animals are practically wise—those that evidently have a capacity for foresight about their own life.
φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἂν εἴη ἡ σοφία καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ ἡ αὐτή· εἰ γὰρ τὴν περὶ τὰ ὠφέλιμα τὰ αὑτοῖς ἐροῦσι σοφίαν, πολλαὶ ἔσονται σοφίαι· οὐ γὰρ μία περὶ τὸ ἁπάντων ἀγαθὸν τῶν ζῴων, ἀλλ' ἑτέρα περὶ ἕκαστον, εἰ μὴ καὶ ἰατρικὴ μία περὶ πάντων τῶν ὄντων. εἰ δ' ὅτι βέλτιστον ἄνθρωπος τῶν ἄλλων ζῴων, οὐδὲν διαφέρει· καὶ γὰρ ἀνθρώπου ἄλλα πολὺ θειότερα τὴν φύσιν,	It is also evident that wisdom and political expertise would not be the same. For if people are going to call knowledge of what is beneficial to themselves wisdom, there will be many wisdoms. There is not one wisdom concerned with the good of all animals, but a different one for each—unless there is also one medicine for all beings. And if the point is that a human being is the best of the animals, that makes no difference; for there are other things far more divine in nature than a human being—
1141b	1141b most evidently, the bodies of which the cosmos is composed. From what has been said, then, it is clear that wisdom is scientific knowledge together with intellect, of the things most honorable by nature.
οἷον φανερώτατά γε ἐξ ὧν ὁ κόσμος συνέστηκεν. ἐκ δὴ τῶν εἰρημένων δῆλον ὅτι ἡ σοφία ἐστὶ καὶ ἐπιστήμη καὶ νοῦς τῶν τιμιωτάτων τῇ φύσει.	
1141b διὸ Ἀναξαγόραν καὶ Θαλῆν καὶ τοὺς τοιούτους σοφοὺς μὲν φρονίμους δ' οὔ φασιν εἶναι, ὅταν ἴδωσιν ἀγνοοῦντας τὰ συμφέροντα ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ περιττὰ μὲν καὶ θαυμαστὰ καὶ χαλεπὰ καὶ δαιμόνια εἰδέναι αὐτούς φασιν, ἄχρηστα δ', ὅτι οὐ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ἀγαθὰ ζητοῦσιν. ἡ δὲ φρόνησις περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπινα καὶ περὶ ὧν ἔστι βουλεύσασθαι· τοῦ γὰρ φρονίμου μάλιστα τοῦτ' ἔργον εἶναί φαμεν, τὸ εὖ βουλεύεσθαι, βουλεύεται δ' οὐδεὶς περὶ τῶν ἀδυνάτων ἄλλως ἔχειν, οὐδ' ὅσων μὴ τέλος τι ἔστι, καὶ τοῦτο πρακτὸν ἀγαθόν. ὁ δ' ἁπλῶς εὔβουλος ὁ τοῦ ἀρίστου ἀνθρώπῳ τῶν πρακτῶν στοχαστικὸς κατὰ τὸν λογισμόν. οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἡ φρόνησις τῶν καθόλου μόνον, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα γνωρίζειν· πρακτικὴ γάρ, ἡ δὲ πρᾶξις περὶ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα.	That is why people say that Anaxagoras, Thales and men like them are wise but not practically wise, when they see them ignorant of what is to their own advantage; and they say these men know things that are remarkable, wonderful, difficult and superhuman, but useless, because it is not human goods they are seeking. Practical wisdom, by contrast, is concerned with human affairs and with what can be deliberated about. For we say that this above all is the function of the practically wise person, to deliberate well; and no one deliberates about what cannot be otherwise, or about things that do not lead to some end, an end that is a good achievable in action. The person

5 Phidias and Polyclitus were the most celebrated sculptors of the fifth century BC; the *Margites*, a comic poem about a fool, was ascribed in antiquity to Homer.

GREEK

ENGLISH

who is good at deliberating without qualification is the one who, by calculation, aims at the best of the goods achievable in action for a human being. Nor is practical wisdom concerned only with universals; it must also recognize particulars, since it is practical, and action is concerned with particulars.[6]

διὸ καὶ ἔνιοι οὐκ εἰδότες ἑτέρων εἰδότων πρακτικώτεροι, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄλλοις οἱ ἔμπειροι· εἰ γὰρ εἰδείη ὅτι τὰ κοῦφα εὔπεπτα κρέα καὶ ὑγιεινά, ποῖα δὲ κοῦφα ἀγνοοῖ, οὐ ποιήσει ὑγίειαν, ἀλλ' ὁ εἰδὼς ὅτι τὰ ὀρνίθεια κοῦφα καὶ ὑγιεινὰ ποιήσει μᾶλλον. ἡ δὲ φρόνησις πρακτική· ὥστε δεῖ ἄμφω ἔχειν, ἢ ταύτην μᾶλλον. εἴη δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἐνταῦθα ἀρχιτεκτονική.

That is why some people who lack knowledge are more effective in action than others who have it; and in other fields too, those with experience are. If someone knew that light meats are easily digested and healthy, but did not know which meats are light, he will not produce health; the person who knows that poultry is light and healthy is more likely to. Practical wisdom is concerned with action, so one needs both kinds of knowledge—or this kind more. But here too there would be a master form of it, one that directs the rest.

ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ καὶ ἡ φρόνησις ἡ αὐτὴ μὲν ἕξις, τὸ μέντοι εἶναι οὐ ταὐτὸν αὐταῖς. τῆς δὲ περὶ πόλιν ἡ μὲν ὡς ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ φρόνησις νομοθετική, ἡ δὲ ὡς τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα τὸ κοινὸν ἔχει ὄνομα, πολιτική· αὕτη δὲ πρακτικὴ καὶ βουλευτική· τὸ γὰρ ψήφισμα πρακτὸν ὡς τὸ ἔσχατον. διὸ πολιτεύεσθαι τούτους μόνον λέγουσιν· μόνοι γὰρ πράττουσιν οὗτοι ὥσπερ οἱ χειροτέχναι. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ φρόνησις μάλιστ' εἶναι ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν καὶ ἕνα· καὶ ἔχει αὕτη τὸ κοινὸν ὄνομα, φρόνησις· ἐκείνων δὲ ἡ μὲν οἰκονομία ἡ δὲ νομοθεσία ἡ δὲ πολιτική, καὶ ταύτης ἡ μὲν βουλευτικὴ ἡ δὲ δικαστική.

Political expertise and practical wisdom are the same state, but what it is to be each of them is not the same. Of the practical wisdom concerned with the city, the directing, master part is legislative; the part concerned with particulars has the common name, "political." This part deals with action and deliberation, since a decree is something to be acted on, as the last step. That is why only these people are said to "take part in politics": they alone act, the way manual craftsmen do. Practical wisdom, too, is thought to be above all the kind concerned with oneself as an individual, and this kind has the common name, "practical wisdom." Of the others, one is household management, another legislation, another political expertise; and of this last, one part is deliberative and the other judicial.

εἶδος μὲν οὖν τι ἂν εἴη γνώσεως τὸ αὑτῷ εἰδέναι· ἀλλ' ἔχει διαφορὰν πολλήν· [1142a] καὶ δοκεῖ ὁ τὰ περὶ αὑτὸν εἰδὼς καὶ διατρίβων φρόνιμος εἶναι, οἱ δὲ πολιτικοὶ πολυπράγμονες· διὸ Εὐριπίδης πῶς δ' ἂν φρονοίην, ᾧ παρῆν ἀπραγμόνως ἐν τοῖσι πολλοῖς ἠριθμημένον στρατοῦ ἶσον μετασχεῖν; τοὺς γὰρ περισσοὺς καί τι πράσσοντας πλέον ζητοῦσι γὰρ τὸ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθόν, καὶ οἴονται τοῦτο δεῖν πράττειν. ἐκ ταύτης οὖν τῆς δόξης ἐλήλυθε τὸ τούτους φρονίμους εἶναι· καίτοι ἴσως οὐκ ἔστι τὸ αὑτοῦ εὖ ἄνευ οἰκονομίας οὐδ' ἄνευ πολιτείας. ἔτι δὲ τὰ αὑτοῦ πῶς δεῖ διοικεῖν, ἄδηλον καὶ σκεπτέον. σημεῖον

Knowing what is good for oneself would, then, be one kind of knowledge; but it differs a great deal from the others. [1142a] The person who knows about his own affairs and spends his time on them is thought to be practically wise, while politicians are thought to be busybodies. Hence Euripides: "How could I be wise, when I might have lived free of affairs, counted as one among the many in the army, with an equal share? … For those who stand out and do something more …" For people seek their own good, and think that this is what they

6 Thales (sixth century BC) and Anaxagoras (fifth century BC) were early natural philosophers who studied the heavens and the nature of things.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	δ' ἐστὶ τοῦ εἰρημένου καὶ διότι γεωμετρικοὶ μὲν νέοι καὶ μαθηματικοὶ γίνονται καὶ σοφοὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, φρόνιμος δ' οὐ δοκεῖ γίνεσθαι.	ought to do. It is from this opinion, then, that the idea has come that such people are the practically wise. Yet perhaps one's own good cannot exist without household management, or without a political order. Further, how one ought to manage one's own affairs is unclear and needs examining. A sign of what has been said is that the young become good at geometry and mathematics, and wise in such matters, but a young person does not seem to become practically wise.[7]
1142a	αἴτιον δ' ὅτι καὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστά ἐστιν ἡ φρόνησις, ἃ γίνεται γνώριμα ἐξ ἐμπειρίας, νέος δ' ἔμπειρος οὐκ ἔστιν· πλῆθος γὰρ χρόνου ποιεῖ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν· ἐπεὶ καὶ τοῦτ' ἄν τις σκέψαιτο, διὰ τί δὴ μαθηματικὸς μὲν παῖς γένοιτ' ἄν, σοφὸς δ' ἢ φυσικὸς οὔ. ἢ ὅτι τὰ μὲν δι' ἀφαιρέσεώς ἐστιν, τῶν δ' αἱ ἀρχαὶ ἐξ ἐμπειρίας· καὶ τὰ μὲν οὐ πιστεύουσιν οἱ νέοι ἀλλὰ λέγουσιν, τῶν δὲ τὸ τί ἐστιν οὐκ ἄδηλον; ἔτι ἡ ἁμαρτία ἢ περὶ τὸ καθόλου ἐν τῷ βουλεύσασθαι ἢ περὶ τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον· ἢ γὰρ ὅτι πάντα τὰ βαρύσταθμα ὕδατα φαῦλα, ἢ ὅτι τοδὶ βαρύσταθμον. ὅτι δ' ἡ φρόνησις οὐκ ἐπιστήμη, φανερόν· τοῦ γὰρ ἐσχάτου ἐστίν, ὥσπερ εἴρηται· τὸ γὰρ πρακτὸν τοιοῦτον.	The reason is that practical wisdom is also concerned with particulars, and these become familiar through experience; but a young person is not experienced, since it takes a long stretch of time to produce experience. One might also consider this question: why can a child become a mathematician, but not wise, or a natural scientist? Is it because the objects of mathematics exist through abstraction, while the first principles of the other subjects come from experience? And the young don't really believe the latter but merely repeat them, whereas what mathematical objects are is not unclear to them? Further, error in deliberation may concern either the universal or the particular: one may go wrong either about the claim that all heavy water is bad, or about the claim that this water is heavy. That practical wisdom is not scientific knowledge is evident; for it is concerned with the last thing, as has been said, since what is to be done is of this kind.
	ἀντίκειται μὲν δὴ τῷ νῷ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ νοῦς τῶν ὅρων, ὧν οὐκ ἔστι λόγος, ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἐσχάτου, οὗ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπιστήμη ἀλλ' αἴσθησις, οὐχ ἡ τῶν ἰδίων, ἀλλ' οἵᾳ αἰσθανόμεθα ὅτι τὸ ἐν τοῖς μαθηματικοῖς ἔσχατον τρίγωνον· στήσεται γὰρ κἀκεῖ. ἀλλ' αὕτη μᾶλλον αἴσθησις ἢ φρόνησις, ἐκείνης δ' ἄλλο εἶδος.	So it is opposed to intellect. For intellect is concerned with the first terms, of which there is no account, while practical wisdom is concerned with the last thing, of which there is no scientific knowledge but perception—not perception of the objects special to each sense, but the kind by which we perceive that the last figure in mathematics is a triangle; for there too one will come to a stop. But this is perception rather than practical wisdom, though a different kind of perception from the other.

GOOD DELIBERATION, COMPREHENSION AND JUDGEMENT

Aristotle examines good deliberation, comprehension, judgment and intellect as parts of practical thought.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	τὸ ζητεῖν δὲ καὶ τὸ βουλεύεσθαι διαφέρει· τὸ γὰρ βουλεύεσθαι ζητεῖν τι ἐστίν. δεῖ δὲ λαβεῖν καὶ περὶ	

GREEK	ENGLISH
εὐβουλίας τί ἐστι, πότερον ἐπιστήμη τις ἢ δόξα ἢ εὐστοχία ἢ ἄλλο τι γένος. ἐπιστήμη μὲν δὴ οὐκ ἔστιν· οὐ γὰρ ζητοῦσι περὶ ὧν ἴσασιν, [1142b] ἡ δ' εὐβουλία βουλή τις, ὁ δὲ βουλευόμενος ζητεῖ καὶ λογίζεται. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' εὐστοχία· ἄνευ τε γὰρ λόγου καὶ ταχύ τι ἡ εὐστοχία, βουλεύονται δὲ πολὺν χρόνον, καὶ φασὶ πράττειν μὲν δεῖν ταχὺ τὰ βουλευθέντα, βουλεύεσθαι δὲ βραδέως. ἔτι ἡ ἀγχίνοια ἕτερον καὶ ἡ εὐβουλία· ἔστι δ' εὐστοχία τις ἡ ἀγχίνοια. οὐδὲ δὴ δόξα ἡ εὐβουλία οὐδεμία.	Inquiring and deliberating are different; deliberating is a particular kind of inquiring. We must also grasp what good deliberation is—whether it is some kind of scientific knowledge, or opinion, or good guessing, or something of another kind. Well, it is not scientific knowledge: people do not inquire about what they know, [1142b] whereas good deliberation is a kind of deliberation, and someone deliberating is inquiring and calculating. Nor, again, is it good guessing: good guessing works without reasoning, and quickly, whereas people deliberate for a long time, and they say one should carry out quickly what one has deliberated on, but deliberate slowly. Further, quickness of mind is different from good deliberation; quickness of mind is a kind of good guessing. Nor, then, is good deliberation any kind of opinion.
1142b ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ ὁ μὲν κακῶς βουλευόμενος ἁμαρτάνει, ὁ δ' εὖ ὀρθῶς βουλεύεται, δῆλον ὅτι ὀρθότης τις ἡ εὐβουλία ἐστίν, οὔτ' ἐπιστήμης δὲ οὔτε δόξης· ἐπιστήμης μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ὀρθότης (οὐδὲ γὰρ ἁμαρτία), δόξης δ' ὀρθότης ἀλήθεια· ἅμα δὲ καὶ ὥρισται ἤδη πᾶν οὗ δόξα ἐστίν. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδ' ἄνευ λόγου ἡ εὐβουλία. διανοίας ἄρα λείπεται· αὕτη γὰρ οὔπω φάσις· καὶ γὰρ ἡ δόξα οὐ ζήτησις ἀλλὰ φάσις τις ἤδη, ὁ δὲ βουλευόμενος, ἐάν τε εὖ ἐάν τε καὶ κακῶς βουλεύηται, ζητεῖ τι καὶ λογίζεται. ἀλλ' ὀρθότης τίς ἐστιν ἡ εὐβουλία βουλῆς· διὸ ἡ βουλὴ ζητητέα πρῶτον τί καὶ περὶ τί.	But since someone who deliberates badly goes wrong, while someone who deliberates well deliberates correctly, it is clear that good deliberation is a kind of correctness—though not of scientific knowledge, nor of opinion. Scientific knowledge has no correctness (since it has no error either), and the correctness of opinion is truth; and besides, whatever opinion is about has already been settled. Yet good deliberation does not come about without reasoning either. What remains, then, is that it is correctness of thinking; for thinking is not yet an assertion. Opinion is not inquiry but already a kind of assertion, whereas the person deliberating, whether he deliberates well or badly, is inquiring into something and calculating. But good deliberation is a kind of correctness of deliberation; so we must first inquire what deliberation is and what it is about.
ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ ὀρθότης πλεοναχῶς, δῆλον ὅτι οὐ πᾶσα· ὁ γὰρ ἀκρατὴς καὶ ὁ φαῦλος ὃ προτίθεται †ἰδεῖν† ἐκ τοῦ λογισμοῦ τεύξεται, ὥστε ὀρθῶς ἔσται βεβουλευμένος, κακὸν δὲ μέγα εἰληφώς. δοκεῖ δ' ἀγαθόν τι τὸ εὖ βεβουλεῦσθαι· ἡ γὰρ τοιαύτη ὀρθότης βουλῆς εὐβουλία, ἡ ἀγαθοῦ τευκτική. ἀλλ' ἔστι καὶ τούτου ψευδεῖ συλλογισμῷ τυχεῖν, καὶ ὃ μὲν δεῖ ποιῆσαι τυχεῖν, δι' οὗ δ' οὔ, ἀλλὰ ψευδῆ τὸν μέσον ὅρον εἶναι· ὥστ' οὐδ' αὕτη πω εὐβουλία, καθ' ἣν οὗ δεῖ μὲν τυγχάνει, οὐ μέντοι δι' οὗ ἔδει. ἔτι ἔστι πολὺν χρόνον βουλευόμενον τυχεῖν, τὸν δὲ ταχύ. οὐκοῦν οὐδ' ἐκείνη πω εὐβουλία, ἀλλ' ὀρθότης ἡ	Since correctness has more than one sense, it is clear that good deliberation is not every kind of it. For the uncontrolled person and the bad person will attain by calculation what he sets himself to do, and so he will have deliberated correctly, yet will have got hold of a great evil. But having deliberated well is thought to be something good; for good deliberation is the kind of correctness of deliberation that attains a good. Yet it is possible to attain even this by a false syllogism—to hit on what one ought to do, but not by the right means, the middle term being false. So this is not yet good

7 The quotation breaks off in the text.

GREEK	ENGLISH
κατὰ τὸ ὠφέλιμον, καὶ οὗ δεῖ καὶ ὡς καὶ ὅτε. ἔτι ἔστι καὶ ἁπλῶς εὖ βεβουλεῦσθαι καὶ πρός τι τέλος.	deliberation either, the kind by which one attains what one should, but not by the means one should. Further, one person may reach the result after deliberating for a long time, another quickly. So that is not yet good deliberation either; rather, good deliberation is correctness with respect to what is beneficial—about what one should, in the way one should, and when. Further, one can have deliberated well either without qualification or in relation to some particular end.
ἡ μὲν δὴ ἁπλῶς ἡ πρὸς τὸ τέλος τὸ ἁπλῶς κατορθοῦσα, τὶς δὲ ἡ πρός τι τέλος. εἰ δὴ τῶν φρονίμων τὸ εὖ βεβουλεῦσθαι, ἡ εὐβουλία εἴη ἂν ὀρθότης ἡ κατὰ τὸ συμφέρον πρὸς τὸ τέλος, οὗ ἡ φρόνησις ἀληθὴς ὑπόληψίς ἐστιν.	Good deliberation without qualification is the kind that succeeds in relation to the end without qualification; a particular kind is one that succeeds in relation to some particular end. If, then, having deliberated well is characteristic of the practically wise, good deliberation would be correctness with respect to what is advantageous in relation to the end, of which practical wisdom is the true grasp.
ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ σύνεσις καὶ ἡ εὐσυνεσία, [1143a] καθ' ἃς λέγομεν συνετοὺς καὶ εὐσυνέτους, οὔθ' ὅλως τὸ αὐτὸ ἐπιστήμῃ ἢ δόξῃ (πάντες γὰρ ἂν ἦσαν συνετοί) οὔτε τις μία τῶν κατὰ μέρος ἐπιστημῶν, οἷον ἡ ἰατρικὴ περὶ ὑγιεινῶν, ἡ γεωμετρία περὶ μεγέθη· οὔτε γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἀεὶ ὄντων καὶ ἀκινήτων ἡ σύνεσίς ἐστιν οὔτε περὶ τῶν γιγνομένων ὁτουοῦν, ἀλλὰ περὶ ὧν ἀπορήσειεν ἄν τις καὶ βουλεύσαιτο. διὸ περὶ τὰ αὐτὰ μὲν τῇ φρονήσει ἐστίν, οὐκ ἔστι δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ σύνεσις καὶ φρόνησις. ἡ μὲν γὰρ φρόνησις ἐπιτακτική ἐστιν· τί γὰρ δεῖ πράττειν ἢ μή, τὸ τέλος αὐτῆς ἐστίν· ἡ δὲ σύνεσις κριτικὴ μόνον. ταὐτὸ γὰρ σύνεσις καὶ εὐσυνεσία καὶ συνετοὶ καὶ εὐσύνετοι.	Comprehension, too, and good comprehension, [1143a] in virtue of which we call people comprehending and good at comprehending, are neither the same as scientific knowledge or opinion in general (otherwise everyone would be comprehending), nor any one of the particular sciences, as medicine is about what is healthy, or geometry about magnitudes. For comprehension is neither about things that always exist and are unchanging, nor about just anything that comes to be, but about things one might be puzzled about and deliberate on. So it is concerned with the same things as practical wisdom, but comprehension and practical wisdom are not the same. Practical wisdom gives commands, since its end is what one should or should not do; comprehension only judges. (Comprehension is the same as good comprehension, and people who comprehend the same as those who comprehend well.)
1143a ἔστι δ' οὔτε τὸ ἔχειν τὴν φρόνησιν οὔτε τὸ λαμβάνειν ἡ σύνεσις· ἀλλ' ὥσπερ τὸ μανθάνειν λέγεται συνιέναι, ὅταν χρῆται τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ, οὕτως ἐν τῷ χρῆσθαι τῇ δόξῃ ἐπὶ τὸ κρίνειν περὶ τούτων περὶ ὧν ἡ φρόνησίς ἐστιν, ἄλλου λέγοντος, καὶ κρίνειν καλῶς· τὸ γὰρ εὖ τῷ καλῶς τὸ αὐτό. καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἐλήλυθε τοὔνομα ἡ σύνεσις, καθ' ἣν εὐσύνετοι, ἐκ τῆς ἐν τῷ μανθάνειν· λέγομεν γὰρ τὸ μανθάνειν συνιέναι πολλάκις.	Comprehension is neither having practical wisdom nor acquiring it. Rather, just as learning is called comprehending when one uses scientific knowledge, so comprehending lies in using opinion to judge, when someone else is speaking, about the things practical wisdom is concerned with—and to judge them finely, since "well" is the same as "finely." And this is where the name "comprehension," in virtue of which people are good at comprehending, came from: from comprehension

GREEK

ENGLISH

in learning. For we often call learning "comprehending."[8]

ἡ δὲ καλουμένη γνώμη, καθ' ἣν συγγνώμονας καὶ ἔχειν φαμὲν γνώμην, ἡ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ἐστὶ κρίσις ὀρθή. σημεῖον δέ· τὸν γὰρ ἐπιεικῆ μάλιστά φαμεν εἶναι συγγνωμονικόν, καὶ ἐπιεικὲς τὸ ἔχειν περὶ ἔνια συγγνώμην. ἡ δὲ συγγνώμη γνώμη ἐστὶ κριτικὴ τοῦ ἐπιεικοῦς ὀρθή· ὀρθὴ δ' ἡ τοῦ ἀληθοῦς.

What is called judgement, in virtue of which we say people are sympathetic and "have judgement," is the correct discernment of what is decent. A sign of this: we say the decent person is above all sympathetic, and that it is decent to be sympathetic about certain things. And sympathy is judgement that correctly discerns what is decent; and correct judgement is judgement of what is true.[9]

εἰσὶ δὲ πᾶσαι αἱ ἕξεις εὐλόγως εἰς ταὐτὸ τείνουσαι· λέγομεν γὰρ γνώμην καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ φρόνησιν καὶ νοῦν ἐπὶ τοὺς αὐτοὺς ἐπιφέροντες γνώμην ἔχειν καὶ νοῦν ἤδη καὶ φρονίμους καὶ συνετούς. πᾶσαι γὰρ αἱ δυνάμεις αὗται τῶν ἐσχάτων εἰσὶ καὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον· καὶ ἐν μὲν τῷ κριτικὸς εἶναι περὶ ὧν ὁ φρόνιμος, συνετὸς καὶ εὐγνώμων ἢ συγγνώμων· τὰ γὰρ ἐπιεικῆ κοινὰ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἁπάντων ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ πρὸς ἄλλον. ἔστι δὲ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα καὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων ἅπαντα τὰ πρακτά· καὶ γὰρ τὸν φρόνιμον δεῖ γινώσκειν αὐτά, καὶ ἡ σύνεσις καὶ ἡ γνώμη περὶ τὰ πρακτά, ταῦτα δ' ἔσχατα.

All these states tend, reasonably enough, toward the same thing. For when we speak of judgement, comprehension, practical wisdom and intellect, we attribute them to the same people, saying that they have judgement and, by now, intellect, and are practically wise and comprehending. For all these capacities are concerned with ultimate things, that is, with particulars. It is in being able to judge about the things the practically wise person is concerned with that someone is comprehending and of good judgement, or sympathetic; for what is decent is common to all good people in their dealings with others. And all things to be done are particulars and ultimate things: the practically wise person must know them, and comprehension and judgement are concerned with things to be done, and these are ultimate.

καὶ ὁ νοῦς τῶν ἐσχάτων ἐπ' ἀμφότερα· καὶ γὰρ τῶν πρώτων ὅρων καὶ τῶν ἐσχάτων [1143b] νοῦς ἐστὶ καὶ οὐ λόγος, καὶ ὁ μὲν κατὰ τὰς ἀποδείξεις τῶν ἀκινήτων ὅρων καὶ πρώτων, ὁ δ' ἐν ταῖς πρακτικαῖς τοῦ ἐσχάτου καὶ ἐνδεχομένου καὶ τῆς ἑτέρας προτάσεως· ἀρχαὶ γὰρ τοῦ οὗ ἕνεκα αὗται· ἐκ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα γὰρ τὰ καθόλου· τούτων οὖν ἔχειν δεῖ αἴσθησιν, αὕτη δ' ἐστὶ νοῦς. διὸ καὶ φυσικὰ δοκεῖ εἶναι ταῦτα, καὶ φύσει σοφὸς μὲν οὐδείς, γνώμην δ' ἔχειν καὶ σύνεσιν καὶ νοῦν. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι καὶ ταῖς ἡλικίαις οἰόμεθα ἀκολουθεῖν, καὶ ἥδε ἡ ἡλικία νοῦν ἔχει καὶ γνώμην, ὡς τῆς φύσεως αἰτίας οὔσης. διὸ καὶ ἀρχὴ καὶ τέλος νοῦς· ἐκ τούτων γὰρ αἱ ἀποδείξεις καὶ περὶ τούτων.

Intellect, too, is concerned with ultimate things, in both directions. For both the first terms and the ultimate things [1143b] are grasped by intellect and not by reasoning. In demonstrations, intellect grasps the unchanging first terms; in practical matters, it grasps the ultimate thing, the one that can be otherwise, and the second premise. For these are the starting points of that for the sake of which we act, since universals are reached from particulars. Of these, then, one must have perception, and this perception is intellect. That is why these states are thought to be natural, and why, while no one is thought to be wise by nature, people are thought to have judgement, comprehension and intellect by nature. A sign of this is that we think they go with the stages of life, and that a particular age has intellect and judgement, as though nature were the cause. That is why intel-

8 The Greek verb *sunienai*, "to comprehend," is also used of following and taking in what one is taught.
9 *Gnōmē* is "judgement"; *sungnōmē*, literally "judging-with," is the ordinary word for sympathy, pardon or forgiveness.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	lect is both beginning and end; for demonstrations start from these things and are about them.
1143b ὥστε δεῖ προσέχειν τῶν ἐμπείρων καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἢ φρονίμων ταῖς ἀναποδείκτοις φάσεσι καὶ δόξαις οὐχ ἧττον τῶν ἀποδείξεων· διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἔχειν ἐκ τῆς ἐμπειρίας ὄμμα ὁρῶσιν ὀρθῶς. τί μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἡ φρόνησις καὶ ἡ σοφία, καὶ περὶ τί ἑκατέρα τυγχάνει οὖσα, καὶ ὅτι ἄλλου τῆς ψυχῆς μορίου ἀρετὴ ἑκατέρα, εἴρηται.	So one should pay attention to the undemonstrated sayings and opinions of experienced and older people, or of the practically wise, no less than to demonstrations; for because experience has given them an eye, they see correctly. We have said, then, what practical wisdom and wisdom are, what each of them is concerned with, and that each is the excellence of a different part of the soul.

WHAT WISDOM AND PRACTICAL WISDOM ARE FOR

Aristotle asks what use wisdom and practical wisdom are, and ties practical wisdom to excellence of character.

GREEK	ENGLISH
διαπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις περὶ αὐτῶν τί χρήσιμοί εἰσιν. ἡ μὲν γὰρ σοφία οὐδὲν θεωρήσει ἐξ ὧν ἔσται εὐδαίμων ἄνθρωπος (οὐδεμιᾶς γάρ ἐστι γενέσεως), ἡ δὲ φρόνησις τοῦτο μὲν ἔχει, ἀλλὰ τίνος ἕνεκα δεῖ αὐτῆς; εἴπερ ἡ μὲν φρόνησίς ἐστιν ἡ περὶ τὰ δίκαια καὶ καλὰ καὶ ἀγαθὰ ἀνθρώπῳ, ταῦτα δ' ἐστὶν ἃ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ἐστὶν ἀνδρὸς πράττειν, οὐδὲν δὲ πρακτικώτεροι τῷ εἰδέναι αὐτά ἐσμεν, εἴπερ ἕξεις αἱ ἀρεταί εἰσιν, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰ ὑγιεινὰ οὐδὲ τὰ εὐεκτικά, ὅσα μὴ τῷ ποιεῖν ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀπὸ τῆς ἕξεως εἶναι λέγεται· οὐθὲν γὰρ πρακτικώτεροι τῷ ἔχειν τὴν ἰατρικὴν καὶ γυμναστικήν ἐσμεν.	But someone might raise a puzzle about what use they are. Wisdom will contemplate none of the things from which a human being becomes happy, since it is not concerned with any coming-to-be. Practical wisdom does have this concern, but what do we need it for? Practical wisdom is what is concerned with things just and fine and good for a human being, and these are what a good man does; but we are no more able to do them for knowing them, if the excellences are states—just as we are not with things that are healthy or fit, in the sense of things said to be so not because they produce health but because they result from the state. We are no more able to act for having the craft of medicine or of physical training.
εἰ δὲ μὴ τούτων χάριν φρόνιμον ῥητέον ἀλλὰ τοῦ γίνεσθαι, τοῖς οὖσι σπουδαίοις οὐθὲν ἂν εἴη χρήσιμος· ἔτι δ' οὐδὲ τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν· οὐδὲν γὰρ διοίσει αὐτοὺς ἔχειν ἢ ἄλλοις ἔχουσι πείθεσθαι, ἱκανῶς τ' ἔχοι ἂν ἡμῖν ὥσπερ καὶ περὶ τὴν ὑγίειαν· βουλόμενοι γὰρ ὑγιαίνειν ὅμως οὐ μανθάνομεν ἰατρικήν. πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἄτοπον ἂν εἶναι δόξειεν, εἰ χείρων τῆς σοφίας οὖσα κυριωτέρα αὐτῆς ἔσται· ἡ γὰρ ποιοῦσα ἄρχει καὶ ἐπιτάττει περὶ ἕκαστον. περὶ δὴ τούτων λεκτέον· νῦν μὲν γὰρ ἠπόρηται περὶ αὐτῶν μόνον. 1144a πρῶτον μὲν οὖν λέγωμεν ὅτι καθ' αὑτὰς ἀναγκαῖον αἱρετὰς αὐτὰς εἶναι, ἀρετάς γ' οὔσας ἑκατέραν ἑκατέρου τοῦ μορίου, καὶ εἰ μὴ ποιοῦσι μηδὲν μηδετέρα αὐτῶν.	If instead we are to call a person practically wise not for the sake of this but for the sake of becoming good, practical wisdom would be of no use to those who are already excellent. Nor, further, to those who do not have it; for it will make no difference whether they have it themselves or obey others who do, and it would be enough for us to do as we do with health: we want to be healthy, and yet we don't learn medicine. Besides, it would seem odd if practical wisdom, though inferior to wisdom, were to have more authority than it; for what produces something rules and gives orders about it. We must discuss these questions; so far we have only raised puzzles about them. 1144a First, then, let us say that they must be choiceworthy in themselves, since each is the excellence of one of the two parts, even if neither of them produces anything.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
1144a	ἔπειτα καὶ ποιοῦσι μέν, οὐχ ὡς ἡ ἰατρικὴ δὲ ὑγίειαν, ἀλλ' ὡς ἡ ὑγίεια, οὕτως ἡ σοφία εὐδαιμονίαν· μέρος γὰρ οὖσα τῆς ὅλης ἀρετῆς τῷ ἔχεσθαι ποιεῖ καὶ †τῷ ἐνεργεῖν εὐδαίμονα.† ἔτι τὸ ἔργον ἀποτελεῖται κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν καὶ τὴν ἠθικὴν ἀρετήν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴ τὸν σκοπὸν ποιεῖ ὀρθόν, ἡ δὲ φρόνησις τὰ πρὸς τοῦτον. τοῦ δὲ τετάρτου μορίου τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἔστιν ἀρετὴ τοιαύτη, τοῦ θρεπτικοῦ· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτῷ πράττειν ἢ μὴ πράττειν. περὶ δὲ τοῦ μηθὲν εἶναι πρακτικωτέρους διὰ τὴν φρόνησιν τῶν καλῶν καὶ δικαίων, μικρὸν ἄνωθεν ἀρκτέον, λαβόντας ἀρχὴν ταύτην.	Next, they do produce something—not as medicine produces health, but as health does: this is how wisdom produces happiness. For since it is a part of excellence as a whole, by being possessed and by being active it makes a person happy. Further, the function is completed in accordance with practical wisdom and excellence of character: excellence makes the goal correct, and practical wisdom makes correct what leads to it. The fourth part of the soul, the nutritive, has no excellence of this kind, since it is not up to it to act or not act. As for the claim that practical wisdom makes us no more able to do fine and just things, we must start a little further back, taking this as our starting point.
	ὥσπερ γὰρ καὶ τὰ δίκαια λέγομεν πράττοντάς τινας οὔπω δικαίους εἶναι, οἷον τοὺς τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν νόμων τεταγμένα ποιοῦντας ἢ ἄκοντας ἢ δι' ἄγνοιαν ἢ δι' ἕτερόν τι καὶ μὴ δι' αὐτά (καίτοι πράττουσί γε ἃ δεῖ καὶ ὅσα χρὴ τὸν σπουδαῖον), οὕτως, ὡς ἔοικεν, ἔστι τὸ πῶς ἔχοντα πράττειν ἕκαστα ὥστ' εἶναι ἀγαθόν, λέγω δ' οἷον διὰ προαίρεσιν καὶ αὐτῶν ἕνεκα τῶν πραττομένων. τὴν μὲν οὖν προαίρεσιν ὀρθὴν ποιεῖ ἡ ἀρετή, τὸ δ' ὅσα ἐκείνης ἕνεκα πέφυκε πράττεσθαι οὐκ ἔστι τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀλλ' ἑτέρας δυνάμεως. λεκτέον δ' ἐπιστήσασι σαφέστερον περὶ αὐτῶν. ἔστι δὴ δύναμις ἣν καλοῦσι δεινότητα· αὕτη δ' ἐστὶ τοιαύτη ὥστε τὰ πρὸς τὸν ὑποτεθέντα σκοπὸν συντείνοντα δύνασθαι ταῦτα πράττειν καὶ τυγχάνειν αὐτοῦ.	Just as we say that some people who do just things are not yet just—for example, those who do what the laws prescribe either unwillingly, or through ignorance, or for some other reason and not for the sake of the acts themselves (even though they do what they should, and all that the excellent person ought to do)—so, it seems, there is a certain condition one must be in when doing each thing in order to be good: I mean, doing it from decision and for the sake of the things done themselves. Excellence makes the decision correct; but doing whatever is naturally done for the sake of that decision belongs not to excellence but to another capacity. We must pause on these matters and speak about them more clearly. There is a capacity people call cleverness. It is the ability to do the things that contribute to a goal one has set, and to attain it.
	ἂν μὲν οὖν ὁ σκοπὸς ᾖ καλός, ἐπαινετή ἐστιν, ἐὰν δὲ φαῦλος, πανουργία· διὸ καὶ τοὺς φρονίμους δεινοὺς καὶ πανούργους φαμὲν εἶναι. ἔστι δ' ἡ φρόνησις οὐχ ἡ δύναμις, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἄνευ τῆς δυνάμεως ταύτης. ἡ δ' ἕξις τῷ ὄμματι τούτῳ γίνεται τῆς ψυχῆς οὐκ ἄνευ ἀρετῆς, ὡς εἴρηταί τε καὶ ἔστι δῆλον· οἱ γὰρ συλλογισμοὶ τῶν πρακτῶν ἀρχὴν ἔχοντές εἰσιν, ἐπειδὴ τοιόνδε τὸ τέλος καὶ τὸ ἄριστον, ὁτιδήποτε ὄν (ἔστω γὰρ λόγου χάριν τὸ τυχόν)· τοῦτο δ' εἰ μὴ τῷ ἀγαθῷ, οὐ φαίνεται· διαστρέφει γὰρ ἡ μοχθηρία καὶ διαψεύδεσθαι ποιεῖ περὶ τὰς πρακτικὰς ἀρχάς. ὥστε φανερὸν ὅτι ἀδύνατον φρόνιμον εἶναι μὴ ὄντα ἀγαθόν.	If the goal is fine, cleverness is praiseworthy; if it is bad, it is unscrupulousness. That is why we call both the practically wise and the unscrupulous clever. Practical wisdom is not this capacity, but it does not exist without it. And this eye of the soul does not acquire its state without excellence, as has been said and is clear. For practical syllogisms have a starting point: "since the end, the best thing, is such-and-such"—whatever it may be (let it be anything at all, for the sake of argument). And this is not apparent except to the good person; for vice distorts us and makes us deceived about the starting points of action. So it is evident that one cannot be practically wise without being good.
1144b		

GREEK

σκεπτέον δὴ πάλιν καὶ περὶ ἀρετῆς· καὶ γὰρ ἡ ἀρετὴ παραπλησίως ἔχει ὡς ἡ φρόνησις πρὸς τὴν δεινότητα —οὐ ταὐτὸ μέν, ὅμοιον δέ—οὕτω καὶ ἡ φυσικὴ ἀρετὴ πρὸς τὴν κυρίαν. πᾶσι γὰρ δοκεῖ ἕκαστα τῶν ἠθῶν ὑπάρχειν φύσει πως· καὶ γὰρ δίκαιοι καὶ σωφρονικοὶ καὶ ἀνδρεῖοι καὶ τἆλλα ἔχομεν εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς· ἀλλ' ὅμως ζητοῦμεν ἕτερόν τι τὸ κυρίως ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἄλλον τρόπον ὑπάρχειν. καὶ γὰρ παισὶ καὶ θηρίοις αἱ φυσικαὶ ὑπάρχουσιν ἕξεις, ἀλλ' ἄνευ νοῦ βλαβεραὶ φαίνονται οὖσαι. πλὴν τοσοῦτον ἔοικεν ὁρᾶσθαι, ὅτι ὥσπερ σώματι ἰσχυρῷ ἄνευ ὄψεως κινουμένῳ συμβαίνει σφάλλεσθαι ἰσχυρῶς διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ὄψιν, οὕτω καὶ ἐνταῦθα· ἐὰν δὲ λάβῃ νοῦν, ἐν τῷ πράττειν διαφέρει· ἡ δ' ἕξις ὁμοία οὖσα τότ' ἔσται κυρίως ἀρετή.

ὥστε καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦ δοξαστικοῦ δύο ἐστὶν εἴδη, δεινότης καὶ φρόνησις, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τοῦ ἠθικοῦ δύο ἐστί, τὸ μὲν ἀρετὴ φυσικὴ τὸ δ' ἡ κυρία, καὶ τούτων ἡ κυρία οὐ γίνεται ἄνευ φρονήσεως. διόπερ τινές φασι πάσας τὰς ἀρετὰς φρονήσεις εἶναι, καὶ Σωκράτης τῇ μὲν ὀρθῶς ἐζήτει τῇ δ' ἡμάρτανεν· ὅτι μὲν γὰρ φρονήσεις ᾤετο εἶναι πάσας τὰς ἀρετάς, ἡμάρτανεν, ὅτι δ' οὐκ ἄνευ φρονήσεως, καλῶς ἔλεγεν. σημεῖον δέ· καὶ γὰρ νῦν πάντες, ὅταν ὁρίζωνται τὴν ἀρετήν, προστιθέασι, τὴν ἕξιν εἰπόντες καὶ πρὸς ἅ ἐστι, τὴν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον· ὀρθὸς δ' ὁ κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν. ἐοίκασι δὴ μαντεύεσθαί πως ἅπαντες ὅτι ἡ τοιαύτη ἕξις ἀρετή ἐστιν, ἡ κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν. δεῖ δὲ μικρὸν μεταβῆναι.

ἔστι γὰρ οὐ μόνον ἡ κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον, ἀλλ' ἡ μετὰ τοῦ ὀρθοῦ λόγου ἕξις ἀρετή ἐστιν· ὀρθὸς δὲ λόγος περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἡ φρόνησίς ἐστιν. Σωκράτης μὲν οὖν λόγους τὰς ἀρετὰς ᾤετο εἶναι (ἐπιστήμας γὰρ εἶναι πάσας), ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ λόγου. δῆλον οὖν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων ὅτι οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀγαθὸν εἶναι κυρίως ἄνευ φρονήσεως, οὐδὲ φρόνιμον ἄνευ τῆς ἠθικῆς ἀρετῆς. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁ λόγος ταύτῃ λύοιτ' ἄν, ᾧ διαλεχθείη τις ἂν ὅτι χωρίζονται ἀλλήλων αἱ ἀρεταί· οὐ γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς εὐφυέστατος πρὸς ἁπάσας, ὥστε τὴν μὲν ἤδη τὴν δ' οὔπω εἰληφὼς ἔσται· τοῦτο γὰρ κατὰ μὲν τὰς φυσικὰς ἀρετὰς

ENGLISH

We must, then, examine excellence again too. For excellence stands in a closely similar relation: as practical wisdom is to cleverness—not the same, but similar—so natural excellence is to excellence in the full sense. Everyone thinks each type of character belongs to us somehow by nature; we are just, moderate, brave and so on, right from birth. But still we look for something else, what is good in the full sense, and for such qualities to belong to us in another way. For children and animals also have the natural states, but without intellect they are evidently harmful. This much, at least, seems observable: just as a strong body moving about without sight stumbles heavily because it has no sight, so it is here too. But if someone acquires intellect, it makes a difference in his actions; and his state, while similar, will then be excellence in the full sense.

So just as in the part that forms opinions there are two kinds, cleverness and practical wisdom, so in the part concerned with character there are two, natural excellence and excellence in the full sense; and of these, excellence in the full sense does not come about without practical wisdom. That is why some say all the excellences are forms of practical wisdom, and why Socrates was partly right in his inquiry and partly wrong: he was wrong in thinking that all the excellences are forms of practical wisdom, but right in saying that they do not exist without it. A sign of this: even now, when people define excellence, everyone, after naming the state and what it concerns, adds "in accordance with correct reason"; and reason is correct when it accords with practical wisdom. So everyone seems somehow to divine that excellence is this sort of state, the one in accordance with practical wisdom. But we must go a little further.

Excellence is not merely the state in accordance with correct reason, but the state that involves correct reason; and correct reason about such matters is practical wisdom. So Socrates thought the excellences were forms of reason (for he thought they were all forms of scientific knowledge), whereas we think they involve reason. It is clear, then, from what has been said, that it is not possible to be good in the full sense without practical wisdom, nor practically wise without excellence of character. And in this way we could also

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ἐνδέχεται, [1145a] καθ' ἃς δὲ ἁπλῶς λέγεται ἀγαθός, οὐκ ἐνδέχεται· ἅμα γὰρ τῇ φρονήσει μιᾷ ὑπαρχούσῃ πᾶσαι ὑπάρξουσιν.	answer the argument by which someone might contend that the excellences exist separately from one another, on the grounds that the same person is not best endowed by nature for all of them, so that he will already have acquired one but not yet another. That is possible with the natural excellences, [1145a] but not with those in virtue of which someone is called good without qualification; for when practical wisdom, which is one, is present, all of them will be present.
1145a	δῆλον δέ, κἂν εἰ μὴ πρακτικὴ ἦν, ὅτι ἔδει ἂν αὐτῆς διὰ τὸ τοῦ μορίου ἀρετὴν εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔσται ἡ προαίρεσις ὀρθὴ ἄνευ φρονήσεως οὐδ' ἄνευ ἀρετῆς· ἣ μὲν γὰρ τὸ τέλος ἣ δὲ τὰ πρὸς τὸ τέλος ποιεῖ πράττειν. ἀλλὰ μὴν οὐδὲ κυρία γ' ἐστὶ τῆς σοφίας οὐδὲ τοῦ βελτίονος μορίου, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τῆς ὑγιείας ἡ ἰατρική· οὐ γὰρ χρῆται αὐτῇ, ἀλλ' ὁρᾷ ὅπως γένηται· ἐκείνης οὖν ἕνεκα ἐπιτάττει, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκείνῃ. ἔτι ὅμοιον κἂν εἴ τις τὴν πολιτικὴν φαίη ἄρχειν τῶν θεῶν, ὅτι ἐπιτάττει περὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν τῇ πόλει.	It is clear, too, that even if practical wisdom were not concerned with action, we would need it because it is the excellence of that part of the soul; and that decision will not be correct without practical wisdom, nor without excellence. For the one makes us achieve the end, the other the things that lead to the end. Yet it does not have authority over wisdom, or over the better part, any more than medicine has authority over health. It does not use health, but sees to it that health comes about; so it gives orders for the sake of health, not to it. Further, saying that it did would be like saying that political expertise rules the gods, because it gives orders about everything in the city.

Book VII

Lack of self-control; pleasure
Aristotle examines lack of self-control, how it differs from vice, and whether pleasure is good.

GREEK

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα λεκτέον, ἄλλην ποιησαμένους ἀρχήν, ὅτι τῶν περὶ τὰ ἤθη φευκτῶν τρία ἐστὶν εἴδη, κακία ἀκρασία θηριότης. τὰ δ' ἐναντία τοῖς μὲν δυσὶ δῆλα· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀρετὴν τὸ δ' ἐγκράτειαν καλοῦμεν· πρὸς δὲ τὴν θηριότητα μάλιστ' ἂν ἁρμόττοι λέγειν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς ἀρετήν, ἡρωικήν τινα καὶ θείαν, ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος περὶ τοῦ Ἕκτορος πεποίηκε λέγοντα τὸν Πρίαμον ὅτι σφόδρα ἦν ἀγαθός, οὐδὲ ἐῴκει ἀνδρός γε θνητοῦ πάις ἔμμεναι ἀλλὰ θεοῖο. ὥστ' εἰ, καθάπερ φασίν, ἐξ ἀνθρώπων γίνονται θεοὶ δι' ἀρετῆς ὑπερβολήν, τοιαύτη τις ἂν εἴη δῆλον ὅτι ἡ τῇ θηριώδει ἀντιτιθεμένη ἕξις· καὶ γὰρ ὥσπερ οὐδὲ θηρίου ἐστὶ κακία οὐδ' ἀρετή, οὕτως οὐδὲ θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἡ μὲν τιμιώτερον ἀρετῆς, ἡ δ' ἕτερόν τι γένος κακίας.

ἐπεὶ δὲ σπάνιον καὶ τὸ θεῖον ἄνδρα εἶναι, καθάπερ οἱ Λάκωνες εἰώθασι προσαγορεύειν, οἳ ὅταν ἀγασθῶσι σφόδρα του, σεῖος ἀνήρ φασιν, οὕτω καὶ ὁ θηριώδης ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις σπάνιος· μάλιστα δ' ἐν τοῖς βαρβάροις ἐστίν, γίνεται δ' ἔνια καὶ διὰ νόσους καὶ πηρώσεις· καὶ τοὺς διὰ κακίαν δὲ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ὑπερβάλλοντας οὕτως ἐπιδυσφημοῦμεν. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τῆς διαθέσεως τῆς τοιαύτης ὕστερον ποιητέον τινὰ μνείαν, περὶ δὲ κακίας εἴρηται πρότερον· περὶ δὲ ἀκρασίας καὶ μαλακίας καὶ τρυφῆς λεκτέον, καὶ περὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ καρτερίας· 1145b οὔτε γὰρ ὡς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ἕξεων τῇ ἀρετῇ καὶ τῇ μοχθηρίᾳ ἑκατέραν αὐτῶν ὑποληπτέον, οὔθ' ὡς ἕτερον γένος.

ENGLISH

After this we must make a fresh start and say that there are three kinds of things to be avoided in matters of character: vice, lack of self-control, and brutishness. The opposites of two of these are clear: we call one excellence and the other self-control. As the opposite of brutishness it would be most fitting to name the excellence that is beyond us, a heroic and godlike excellence—as Homer has Priam say of Hector that he was exceedingly good: "he did not seem the son of a mortal man, but of a god." So if, as people say, humans become gods through an excess of excellence, the state opposed to brutishness would clearly be something like this. For just as a beast has neither vice nor excellence, neither does a god: the god's state is something more to be honored than excellence, and the beast's is some different kind of thing from vice.

Since it is rare for a man to be godlike—as the Spartans usually put it: when they greatly admire someone, they call him "a godly man"—so the brutish person is also rare among human beings. It is found most among non-Greeks, and some cases also arise from disease or disability; and we also use the word as a reproach for those who surpass other people in vice. But we must make some mention of this sort of condition later; vice has been discussed before. We must now discuss lack of self-control, softness and luxury, and also self-control and endurance. 1145b For we should not suppose that each of these pairs concerns the same states as excellence and wickedness, nor that it is a different kind.[1]

PUZZLES ABOUT SELF-CONTROL

Aristotle sets out common opinions about self-control and the puzzles they raise.

GREEK

ENGLISH

1145b

1 The Spartans say *seios*, their dialect form of *theios*, "divine."

GREEK

δεῖ δ', ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, τιθέντας τὰ φαινόμενα καὶ πρῶτον διαπορήσαντας οὕτω δεικνύναι μάλιστα μὲν πάντα τὰ ἔνδοξα περὶ ταῦτα τὰ πάθη, εἰ δὲ μή, τὰ πλεῖστα καὶ κυριώτατα· ἐὰν γὰρ λύηταί τε τὰ δυσχερῆ καὶ καταλείπηται τὰ ἔνδοξα, δεδειγμένον ἂν εἴη ἱκανῶς.

δοκεῖ δὴ ἥ τε ἐγκράτεια καὶ καρτερία τῶν σπουδαίων καὶ τῶν ἐπαινετῶν εἶναι, ἡ δ' ἀκρασία τε καὶ μαλακία τῶν φαύλων καὶ ψεκτῶν, καὶ ὁ αὐτὸς ἐγκρατὴς καὶ ἐμμενετικὸς τῷ λογισμῷ, καὶ ἀκρατὴς καὶ ἐκστατικὸς τοῦ λογισμοῦ. καὶ ὁ μὲν ἀκρατὴς εἰδὼς ὅτι φαῦλα πράττει διὰ πάθος, ὁ δ' ἐγκρατὴς εἰδὼς ὅτι φαῦλαι αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι οὐκ ἀκολουθεῖ διὰ τὸν λόγον. καὶ τὸν σώφρονα μὲν ἐγκρατῆ καὶ καρτερικόν, τὸν δὲ τοιοῦτον οἳ μὲν πάντα σώφρονα οἳ δ' οὔ, καὶ τὸν ἀκόλαστον ἀκρατῆ καὶ τὸν ἀκρατῆ ἀκόλαστον συγκεχυμένως, οἳ δ' ἑτέρους εἶναί φασιν. τὸν δὲ φρόνιμον ὁτὲ μὲν οὔ φασιν ἐνδέχεσθαι εἶναι ἀκρατῆ, ὁτὲ δ' ἐνίους φρονίμους ὄντας καὶ δεινοὺς ἀκρατεῖς εἶναι. ἔτι ἀκρατεῖς λέγονται καὶ θυμοῦ καὶ τιμῆς καὶ κέρδους. τὰ μὲν οὖν λεγόμενα ταῦτ' ἐστίν.

ἀπορήσειε δ' ἄν τις πῶς ὑπολαμβάνων ὀρθῶς ἀκρατεύεταί τις. ἐπιστάμενον μὲν οὖν οὔ φασί τινες οἷόν τε εἶναι· δεινὸν γὰρ ἐπιστήμης ἐνούσης, ὡς ᾤετο Σωκράτης, ἄλλο τι κρατεῖν καὶ περιέλκειν αὐτὴν ὥσπερ ἀνδράποδον. Σωκράτης μὲν γὰρ ὅλως ἐμάχετο πρὸς τὸν λόγον ὡς οὐκ οὔσης ἀκρασίας· οὐθένα γὰρ ὑπολαμβάνοντα πράττειν παρὰ τὸ βέλτιστον, ἀλλὰ δι' ἄγνοιαν. οὗτος μὲν οὖν ὁ λόγος ἀμφισβητεῖ τοῖς φαινομένοις ἐναργῶς, καὶ δέον ζητεῖν περὶ τὸ πάθος, εἰ δι' ἄγνοιαν, τίς ὁ τρόπος γίνεται τῆς ἀγνοίας. ὅτι γὰρ οὐκ οἴεταί γε ὁ ἀκρατευόμενος πρὶν ἐν τῷ πάθει γενέσθαι, φανερόν.

ENGLISH

As in other cases, we must set out the appearances and first work through the puzzles, and in this way show, ideally, all the reputable opinions about these feelings, or if not, most of them and the most authoritative. For if the difficulties are resolved and the reputable opinions are left standing, the matter will have been adequately shown.

Self-control and endurance are thought to be among excellent and praiseworthy things, and lack of self-control and softness among bad and blameworthy ones. The self-controlled person is thought to be the same as one who sticks to his calculation, and the uncontrolled person the same as one who abandons it. The uncontrolled person knows that what he does is bad, but does it because of feeling; the self-controlled person knows that his appetites are bad, and because of reason does not follow them. The moderate person is said to be self-controlled and enduring; but some think anyone who is like that is moderate in every case, and others do not. Some call the self-indulgent person uncontrolled and the uncontrolled person self-indulgent, lumping them together, while others say they are different. As for the practically wise person, sometimes people say he cannot be uncontrolled, and sometimes that some people who are practically wise and clever are uncontrolled. Further, people are called uncontrolled with respect to anger, honor and gain. These, then, are the things that are said.

One might be puzzled about how someone can act without self-control while judging correctly. Some say it is impossible if he has knowledge; for it would be terrible, as Socrates thought, if knowledge were present in someone and something else overpowered it and dragged it around like a slave. Socrates, in fact, fought against the view entirely, on the grounds that there is no such thing as lack of self-control: no one, he held, acts contrary to what is best while judging it to be best, but only through ignorance. Now this argument plainly conflicts with the appearances, and we need to inquire about the feeling: if it comes about through ignorance, what is the manner of the ignorance? For it is evident that the person who acts without self-control does not think he should before he gets into the state of feeling.

GREEK

εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἳ τὰ μὲν συγχωροῦσι τὰ δ' οὔ· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιστήμης μηθὲν εἶναι κρεῖττον ὁμολογοῦσιν, τὸ δὲ μηθένα πράττειν παρὰ τὸ δόξαν βέλτιον οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσιν, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὸν ἀκρατῆ φασὶν οὐκ ἐπιστήμην ἔχοντα κρατεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀλλὰ δόξαν. ἀλλὰ μὴν εἴγε δόξα καὶ μὴ ἐπιστήμη, μηδ' ἰσχυρὰ ὑπόληψις [1146a] ἡ ἀντιτείνουσα ἀλλ' ἠρεμαία, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς διστάζουσι, συγγνώμη τῷ μὴ μένειν ἐν αὐταῖς πρὸς ἐπιθυμίας ἰσχυράς· τῇ δὲ μοχθηρίᾳ οὐ συγγνώμη, οὐδὲ τῶν ἄλλων οὐδενὶ τῶν ψεκτῶν. φρονήσεως ἄρα ἀντιτεινούσης; αὕτη γὰρ ἰσχυρότατον. ἀλλ' ἄτοπον· ἔσται γὰρ ὁ αὐτὸς ἅμα φρόνιμος καὶ ἀκρατής, φήσειε δ' οὐδ' ἂν εἷς φρονίμου εἶναι τὸ πράττειν ἑκόντα τὰ φαυλότατα.

ENGLISH

There are some who grant part of this but not all. They agree that nothing is stronger than knowledge, but they do not agree that no one acts contrary to what seemed better; and so they say that when the uncontrolled person is overpowered by pleasures, he has not knowledge but opinion. But if it is opinion and not knowledge, and the conviction [1146a] that resists is not strong but mild, as in people who are in two minds, we sympathize with someone who does not stick to such opinions against strong appetites. But we do not sympathize with wickedness, or with anything else that is blameworthy. Is it, then, practical wisdom that resists? For that is the strongest thing. But that is absurd: the same person will be at once practically wise and uncontrolled, and no one at all would say that it is characteristic of the practically wise person willingly to do the worst things.

1146a πρὸς δὲ τούτοις δέδεικται πρότερον ὅτι πρακτικός γε ὁ φρόνιμος (τῶν γὰρ ἐσχάτων τις) καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἔχων ἀρετάς. ἔτι εἰ μὲν ἐν τῷ ἐπιθυμίας ἔχειν ἰσχυρὰς καὶ φαύλας ὁ ἐγκρατής, οὐκ ἔσται ὁ σώφρων ἐγκρατὴς οὐδ' ὁ ἐγκρατὴς σώφρων· οὔτε γὰρ τὸ ἄγαν σώφρονος οὔτε τὸ φαύλας ἔχειν. ἀλλὰ μὴν δεῖ γε· εἰ μὲν γὰρ χρηστοὶ αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι, φαύλη ἡ κωλύουσα ἕξις μὴ ἀκολουθεῖν, ὥσθ' ἡ ἐγκράτεια οὐ πᾶσα σπουδαία· εἰ δ' ἀσθενεῖς καὶ μὴ φαῦλαι, οὐθὲν σεμνόν, οὐδ' εἰ φαῦλαι καὶ ἀσθενεῖς, οὐδὲν μέγα.

Besides, it has been shown earlier that the practically wise person is someone who acts (for he is concerned with ultimate things) and has the other excellences. Further, if being self-controlled involves having strong and bad appetites, the moderate person will not be self-controlled, nor the self-controlled person moderate; for it is not characteristic of the moderate person to have excessive appetites, or bad ones. Yet the self-controlled person must have them. For if the appetites are good, the state that stops one from following them is bad, so that not all self-control is excellent; and if they are weak and not bad, there is nothing impressive in resisting them, nor anything great if they are bad but weak.

ἔτι εἰ πάσῃ δόξῃ ἐμμενετικὸν ποιεῖ ἡ ἐγκράτεια, φαύλη, οἷον εἰ καὶ τῇ ψευδεῖ· καὶ εἰ πάσης δόξης ἡ ἀκρασία ἐκστατικόν, ἔσται τις σπουδαία ἀκρασία, οἷον ὁ Σοφοκλέους Νεοπτόλεμος ἐν τῷ Φιλοκτήτῃ· ἐπαινετὸς γὰρ οὐκ ἐμμένων οἷς ἐπείσθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως διὰ τὸ λυπεῖσθαι ψευδόμενος. ἔτι ὁ σοφιστικὸς λόγος ψευδόμενος ἀπορία· διὰ γὰρ τὸ παράδοξα βούλεσθαι ἐλέγχειν, ἵνα δεινοὶ ὦσιν ὅταν ἐπιτύχωσιν, ὁ γενόμενος συλλογισμὸς ἀπορία γίνεται· δέδεται γὰρ ἡ διάνοια, ὅταν μένειν μὴ βούληται διὰ τὸ μὴ ἀρέσκειν τὸ συμπεranθέν, προϊέναι δὲ μὴ δύνηται διὰ τὸ λῦσαι μὴ ἔχειν τὸν λόγον.

GREEK

ENGLISH

Further, if self-control makes one stick to every opinion, it is bad—if, for instance, it makes one stick even to a false one. And if lack of self-control makes one abandon every opinion, there will be an excellent kind of lack of self-control, like Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*: he is praiseworthy for not sticking to what Odysseus persuaded him to do, because lying pains him. Further, the sophistical argument, though false, creates a puzzle. Because sophists want to refute people by reaching paradoxical conclusions, so as to be thought clever when they succeed, the resulting syllogism becomes a puzzle. For thought is tied up: it does not want to stay put, since it dislikes the conclusion, but it cannot move forward, since it cannot undo the argument.[2]

συμβαίνει δὴ ἔκ τινος λόγου ἡ ἀφροσύνη μετ' ἀκρασίας ἀρετή· τἀναντία γὰρ πράττει ὧν ὑπολαμβάνει διὰ τὴν ἀκρασίαν, ὑπολαμβάνει δὲ τἀγαθὰ κακὰ εἶναι καὶ οὐ δεῖν πράττειν, ὥστε τἀγαθὰ καὶ οὐ τὰ κακὰ πράξει. ἔτι ὁ τῷ πεπεῖσθαι πράττων καὶ διώκων τὰ ἡδέα καὶ προαιρούμενος βελτίων ἂν δόξειεν τοῦ μὴ διὰ λογισμὸν ἀλλὰ δι' ἀκρασίαν· εὐιατότερος γὰρ διὰ τὸ μεταπεισθῆναι ἄν. ὁ δ' ἀκρατὴς ἔνοχος τῇ παροιμίᾳ ἐν ᾗ φαμὲν ὅταν τὸ ὕδωρ πνίγῃ, τί δεῖ ἐπιπίνειν; εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐπέπειστο ἃ πράττει, [1146b] μεταπεισθεὶς ἂν ἐπαύσατο· νῦν δὲ ἄλλα πεπεισμένος οὐδὲν ἧττον ἄλλα πράττει. ἔτι εἰ περὶ πάντα ἀκρασία ἐστὶ καὶ ἐγκράτεια, τίς ὁ ἁπλῶς ἀκρατής; οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἁπάσας ἔχει τὰς ἀκρασίας, φαμὲν δ' εἶναί τινας ἁπλῶς.

So from a certain argument it follows that foolishness combined with lack of self-control is excellence. For because of his lack of self-control a person does the opposite of what he judges; but he judges that good things are bad and that he ought not to do them; so he will do the good things and not the bad. Further, the person who does and pursues pleasant things because he is convinced he should, and decides to, would seem better than one who does so not because of calculation but because of lack of self-control; for he is easier to cure, since he might be persuaded otherwise. But the uncontrolled person falls under the proverb in which we say, "When water chokes you, what should you drink after it?" For if he had been persuaded of what he does, [1146b] he would have stopped once persuaded otherwise; as it is, though persuaded of one thing, he does another all the same. Further, if lack of self-control and self-control concern everything, who is the person who is uncontrolled without qualification? No one has every kind of lack of self-control, yet we say some people are uncontrolled without qualification.

1146b αἱ μὲν οὖν ἀπορίαι τοιαῦταί τινες συμβαίνουσιν, τούτων δὲ τὰ μὲν ἀνελεῖν δεῖ τὰ δὲ καταλιπεῖν· ἡ γὰρ λύσις τῆς ἀπορίας εὕρεσίς ἐστιν.

These, then, are roughly the puzzles that arise. Some of these we must remove and others leave standing; for the resolution of a puzzle is a discovery.

2 In Sophocles' play, Odysseus persuades the young Neoptolemus to deceive Philoctetes; Neoptolemus later refuses to keep up the lie.

HOW SOMEONE WHO KNOWS CAN LACK SELF-CONTROL

Aristotle explains how someone can know what is right yet act against it.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πρῶτον μὲν οὖν σκεπτέον πότερον εἰδότες ἢ οὔ, καὶ πῶς εἰδότες· εἶτα περὶ ποῖα τὸν ἀκρατῆ καὶ τὸν ἐγκρατῆ θετέον, λέγω δὲ πότερον περὶ πᾶσαν ἡδονὴν καὶ λύπην ἢ περί τινας ἀφωρισμένας, καὶ τὸν ἐγκρατῆ καὶ τὸν καρτερικόν, πότερον ὁ αὐτὸς ἢ ἕτερός ἐστιν· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσα συγγενῆ τῆς θεωρίας ἐστὶ ταύτης. ἔστι δ' ἀρχὴ τῆς σκέψεως, πότερον ὁ ἐγκρατὴς καὶ ὁ ἀκρατής εἰσι τῷ περὶ ἃ ἢ τῷ ὡς ἔχοντες τὴν διαφοράν, λέγω δὲ πότερον τῷ περὶ ταδὶ εἶναι μόνον ἀκρατὴς ὁ ἀκρατής, ἢ οὐ ἀλλὰ τῷ ὥς, ἢ οὐ ἀλλ' ἐξ ἀμφοῖν· ἔπειτ' εἰ περὶ πάντ' ἐστὶν ἀκρασία καὶ ἐγκράτεια ἢ οὔ.	First, then, we must consider whether uncontrolled people act knowingly or not, and in what way knowingly; next, what sort of things we should take the uncontrolled and the self-controlled person to be concerned with—I mean, whether with every pleasure and pain, or with certain specific ones—and whether the self-controlled and the enduring person are the same or different; and similarly with the other questions akin to this inquiry. The starting point of the investigation is whether the self-controlled and the uncontrolled person differ by what they are concerned with or by how they are disposed—I mean, whether the uncontrolled person is uncontrolled solely by being concerned with these particular things, or not that but by how he is, or not that either but from both; and next, whether lack of self-control and self-control concern everything or not.
οὔτε γὰρ περὶ ἅπαντ' ἐστὶν ὁ ἁπλῶς ἀκρατής, ἀλλὰ περὶ ἅπερ ὁ ἀκόλαστος, οὔτε τῷ πρὸς ταῦτα ἁπλῶς ἔχειν (ταὐτὸν γὰρ ἂν ἦν τῇ ἀκολασίᾳ), ἀλλὰ τῷ ὠδὶ ἔχειν. ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἄγεται προαιρούμενος, νομίζων ἀεὶ δεῖν τὸ παρὸν ἡδὺ διώκειν· ὃ δ' οὐκ οἴεται μέν, διώκει δέ. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ δόξαν ἀληθῆ ἀλλὰ μὴ ἐπιστήμην εἶναι παρ' ἣν ἀκρατεύονται, οὐδὲν διαφέρει πρὸς τὸν λόγον· ἔνιοι γὰρ τῶν δοξαζόντων οὐ διστάζουσιν, ἀλλ' οἴονται ἀκριβῶς εἰδέναι. εἰ οὖν διὰ τὸ ἠρέμα πιστεύειν οἱ δοξάζοντες μᾶλλον τῶν ἐπισταμένων παρὰ τὴν ὑπόληψιν πράξουσιν, οὐθὲν διοίσει ἐπιστήμη δόξης· ἔνιοι γὰρ πιστεύουσιν οὐδὲν ἧττον οἷς δοξάζουσιν ἢ ἕτεροι οἷς ἐπίστανται· δηλοῖ δ' Ἡράκλειτος.	The person who is uncontrolled without qualification is not concerned with everything, but with the same things as the self-indulgent person; nor is he uncontrolled simply by being related to these things (for then it would be the same as self-indulgence), but by being related to them in a particular way. The self-indulgent person is led on by decision, thinking he should always pursue the pleasure at hand; the uncontrolled person does not think so, but pursues it anyway. As for the suggestion that it is true opinion and not knowledge that people act against when they lack self-control, this makes no difference to the argument. For some people who hold opinions are in no doubt, but think they know exactly. So if it is because their belief is mild that people with opinion, more than people with knowledge, will act against their judgement, knowledge will not differ from opinion; for some people are no less convinced of what they believe than others are of what they know—as Heraclitus shows.
ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ διχῶς λέγομεν τὸ ἐπίστασθαι (καὶ γὰρ ὁ ἔχων μὲν οὐ χρώμενος δὲ τῇ ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ ὁ χρώμενος λέγεται ἐπίστασθαι), διοίσει τὸ ἔχοντα μὲν μὴ θεωροῦντα δὲ καὶ τὸ θεωροῦντα ἃ μὴ δεῖ πράττειν τοῦ ἔχοντα καὶ θεωροῦντα· τοῦτο γὰρ δοκεῖ δεινόν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰ μὴ	But since we speak of knowing in two ways (both the person who has knowledge but is not using it and the person who is using it are said to know), there will be a difference between doing what one should not while having the knowledge but not

GREEK	ENGLISH
θεωρῶν. [1147a] ἔτι ἐπεὶ δύο τρόποι τῶν προτάσεων, ἔχοντα μὲν ἀμφοτέρας οὐδὲν κωλύει πράττειν παρὰ τὴν ἐπιστήμην, χρώμενον μέντοι τῇ καθόλου ἀλλὰ μὴ τῇ κατὰ μέρος· πρακτὰ γὰρ τὰ καθ' ἕκαστα.	contemplating it, and doing so while having it and contemplating it. The latter seems terrible, but not if one is not contemplating it. [1147a] Further, since there are two kinds of premise, nothing prevents someone who has both from acting against his knowledge, if he is using the universal premise but not the particular one; for what is done is particular.
1147a διαφέρει δὲ καὶ τὸ καθόλου· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ τὸ δ' ἐπὶ τοῦ πράγματός ἐστιν· οἷον ὅτι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ συμφέρει τὰ ξηρά, καὶ ὅτι αὐτὸς ἄνθρωπος, ἢ ὅτι ξηρὸν τὸ τοιόνδε· ἀλλ' εἰ τόδε τοιόνδε, ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἢ οὐκ ἐνεργεῖ· κατά τε δὴ τούτους διοίσει τοὺς τρόπους ἀμήχανον ὅσον, ὥστε δοκεῖν οὕτω μὲν εἰδέναι μηδὲν ἄτοπον, ἄλλως δὲ θαυμαστόν. ἔτι τὸ ἔχειν τὴν ἐπιστήμην ἄλλον τρόπον τῶν νῦν ῥηθέντων ὑπάρχει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις· ἐν τῷ γὰρ ἔχειν μὲν μὴ χρῆσθαι δὲ διαφέρουσαν ὁρῶμεν τὴν ἕξιν, ὥστε καὶ ἔχειν πως καὶ μὴ ἔχειν, οἷον τὸν καθεύδοντα καὶ μαινόμενον καὶ οἰνωμένον.	The universal, too, differs: one universal applies to the agent himself, the other to the thing. For example, "dry food is good for every human being" and "I am a human being," or "this sort of food is dry"; but as to whether *this* is this sort, either he does not have this knowledge or it is not active. So there will be an enormous difference between these ways of knowing, so that knowing in one way seems not at all strange, but knowing in the other seems astonishing. Further, human beings can have knowledge in yet another way than those just mentioned. For within having but not using, we see a difference in the state, so that one both has it in a way and does not have it—as with someone asleep, or mad, or drunk.
ἀλλὰ μὴν οὕτω διατίθενται οἵ γε ἐν τοῖς πάθεσιν ὄντες· θυμοὶ γὰρ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαι ἀφροδισίων καὶ ἔνια τῶν τοιούτων ἐπιδήλως καὶ τὸ σῶμα μεθιστᾶσιν, ἐνίοις δὲ καὶ μανίας ποιοῦσιν. δῆλον οὖν ὅτι ὁμοίως ἔχειν λεκτέον τοὺς ἀκρατεῖς τούτοις. τὸ δὲ λέγειν τοὺς λόγους τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιστήμης οὐδὲν σημεῖον· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι τούτοις ὄντες ἀποδείξεις καὶ ἔπη λέγουσιν Ἐμπεδοκλέους, καὶ οἱ πρῶτον μαθόντες συνείρουσι μὲν τοὺς λόγους, ἴσασι δ' οὔπω· δεῖ γὰρ συμφυῆναι, τοῦτο δὲ χρόνου δεῖται· ὥστε καθάπερ τοὺς ὑποκρινομένους, οὕτως ὑπολη̣πτέον λέγειν καὶ τοὺς ἀκρατευομένους. ἔτι καὶ ὧδε φυσικῶς ἄν τις ἐπιβλέψειε τὴν αἰτίαν.	But this is just the condition of people in the grip of feelings. Fits of anger, sexual appetites and some other such things plainly alter even the body, and in some people they even cause madness. Clearly, then, we should say that uncontrolled people are in a similar condition to these. Saying the words that come from knowledge is no sign of anything: people in these states recite proofs and verses of Empedocles, and those who have just begun learning string the words together but do not yet know them; for the knowledge must grow into them, and that takes time. So we should suppose that people acting without self-control say the words the way actors do. Further, one might also look at the cause in the following way, in terms of natural science.[3]
ἡ μὲν γὰρ καθόλου δόξα, ἡ δ' ἑτέρα περὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστά ἐστιν, ὧν αἴσθησις ἤδη κυρία· ὅταν δὲ μία γένηται ἐξ αὐτῶν, ἀνάγκη τὸ συμπερανθὲν ἔνθα μὲν φάναι τὴν ψυχήν, ἐν δὲ ταῖς ποιητικαῖς πράττειν εὐθύς· οἷον, εἰ παντὸς γλυκέος γεύεσθαι δεῖ, τουτὶ δὲ γλυκὺ ὡς ἕν τι τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον, ἀνάγκη τὸν δυνάμενον καὶ μὴ κωλυόμενον ἅμα τοῦτο καὶ πράττειν.	One opinion is universal, and the other concerns particulars, which are already governed by perception. When a single one comes from the two, the soul must in one case affirm the conclusion, but in matters of production it must act at once. For example, if one ought to taste everything sweet, and this, as one of the particulars, is sweet,

3 Empedocles of Acragas (fifth century BC), a philosopher who wrote in verse.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	then someone who is able and not prevented must at the same time also do this.
ὅταν οὖν ἡ μὲν καθόλου ἐνῇ κωλύουσα γεύεσθαι, ἡ δέ, ὅτι πᾶν γλυκὺ ἡδύ, τουτὶ δὲ γλυκύ (αὕτη δὲ ἐνεργεῖ), τύχῃ δ' ἐπιθυμία ἐνοῦσα, ἡ μὲν οὖν λέγει φεύγειν τοῦτο, ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία ἄγει· κινεῖν γὰρ ἕκαστον δύναται τῶν μορίων· 1147b ὥστε συμβαίνει ὑπὸ λόγου πως καὶ δόξης ἀκρατεύεσθαι, οὐκ ἐναντίας δὲ καθ' αὑτήν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός—ἡ γὰρ ἐπιθυμία ἐναντία, ἀλλ' οὐχ ἡ δόξα—τῷ ὀρθῷ λόγῳ· ὥστε καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τὰ θηρία οὐκ ἀκρατῆ, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχει καθόλου ὑπόληψιν ἀλλὰ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα φαντασίαν καὶ μνήμην. πῶς δὲ λύεται ἡ ἄγνοια καὶ πάλιν γίνεται ἐπιστήμων ὁ ἀκρατής, ὁ αὐτὸς λόγος καὶ περὶ οἰνωμένου καὶ καθεύδοντος καὶ οὐκ ἴδιος τούτου τοῦ πάθους, ὃν δεῖ παρὰ τῶν φυσιολόγων ἀκούειν.	So when the universal opinion is present forbidding us to taste, and there is also the other one, that everything sweet is pleasant and this is sweet (and this one is active), and appetite happens to be present, then the one opinion tells us to avoid this, but appetite leads us on; for it can move each of the bodily parts. 1147b So it turns out that one acts without self-control under the influence, in a way, of reason and opinion—an opinion that is contrary, not in itself but incidentally (for it is the appetite that is contrary, not the opinion), to correct reason. That is also why animals are not uncontrolled: they have no universal judgement, only imagination and memory of particulars. As for how the ignorance is dissolved and the uncontrolled person regains his knowledge, the account is the same as for the drunk and the sleeper and is not peculiar to this condition; we must learn it from the natural scientists.
1147b ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ τελευταία πρότασις δόξα τε αἰσθητοῦ καὶ κυρία τῶν πράξεων, ταύτην ἢ οὐκ ἔχει ἐν τῷ πάθει ὤν, ἢ οὕτως ἔχει ὡς οὐκ ἦν τὸ ἔχειν ἐπίστασθαι ἀλλὰ λέγειν ὥσπερ ὁ οἰνωμένος τὰ Ἐμπεδοκλέους. καὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ καθόλου μηδ' ἐπιστημονικὸν ὁμοίως εἶναι δοκεῖν τῷ καθόλου τὸν ἔσχατον ὅρον καὶ ἔοικεν ὃ ἐζήτει Σωκράτης συμβαίνειν· οὐ γὰρ τῆς κυρίως ἐπιστήμης εἶναι δοκούσης παρούσης γίνεται τὸ πάθος, οὐδ' αὕτη περιέλκεται διὰ τὸ πάθος, ἀλλὰ τῆς αἰσθητικῆς. περὶ μὲν οὖν τοῦ εἰδότα καὶ μή, καὶ πῶς εἰδότα ἐνδέχεται ἀκρατεύεσθαι, τοσαῦτα εἰρήσθω.	Now since the last premise is a belief about something perceptible, and is what governs our actions, the person in the grip of the feeling either doesn't have it, or has it only in a sense in which having it isn't knowing but merely saying the words, as a drunk recites Empedocles. And because the last term is not universal, and doesn't seem to be an object of scientific knowledge in the way the universal is, what Socrates was looking for also seems to turn out to be the case. For the feeling doesn't arise when what seems to be knowledge in the full sense is present, nor is it that knowledge that gets dragged around by the feeling, but the perceptual kind. So much, then, for the questions whether the uncontrolled person acts knowing or not knowing, and in what sense someone who knows can lack self-control.

WHAT SELF-CONTROL IS CONCERNED WITH

Aristotle argues that self-control in the strict sense concerns bodily pleasures, others only by extension.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πότερον δ' ἐστί τις ἁπλῶς ἀκρατὴς ἢ πάντες κατὰ μέρος, καὶ εἰ ἔστι, περὶ ποῖά ἐστι, λεκτέον ἐφεξῆς. ὅτι μὲν οὖν περὶ ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας εἰσὶν οἵ τ' ἐγκρατεῖς καὶ καρτερικοὶ καὶ οἱ ἀκρατεῖς καὶ μαλακοί, φανερόν.	Next we must discuss whether anyone is uncontrolled without qualification, or everyone who is so is uncontrolled in some particular respect; and if there is such a person, what sorts of things he is uncontrolled about. That the self-controlled and

GREEK

ENGLISH

the enduring, and the uncontrolled and the soft, are concerned with pleasures and pains is clear.

ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστὶ τὰ μὲν ἀναγκαῖα τῶν ποιούντων ἡδονήν, τὰ δ' αἱρετὰ μὲν καθ' αὑτὰ ἔχοντα δ' ὑπερβολήν, ἀναγκαῖα μὲν τὰ σωματικά (λέγω δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα, τά τε περὶ τὴν τροφὴν καὶ τὴν τῶν ἀφροδισίων χρείαν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν σωματικῶν περὶ ἃ τὴν ἀκολασίαν ἔθεμεν καὶ τὴν σωφροσύνην), τὰ δ' ἀναγκαῖα μὲν οὐχί, αἱρετὰ δὲ καθ' αὑτά (λέγω δ' οἷον νίκην τιμὴν πλοῦτον καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα τῶν ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἡδέων)· τοὺς μὲν οὖν πρὸς ταῦτα παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον ὑπερβάλλοντας τὸν ἐν αὑτοῖς ἁπλῶς μὲν οὐ λέγομεν ἀκρατεῖς, προστιθέντες δὲ τὸ χρημάτων ἀκρατεῖς καὶ κέρδους καὶ τιμῆς καὶ θυμοῦ, ἁπλῶς δ' οὔ, ὡς ἑτέρους καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητα λεγομένους, ὥσπερ ἄνθρωπος ὁ τὰ Ὀλύμπια νικῶν· 1148a ἐκείνῳ γὰρ ὁ κοινὸς λόγος τοῦ ἰδίου μικρὸν διέφερεν, ἀλλ' ὅμως ἕτερος ἦν.

Some of the things that produce pleasure are necessary, while others are choiceworthy in themselves but admit of excess. The necessary ones are the bodily ones—I mean things like those to do with food and sexual need, the sort of bodily things we took to be the sphere of self-indulgence and moderation. The others are not necessary but are choiceworthy in themselves—I mean, for example, victory, honor, wealth, and other good and pleasant things of that kind. Now those who go to excess with regard to these latter, against the correct reason that is in them, we don't call uncontrolled without qualification. We add a qualification—uncontrolled about money, or gain, or honor, or anger—and don't call them simply uncontrolled, since they are different and are so called by resemblance. Compare Anthropos, the Olympic victor: 1148a the general account of "human being" differed only slightly from the account peculiar to him, but it was different all the same.[4]

1148a σημεῖον δέ· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ἀκρασία ψέγεται οὐχ ὡς ἁμαρτία μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς κακία τις ἢ ἁπλῶς οὖσα ἢ κατά τι μέρος, τούτων δ' οὐδείς. τῶν δὲ περὶ τὰς σωματικὰς ἀπολαύσεις, περὶ ἃς λέγομεν τὸν σώφρονα καὶ ἀκόλαστον, ὁ μὴ τῷ προαιρεῖσθαι τῶν ἡδέων διώκων τὰς ὑπερβολάς—καὶ τῶν λυπηρῶν φεύγων, πείνης καὶ δίψης καὶ ἀλέας καὶ ψύχους καὶ πάντων τῶν περὶ ἁφὴν καὶ γεῦσιν—ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν καὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, ἀκρατὴς λέγεται, οὐ κατὰ πρόσθεσιν, ὅτι περὶ τάδε, καθάπερ ὀργῆς, ἀλλ' ἁπλῶς μόνον. σημεῖον δέ· καὶ γὰρ μαλακοὶ λέγονται περὶ ταύτας, περὶ ἐκείνων δ' οὐδεμίαν.

Here is a sign of this: lack of self-control is blamed not merely as an error but as a kind of vice, either without qualification or in some particular respect, whereas none of these others is. Among those concerned with bodily enjoyments, the sphere in which we call people moderate or self-indulgent, the one who pursues excesses of pleasant things—and avoids excesses of painful ones, hunger and thirst and heat and cold and everything to do with touch and taste—not by decision but contrary to his decision and his thinking, is called uncontrolled. He is called so not with an addition, "about this," as we say "about anger," but simply without qualification. Another sign: people are also called "soft" with respect to these pleasures, but not with respect to any of the others.

καὶ διὰ τοῦτ' εἰς ταὐτὸ τὸν ἀκρατῆ καὶ τὸν ἀκόλαστον τίθεμεν καὶ ἐγκρατῆ καὶ σώφρονα, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκείνων οὐδένα, διὰ τὸ περὶ τὰς αὐτάς πως ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας εἶναι· οἳ δ' εἰσὶ μὲν περὶ ταὐτά, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡσαύτως εἰσίν, ἀλλ' οἳ μὲν προαιροῦνται οἳ δ' οὐ προαιροῦνται. διὸ μᾶλλον ἀκόλαστον ἂν εἴποιμεν ὅστις μὴ ἐπιθυμῶν ἢ ἡρέμα διώκει τὰς ὑπερβολὰς καὶ φεύγει μετρίας λύπας, ἢ τοῦτον ὅστις διὰ τὸ ἐπιθυμεῖν σφόδρα· τί γὰρ ἂν ἐκεῖνος

That is why we group the uncontrolled person with the self-indulgent, and the self-controlled with the moderate, but none of those others: because they are concerned in a way with the same pleasures and pains. But though they are concerned with the same things, they are not concerned with them in the same way: the one kind decide on them, the other kind don't. So we would

4 Anthropos ("Human Being") was the name of a boxer who won at Olympia in 456 BC.

GREEK

ποιήσειεν, εἰ προσγένοιτο ἐπιθυμία νεανικὴ καὶ περὶ τὰς τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐνδείας λύπη ἰσχυρά;

ἐπεὶ δὲ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν καὶ τῶν ἡδονῶν αἳ μέν εἰσι τῶν τῷ γένει καλῶν καὶ σπουδαίων (τῶν γὰρ ἡδέων ἔνια φύσει αἱρετά), τὰ δ' ἐναντία τούτων, τὰ δὲ μεταξύ, καθάπερ διείλομεν πρότερον, οἷον χρήματα καὶ κέρδος καὶ νίκη καὶ τιμή· πρὸς ἅπαντα δὲ καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα καὶ τὰ μεταξὺ οὐ τῷ πάσχειν καὶ ἐπιθυμεῖν καὶ φιλεῖν ψέγονται, ἀλλὰ τῷ πῶς καὶ ὑπερβάλλειν (διὸ ὅσοι μὲν παρὰ τὸν λόγον ἢ κρατοῦνται ἢ διώκουσι τῶν φύσει τι καλῶν καὶ ἀγαθῶν, οἷον οἱ περὶ τιμὴν μᾶλλον ἢ δεῖ σπουδάζοντες ἢ περὶ τέκνα καὶ γονεῖς· καὶ γὰρ ταῦτα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καὶ ἐπαινοῦνται οἱ περὶ ταῦτα σπουδάζοντες· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἔστι τις ὑπερβολὴ καὶ ἐν τούτοις, εἴ τις ὥσπερ ἡ Νιόβη μάχοιτο καὶ πρὸς τοὺς θεούς, ἢ ὥσπερ Σάτυρος [1148b] ὁ φιλοπάτωρ ἐπικαλούμενος περὶ τὸν πατέρα· λίαν γὰρ ἐδόκει μωραίνειν)· μοχθηρία μὲν οὖν οὐδεμία περὶ ταῦτ' ἐστὶ διὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι φύσει τῶν αἱρετῶν ἕκαστόν ἐστι δι' αὑτό, φαῦλαι δὲ καὶ φευκταὶ αὐτῶν εἰσὶν αἱ ὑπερβολαί.

1148b ὁμοίως δ' οὐδ' ἀκρασία· ἡ γὰρ ἀκρασία οὐ μόνον φευκτὸν ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ψεκτῶν ἐστίν· δι' ὁμοιότητα δὲ τοῦ πάθους προσεπιτιθέντες τὴν ἀκρασίαν περὶ ἕκαστον λέγουσιν, οἷον κακὸν ἰατρὸν καὶ κακὸν ὑποκριτήν, ὃν ἁπλῶς οὐκ ἂν εἴποιεν κακόν. ὥσπερ οὖν οὐδ' ἐνταῦθα, διὰ τὸ μὴ κακίαν εἶναι ἑκάστην αὐτῶν ἀλλὰ τῷ ἀνάλογον ὁμοίαν, οὕτω δῆλον ὅτι κἀκεῖ ὑποληπτέον μόνην ἀκρασίαν καὶ ἐγκράτειαν εἶναι ἥτις ἐστὶ περὶ ταὐτὰ τῇ σωφροσύνῃ καὶ ἀκολασίᾳ, περὶ δὲ θυμοῦ καθ' ὁμοιότητα λέγομεν· διὸ καὶ προστιθέντες ἀκρατῆ θυμοῦ ὥσπερ τιμῆς καὶ κέρδους φαμέν.

ENGLISH

sooner call someone self-indulgent who pursues excesses and avoids moderate pains while feeling no appetite, or only a mild one, than someone who does so because his appetite is intense. For what would the former do if he also came to have a youthful appetite, and violent pain at the lack of necessities?

Some appetites and pleasures are for things that are fine and excellent in kind (for some pleasant things are choiceworthy by nature); others are for their opposites; and others for things in between, as we distinguished earlier—money, for example, and gain, victory, and honor. With regard to all of these, both the fine kind and the intermediate, people are blamed not for being affected by them, having an appetite for them, and loving them, but for doing so in a certain way, and to excess. (So those who, against reason, are overcome by or pursue something that is by nature fine and good are not blamed—those, for example, who care more than they should about honor, or about their children and parents. These too are goods, and those who care about them are praised. Yet there is an excess even here, if someone were to fight even against the gods, like Niobe, or were to be like Satyrus, [1148b] nicknamed "the father-lover," about his father: he was thought to be quite foolish.) There is no wickedness, then, concerned with these things, for the reason stated: each of them is by nature choiceworthy for its own sake, though excesses of them are bad and to be avoided.[5]

Likewise there is no lack of self-control about them either; for lack of self-control is not only to be avoided but also blameworthy. But because the feeling is similar, people apply the term "lack of self-control" with a qualification in each case, as they speak of a bad doctor or a bad actor, whom they would not call bad without qualification. So just as we don't in these cases, because each of these is not a vice but only similar to one by analogy, clearly in the other case too we should suppose that the only lack of self-control and self-control are those concerned with the same things as moderation and self-indulgence, while we speak of them in connection with anger by resemblance. That is why we say, adding a qualification, "uncon-

5 Niobe boasted that she had more children than the goddess Leto, whose children Apollo and Artemis then killed hers.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	trolled about anger," as we do "about honor" and "about gain."

BRUTISH AND DISEASED STATES

Aristotle describes brutish and diseased pleasures and says lack of self-control about them is so only by extension.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἐπεὶ δ' ἐστὶν ἔνια μὲν ἡδέα φύσει, καὶ τούτων τὰ μὲν ἁπλῶς τὰ δὲ κατὰ γένη καὶ ζῴων καὶ ἀνθρώπων, τὰ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν διὰ πηρώσεις τὰ δὲ δι' ἔθη γίνεται, τὰ δὲ διὰ μοχθηρὰς φύσεις, ἔστι καὶ περὶ τούτων ἕκαστα παραπλησίας ἰδεῖν ἕξεις· λέγω δὲ τὰς θηριώδεις, οἷον τὴν ἄνθρωπον ἣν λέγουσι τὰς κυούσας ἀνασχίζουσαν τὰ παιδία κατεσθίειν, ἢ οἵοις χαίρειν φασὶν ἐνίους τῶν ἀπηγριωμένων περὶ τὸν Πόντον, τοὺς μὲν ὠμοῖς τοὺς δὲ ἀνθρώπων κρέασιν, τοὺς δὲ τὰ παιδία δανείζειν ἀλλήλοις εἰς εὐωχίαν, ἢ τὸ περὶ Φάλαριν λεγόμενον.	Some things are pleasant by nature—some of these without qualification, others relative to kinds both of animals and of human beings—while other things are not pleasant by nature but become so, some through deformities, some through habits, and some through depraved natures. With regard to each of these too one can observe corresponding states. I mean the brutish ones: for example, the woman who, they say, rips open pregnant women and devours the babies; or the sort of things that some of the people who have turned savage around the Black Sea are said to enjoy, some eating raw meat, others human flesh, and others lending one another their children for feasts; or what is told of Phalaris.[6]
αὗται μὲν θηριώδεις, αἳ δὲ διὰ νόσους γίνονται (καὶ διὰ μανίαν ἐνίοις, ὥσπερ ὁ τὴν μητέρα καθιερεύσας καὶ φαγών, καὶ ὁ τοῦ συνδούλου τὸ ἧπαρ) αἳ δὲ νοσηματώδεις ἢ ἐξ ἔθους, οἷον τριχῶν τίλσεις καὶ ὀνύχων τρώξεις, ἔτι δ' ἀνθράκων καὶ γῆς, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις ἡ τῶν ἀφροδισίων τοῖς ἄρρεσιν· τοῖς μὲν γὰρ φύσει τοῖς δ' ἐξ ἔθους συμβαίνουσιν, οἷον τοῖς ὑβριζομένοις ἐκ παίδων. ὅσοις μὲν οὖν φύσις αἰτία, τούτους μὲν οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴπειεν ἀκρατεῖς, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὰς γυναῖκας, ὅτι οὐκ ὀπύουσιν ἀλλ' ὀπύονται· ὡσαύτως δὲ καὶ ὅσοι νοσηματώδως ἔχουσι δι' ἔθος.	These states are brutish. Others arise through disease (and in some cases through madness, like the man who sacrificed his mother and ate her, or the one who ate his fellow slave's liver). Others are diseased conditions or come from habit, such as pulling out one's hair and biting one's nails, or even eating coal and earth, and in addition sex between males. For these come about in some people by nature, in others from habit, as with those who have been abused since childhood. Now nobody would call uncontrolled those for whom nature is the cause, any more than we would call women uncontrolled because they take the passive rather than the active role in sex; and the same goes for those who are in a diseased condition through habit.
τὸ μὲν οὖν ἔχειν ἕκαστα τούτων [1149a] ἔξω τῶν ὅρων ἐστὶ τῆς κακίας, καθάπερ καὶ ἡ θηριότης· τὸν δ' ἔχοντα κρατεῖν ἢ κρατεῖσθαι οὐχ ἡ ἁπλῆ ἀκρασία ἀλλ' ἡ καθ' ὁμοιότητα, καθάπερ καὶ τὸν περὶ τοὺς θυμοὺς ἔχοντα τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον τοῦ πάθους, ἀκρατῆ δ' οὐ λεκτέον. πᾶσα γὰρ ὑπερβάλλουσα καὶ ἀφροσύνη καὶ δειλία καὶ ἀκολασία καὶ χαλεπότης αἳ μὲν θηριώδεις αἳ δὲ νοσηματώδεις εἰσίν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ φύσει τοιοῦτος οἷος	Having any of these, then, [1149a] lies outside the limits of vice, as brutishness does too. And when the person who has them masters them or is mastered by them, this is not lack of self-control without qualification but lack of self-control by resemblance—just as someone in this condition with regard to anger should be called uncontrolled in respect of that feeling, but not simply uncontrolled.

6 Phalaris, tyrant of Acragas in Sicily in the sixth century BC, was proverbial for cruelty; he was said to roast his victims alive in a bronze bull.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	δεδιέναι πάντα, κἂν ψοφήσῃ μῦς, θηριώδη δειλίαν δειλός, ὁ δὲ τὴν γαλῆν ἐδεδίει διὰ νόσον· καὶ τῶν ἀφρόνων οἱ μὲν ἐκ φύσεως ἀλόγιστοι καὶ μόνον τῇ αἰσθήσει ζῶντες θηριώδεις, ὥσπερ ἔνια γένη τῶν πόρρω βαρβάρων, οἱ δὲ διὰ νόσους, οἷον τὰς ἐπιληπτικάς, ἢ μανίας νοσηματώδεις.	For every excessive state, whether of folly, cowardice, self-indulgence, or bad temper, is either brutish or diseased. Someone who is by nature the sort to fear everything, even the squeak of a mouse, is cowardly with a brutish cowardice, whereas the man who was afraid of the weasel was so through disease. And among the foolish, those who are by nature unreasoning and live by perception alone are brutish, like some races of distant foreigners, while those who are so through diseases, such as epilepsy, or through madness, are diseased.
1149a	τούτων δ' ἔστι μὲν ἔχειν τινὰ ἐνίοτε μὲν μόνον, μὴ κρατεῖσθαι δέ, λέγω δὲ οἷον εἰ Φάλαρις κατεῖχεν ἐπιθυμῶν παιδίου φαγεῖν ἢ πρὸς ἀφροδισίων ἄτοπον ἡδονήν· ἔστι δὲ καὶ κρατεῖσθαι, μὴ μόνον ἔχειν· ὥσπερ οὖν καὶ μοχθηρίας ἡ μὲν κατ' ἄνθρωπον ἁπλῶς λέγεται μοχθηρία, ἢ δὲ κατὰ πρόσθεσιν, ὅτι θηριώδης ἢ νοσηματώδης, ἁπλῶς δ' οὔ, τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον δῆλον ὅτι καὶ ἀκρασία ἐστὶν ἡ μὲν θηριώδης ἡ δὲ νοσηματώδης, ἁπλῶς δὲ ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἀκολασίαν μόνη.	It is possible to have one of these sometimes without being mastered by it—I mean, for example, if Phalaris had restrained himself when he had an appetite to eat a child, or for some bizarre sexual pleasure—and it is also possible to be mastered, not merely to have it. So just as with wickedness, the kind on a human scale is called wickedness without qualification, while the other kind is called wickedness with an addition—brutish or diseased—and not without qualification, in the same way it is clear that lack of self-control too is sometimes brutish and sometimes diseased, and only the kind that corresponds to human self-indulgence is lack of self-control without qualification.
	ὅτι μὲν οὖν ἀκρασία καὶ ἐγκράτειά ἐστι μόνον περὶ ἅπερ ἀκολασία καὶ σωφροσύνη, καὶ ὅτι περὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἐστὶν ἄλλο εἶδος ἀκρασίας, λεγόμενον κατὰ μεταφορὰν καὶ οὐχ ἁπλῶς, δῆλον.	It is clear, then, that lack of self-control and self-control are concerned only with the same things as self-indulgence and moderation, and that concerning other things there is another kind of lack of self-control, so called by metaphor and not without qualification.

ANGER AND APPETITE

Aristotle argues that lack of control over anger is less shameful than over appetite.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἧττον αἰσχρὰ ἀκρασία ἡ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἢ ἡ τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν, θεωρήσωμεν. ἔοικε γὰρ ὁ θυμὸς ἀκούειν μέν τι τοῦ λόγου, παρακούειν δέ, καθάπερ οἱ ταχεῖς τῶν διακόνων, οἳ πρὶν ἀκοῦσαι πᾶν τὸ λεγόμενον ἐκθέουσιν, εἶτα ἁμαρτάνουσι τῆς προστάξεως, καὶ οἱ κύνες, πρὶν σκέψασθαι εἰ φίλος, ἂν μόνον ψοφήσῃ, ὑλακτοῦσιν· οὕτως ὁ θυμὸς διὰ θερμότητα καὶ ταχυτῆτα τῆς φύσεως ἀκούσας μέν, οὐκ ἐπίταγμα δ' ἀκούσας, ὁρμᾷ πρὸς τὴν τιμωρίαν. ὁ μὲν γὰρ λόγος ἢ ἡ φαντασία ὅτι ὕβρις ἢ ὀλιγωρία ἐδήλωσεν, ὃ δ' ὥσπερ συλλογισάμενος ὅτι δεῖ τῷ τοιούτῳ πολεμεῖν χαλεπαίνει δὴ εὐθύς· ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία,	Let us now observe that lack of self-control about anger is also less shameful than lack of self-control about appetites. For anger seems to hear reason to some extent, but to mishear it, like hasty servants who dash off before they've heard everything that's said and then get the order wrong, or like dogs that bark at a mere knock before checking whether it's a friend. In the same way anger, because of the heat and haste of its nature, hears, but doesn't hear the instruction, and

GREEK

ἐὰν μόνον εἴπῃ ὅτι ἠδὺ ὁ λόγος ἢ ἡ αἴσθησις, ὁρμᾷ πρὸς τὴν ἀπόλαυσιν. 1149b ὥσθ' ὁ μὲν θυμὸς ἀκολουθεῖ τῷ λόγῳ πως, ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία οὔ.

1149b αἰσχίων οὖν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τοῦ θυμοῦ ἀκρατὴς τοῦ λόγου πως ἡττᾶται, ὃ δὲ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας καὶ οὐ τοῦ λόγου. ἔτι ταῖς φυσικαῖς μᾶλλον συγγνώμη ἀκολουθεῖν ὀρέξεσιν, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἐπιθυμίαις ταῖς τοιαύταις μᾶλλον ὅσαι κοιναὶ πᾶσι, καὶ ἐφ' ὅσον κοιναί· ὁ δὲ θυμὸς φυσικώτερον καὶ ἡ χαλεπότης τῶν ἐπιθυμιῶν τῶν τῆς ὑπερβολῆς καὶ τῶν μὴ ἀναγκαίων, ὥσπερ ὁ ἀπολογούμενος ὅτι τὸν πατέρα τύπτοι καὶ γὰρ οὗτος ἔφη τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κἀκεῖνος τὸν ἄνωθεν,καὶ τὸ παιδίον δείξας καὶ οὗτος ἐμέ ἔφη, ὅταν ἀνὴρ γένηται· συγγενὲς γὰρ ἡμῖν· καὶ ὁ ἑλκόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ υἱοῦ παύεσθαι ἐκέλευε πρὸς ταῖς θύραις· καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἑλκύσαι τὸν πατέρα μέχρις ἐνταῦθα. ἔτι ἀδικώτεροι οἱ ἐπιβουλότεροι.

ὁ μὲν οὖν θυμώδης οὐκ ἐπίβουλος, οὐδ' ὁ θυμός, ἀλλὰ φανερός· ἡ δ' ἐπιθυμία, καθάπερ τὴν Ἀφροδίτην φασίν· δολοπλόκου γὰρ κυπρογενοῦς· καὶ τὸν κεστὸν ἱμάντα Ὅμηρος· πάρφασις, ἥ τ' ἔκλεψε νόον πύκα περ φρονέοντος. ὥστ' εἴπερ ἀδικωτέρα καὶ αἰσχίων ἡ ἀκρασία αὕτη τῆς περὶ τὸν θυμόν ἐστι, καὶ ἁπλῶς ἀκρασία καὶ κακία πως. ἔτι οὐδεὶς ὑβρίζει λυπούμενος, ὁ δ' ὀργῇ ποιῶν πᾶς ποιεῖ λυπούμενος, ὁ δ' ὑβρίζων μεθ' ἡδονῆς. εἰ οὖν οἷς ὀργίζεσθαι μάλιστα δίκαιον, ταῦτα ἀδικώτερα, καὶ ἡ ἀκρασία ἡ δι' ἐπιθυμίαν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐν θυμῷ ὕβρις. ὡς μὲν τοίνυν αἰσχίων ἡ περὶ ἐπιθυμίας ἀκρασία τῆς περὶ τὸν θυμόν, καὶ ὅτι ἔστιν ἐγκράτεια καὶ ἡ ἀκρασία περὶ ἐπιθυμίας καὶ ἡδονὰς σωματικάς, δῆλον· αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων τὰς διαφορὰς ληπτέον.

ENGLISH

rushes off to take revenge. For reason or appearance has indicated that there has been an insult or a slight, and anger, as though it had reasoned that one must go to war against anything like that, immediately flares up. Appetite, on the other hand, rushes off to enjoy something if reason or perception merely says it is pleasant. 1149b So anger follows reason in a way, but appetite does not.

So lack of self-control about appetite is more shameful. For the person who is uncontrolled about anger is in a way overcome by reason, whereas the other is overcome by appetite and not by reason. Again, we are more ready to forgive people for following natural desires, since we are more forgiving even of appetites when they are the sort common to everyone, and to the extent that they are common. And anger and bad temper are more natural than the appetites for excess and for what is not necessary. Take the man who defended himself for beating his father by saying, "He beat his own father too, and his father beat his"; and pointing to his little boy, he said, "And he'll beat me when he grows up: it runs in our family." Or the man being dragged along by his son who told him to stop at the front door, since he himself had dragged his own father only that far. Again, those who are more given to scheming are more unjust.

Now the angry person is not given to scheming, and neither is anger: it is open. But appetite is like what they say of Aphrodite, "guile-weaving, Cyprus-born," and what Homer says of her embroidered girdle: "beguiling talk, which steals the wits even of the very shrewd." So if this lack of self-control is more unjust and more shameful than the one concerned with anger, it is lack of self-control without qualification, and in a way a vice. Again, no one commits outrage while feeling pain; but everyone who acts in anger acts while feeling pain, whereas the one who commits outrage does so with pleasure. So if the acts that it is most just to be angry at are more unjust, then lack of self-control due to appetite is more unjust too; for there is no outrage in anger. It is clear, then, that lack of self-control about appetites is more shameful than lack of self-control about anger, and that self-control and lack of self-control are concerned with bodily appetites and pleasures.

GREEK

ENGLISH

But we must grasp the differences among these very appetites and pleasures.

ὥσπερ γὰρ εἴρηται κατ' ἀρχάς, αἳ μὲν ἀνθρώπιναί εἰσι καὶ φυσικαὶ καὶ τῷ γένει καὶ τῷ μεγέθει, αἳ δὲ θηριώδεις, αἳ δὲ διὰ πηρώσεις καὶ νοσήματα. τούτων δὲ περὶ τὰς πρώτας σωφροσύνη καὶ ἀκολασία μόνον ἐστίν· διὸ καὶ τὰ θηρία οὔτε σώφρονα οὔτ' ἀκόλαστα λέγομεν ἀλλ' ἢ κατὰ μεταφορὰν καὶ εἴ τινι ὅλως ἄλλο πρὸς ἄλλο διαφέρει γένος τῶν ζῴων ὕβρει καὶ σιναμωρίᾳ καὶ τῷ παμφάγον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἔχει προαίρεσιν οὐδὲ λογισμόν, ἀλλ' ἐξέστηκε τῆς φύσεως, ὥσπερ οἱ μαινόμενοι τῶν ἀνθρώπων. 1150a ἔλαττον δὲ θηριότης κακίας, φοβερώτερον δέ· οὐ γὰρ διέφθαρται τὸ βέλτιον, ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἔχει. ὅμοιον οὖν ὥσπερ ἄψυχον συμβάλλειν πρὸς ἔμψυχον, πότερον κάκιον· ἀσινεστέρα γὰρ ἡ φαυλότης ἀεὶ ἡ τοῦ μὴ ἔχοντος ἀρχήν, ὁ δὲ νοῦς ἀρχή.

For as was said at the beginning, some are human and natural, both in kind and in magnitude; others are brutish; and others are due to deformities and diseases. Of these, moderation and self-indulgence are concerned only with the first. That is why we don't call animals moderate or self-indulgent, except by metaphor, and only if one kind of animal differs from another as a whole in wantonness, destructiveness, and voracity. For they have neither decision nor reasoning; they have departed from nature, like madmen among human beings. 1150a Bestiality is a lesser thing than vice, though more frightening; for the better part has not been corrupted, as it is in a human being—the animal simply doesn't have it. So it is like comparing something inanimate with something animate and asking which is worse: the badness of something that has no originating principle is always less harmful, and intellect is an originating principle.

1150a παραπλήσιον οὖν τὸ συμβάλλειν ἀδικίαν πρὸς ἄνθρωπον ἄδικον. ἔστι γὰρ ὡς ἑκάτερον κάκιον· μυριοπλάσια γὰρ ἂν κακὰ ποιήσειεν ἄνθρωπος κακὸς θηρίου.

So it is similar to comparing injustice with an unjust human being: in a way each is worse. For a bad human being could do ten thousand times as much harm as a beast.

περὶ δὲ τὰς δι' ἁφῆς καὶ γεύσεως ἡδονὰς καὶ λύπας καὶ ἐπιθυμίας καὶ φυγάς, περὶ ἃς ἥ τε ἀκολασία καὶ ἡ σωφροσύνη διωρίσθη πρότερον, ἔστι μὲν οὕτως ἔχειν ὥστε ἡττᾶσθαι καὶ ὧν οἱ πολλοὶ κρείττους, ἔστι δὲ κρατεῖν καὶ ὧν οἱ πολλοὶ ἥττους· τούτων δ' ὁ μὲν περὶ ἡδονὰς ἀκρατὴς ὁ δ' ἐγκρατής, ὁ δὲ περὶ λύπας μαλακὸς ὁ δὲ καρτερικός. μεταξὺ δ' ἡ τῶν πλείστων ἕξις, κἂν εἰ ῥέπουσι μᾶλλον πρὸς τὰς χείρους.

With regard to the pleasures and pains, and the appetites and aversions, that come through touch and taste—the sphere in which self-indulgence and moderation were marked off earlier—it is possible to be in such a state as to be overcome even by those that most people master, and it is also possible to master even those by which most people are overcome. Of these, the one who is like this about pleasures is uncontrolled or self-controlled, and the one who is like this about pains is soft or enduring. The state of most people lies in between, even if they lean more toward the worse states.

ἐπεὶ δ' ἔνιαι τῶν ἡδονῶν ἀναγκαῖαί εἰσιν αἳ δ' οὔ, καὶ μέχρι τινός, αἱ δ' ὑπερβολαὶ οὔ, οὐδ' αἱ ἐλλείψεις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ ἐπιθυμίας ἔχει καὶ λύπας, ὁ μὲν τὰς ὑπερβολὰς διώκων τῶν ἡδέων †ἢ καθ' ὑπερβολὰς† ἢ διὰ προαίρεσιν, δι' αὐτὰς καὶ μηδὲν δι' ἕτερον ἀποβαῖνον, ἀκόλαστος· ἀνάγκη γὰρ τοῦτον μὴ εἶναι μεταμελητικόν, ὥστ' ἀνίατος· ὁ γὰρ ἀμεταμέλητος ἀνίατος. ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων ὁ ἀντικείμενος, ὁ δὲ μέσος σώφρων. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ φεύγων τὰς σωματικὰς λύπας μὴ δι' ἧτταν ἀλλὰ διὰ

Some pleasures are necessary and others are not, and the necessary ones are so up to a point, while their excesses are not, and neither are their deficiencies; and the same holds for appetites and pains. So the person who pursues the excesses of pleasant things, or pursues them to excess, and does so by decision, for their own sake and not at all for some further result, is self-indulgent. Such a person is bound to have no regrets, and so is in-

GREEK

προαίρεσιν. τῶν δὲ μὴ προαιρουμένων ὃ μὲν ἄγεται διὰ τὴν ἡδονήν, ὃ δὲ διὰ τὸ φεύγειν τὴν λύπην τὴν ἀπὸ τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ὥστε διαφέρουσιν ἀλλήλων.

παντὶ δ' ἂν δόξειε χείρων εἶναι, εἴ τις μὴ ἐπιθυμῶν ἢ ἠρέμα πράττοι τι αἰσχρόν, ἢ εἰ σφόδρα ἐπιθυμῶν, καὶ εἰ μὴ ὀργιζόμενος τύπτοι ἢ εἰ ὀργιζόμενος· τί γὰρ ἂν ἐποίει ἐν πάθει ὤν; διὸ ὁ ἀκόλαστος χείρων τοῦ ἀκρατοῦς. τῶν δὴ λεχθέντων τὸ μὲν μαλακίας εἶδος μᾶλλον, ὃ δ' ἀκόλαστος. ἀντίκειται δὲ τῷ μὲν ἀκρατεῖ ὁ ἐγκρατής, τῷ δὲ μαλακῷ ὁ καρτερικός· τὸ μὲν γὰρ καρτερεῖν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἀντέχειν, ἡ δ' ἐγκράτεια ἐν τῷ κρατεῖν, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ ἀντέχειν καὶ κρατεῖν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ μὴ ἡττᾶσθαι τοῦ νικᾶν· διὸ καὶ αἱρετώτερον ἐγκράτεια καρτερίας ἐστίν.

1150b ὁ δ' ἐλλείπων πρὸς ἃ οἱ πολλοὶ καὶ ἀντιτείνουσι καὶ δύνανται, οὗτος μαλακὸς καὶ τρυφῶν· καὶ γὰρ ἡ τρυφὴ μαλακία τίς ἐστιν· ὃς ἕλκει τὸ ἱμάτιον, ἵνα μὴ πονήσῃ τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ αἴρειν λύπην, καὶ μιμούμενος τὸν κάμνοντα οὐκ οἴεται ἄθλιος εἶναι, ἀθλίῳ ὅμοιος ὤν. ὁμοίως δ' ἔχει καὶ περὶ ἐγκράτειαν καὶ ἀκρασίαν.

οὐ γὰρ εἴ τις ἰσχυρῶν καὶ ὑπερβαλλουσῶν ἡδονῶν ἡττᾶται ἢ λυπῶν, θαυμαστόν, ἀλλὰ συγγνωμονικὸν εἰ ἀντιτείνων, ὥσπερ ὁ Θεοδέκτου Φιλοκτήτης ὑπὸ τοῦ ἕχεως πεπληγμένος ἢ ὁ Καρκίνου ἐν τῇ Ἀλόπῃ Κερκύων, καὶ ὥσπερ οἱ κατέχειν πειρώμενοι τὸν γέλωτα ἀθρόον ἐκκαγχάζουσιν, οἷον συνέπεσε Ξενοφάντῳ· ἀλλ' εἴ τις πρὸς ἃς οἱ πολλοὶ δύνανται ἀντέχειν, τούτων ἡττᾶται καὶ μὴ δύναται ἀντιτείνειν, μὴ διὰ φύσιν τοῦ γένους ἢ διὰ νόσον, οἷον ἐν τοῖς Σκυθῶν βασιλεῦσιν ἡ μαλακία διὰ τὸ γένος, καὶ ὡς τὸ θῆλυ πρὸς τὸ ἄρρεν διέστηκεν. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ ὁ παιδιώδης ἀκόλαστος εἶναι, ἔστι δὲ μαλακός. ἡ γὰρ παιδιὰ ἄνεσίς ἐστιν, εἴπερ ἀνάπαυσις· τῶν δὲ πρὸς ταύτην ὑπερβαλλόντων ὁ παιδιώδης ἐστίν. ἀκρασίας δὲ τὸ μὲν προπέτεια τὸ δ' ἀσθένεια.

ENGLISH

curable, since someone without regret is incurable. The person who falls short is his opposite, and the one in the middle is moderate. The same holds for the person who avoids bodily pains not because he is overcome but by decision. Of those who don't act by decision, one is led on by pleasure, the other by the wish to avoid the pain that comes from appetite; so they differ from each other.

Everyone would think a person worse if he did something shameful while feeling no appetite, or only a mild one, than if he did it with intense appetite; and worse if he struck someone without being angry than if he did it in anger. For what would he have done in the grip of feeling? That is why the self-indulgent person is worse than the uncontrolled one. Of the types just mentioned, then, the one is more a form of softness, while the other is the self-indulgent person. The self-controlled person is opposed to the uncontrolled, and the enduring to the soft. For endurance consists in holding out, while self-control consists in mastering, and holding out is different from mastering, just as not being beaten is different from winning. That is why self-control is also more choiceworthy than endurance.

The person who falls short with regard to what most people resist and are able to withstand is soft and pampered—for being pampered is a kind of softness. He lets his cloak trail so as not to suffer the effort of lifting it, and though he imitates an invalid, he doesn't think himself miserable, even though he resembles someone miserable. It is similar with self-control and lack of self-control.

For it's not surprising if someone is overcome by strong and excessive pleasures or pains; it is forgivable if he puts up resistance, like Philoctetes in Theodectes' play when bitten by the viper, or Carcinus' Cercyon in the *Alope*, or like people trying to hold back their laughter who burst out in a guffaw, as happened to Xenophantus. What is surprising is if someone is overcome by pleasures and pains that most people can hold out against, and is unable to resist them—when this is not due to the nature of his stock, or to disease, as softness runs in the family among the Scythian kings, or as the female differs from the male. The person fond of amusement also seems to be self-indulgent, but he is really soft. For amusement is a relaxation, since

GREEK	ENGLISH
	it is a rest, and the person fond of amusement is one of those who go to excess in this. Of lack of self-control, one form is impetuosity, the other weakness.[7]
οἳ μὲν γὰρ βουλευσάμενοι οὐκ ἐμμένουσιν οἷς ἐβουλεύσαντο διὰ τὸ πάθος, οἳ δὲ διὰ τὸ μὴ βουλεύσασθαι ἄγονται ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους· ἔνιοι γάρ, ὥσπερ προγαργαλίσαντες οὐ γαργαλίζονται, οὕτω καὶ προαισθόμενοι καὶ προϊδόντες καὶ προεγείραντες ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὸν λογισμὸν οὐχ ἡττῶνται ὑπὸ τοῦ πάθους, οὔτ' ἂν ἡδὺ ᾖ οὔτ' ἂν λυπηρόν. μάλιστα δ' οἱ ὀξεῖς καὶ μελαγχολικοὶ τὴν προπετῆ ἀκρασίαν εἰσὶν ἀκρατεῖς· οἳ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τὴν ταχυτῆτα οἳ δὲ διὰ τὴν σφοδρότητα οὐκ ἀναμένουσι τὸν λόγον, διὰ τὸ ἀκολουθητικοὶ εἶναι τῇ φαντασίᾳ.	Some people deliberate but then, because of their feeling, don't stick to what they deliberated; others are led by their feeling because they haven't deliberated. For some people—just as those who tickle first don't get tickled—if they perceive and see it coming in advance, and rouse themselves and their reasoning beforehand, are not overcome by the feeling, whether it's something pleasant or something painful. It is especially the quick-tempered and the melancholic who are uncontrolled with the impetuous kind of lack of self-control: the former because of their haste, the latter because of their intensity, don't wait for reason, since they tend to follow appearances.[8]

WHY LACK OF SELF-CONTROL IS NOT VICE

Aristotle argues that lack of self-control differs from vice because it acts against one's decision.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἔστι δ' ὁ μὲν ἀκόλαστος, ὥσπερ ἐλέχθη, οὐ μεταμελητικός· ἐμμένει γὰρ τῇ προαιρέσει· ὁ δ' ἀκρατὴς μεταμελητικὸς πᾶς. διὸ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἠπορήσαμεν, οὕτω καὶ ἔχει, ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν ἀνίατος ὃ δ' ἰατός· ἔοικε γὰρ ἡ μὲν μοχθηρία τῶν νοσημάτων οἷον ὑδέρῳ καὶ φθίσει, ἡ δ' ἀκρασία τοῖς ἐπιληπτικοῖς· ἢ μὲν γὰρ συνεχὴς ἡ δ' οὐ συνεχὴς πονηρία. καὶ ὅλως δ' ἕτερον τὸ γένος ἀκρασίας καὶ κακίας· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κακία λανθάνει, ἡ δ' ἀκρασία οὐ λανθάνει. 1151a αὐτῶν δὲ τούτων βελτίους οἱ ἐκστατικοὶ ἢ οἱ τὸν λόγον ἔχοντες μέν, μὴ ἐμμένοντες δέ· ὑπ' ἐλάττονος γὰρ πάθους ἡττῶνται, καὶ οὐκ ἀπροβούλευτοι ὥσπερ ἅτεροι· ὅμοιος γὰρ ὁ ἀκρατής ἐστι τοῖς ταχὺ μεθυσκομένοις καὶ ὑπ' ὀλίγου οἴνου καὶ ἐλάττονος ἢ ὡς οἱ πολλοί.	The self-indulgent person, as was said, is not given to regret, since he abides by his decision; but every uncontrolled person is given to regret. So the situation is not as we posed it in raising the puzzle: rather, the one is incurable and the other curable. For wickedness resembles diseases like dropsy and consumption, while lack of self-control is like epilepsy: the one is a continuous badness, the other not continuous. And in general lack of self-control and vice are different in kind: vice goes unnoticed, while lack of self-control does not. 1151a Among these types themselves, those who get carried away are better than those who have reason but don't stick to it; for the latter are overcome by a lesser feeling, and not without prior deliberation, as the others are. For the uncontrolled person is like people who get drunk quickly, and on little wine, less than most people need.
1151a ὅτι μὲν οὖν κακία ἡ ἀκρασία οὐκ ἔστι, φανερόν (ἀλλὰ πῇ ἴσως)· τὸ μὲν γὰρ παρὰ προαίρεσιν τὸ δὲ κατὰ τὴν	It is evident, then, that lack of self-control is not a vice (though perhaps it is in a way). For the one is

7 Theodectes and Carcinus were tragic poets of the fourth century BC; in these lost plays Philoctetes cries out in the agony of his snakebite, and Cercyon breaks down over his daughter Alope's disgrace.
8 In Greek medicine the "melancholic" were those with an excess of black bile, thought to make people excitable and prone to intense impulses.

GREEK

προαίρεσίν ἐστιν· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ὅμοιόν γε κατὰ τὰς πράξεις, ὥσπερ τὸ Δημοδόκου εἰς Μιλησίους Μιλήσιοι ἀξύνετοι μὲν οὐκ εἰσίν, δρῶσιν δ' οἷάπερ ἀξύνετοι, καὶ οἱ ἀκρατεῖς ἄδικοι μὲν οὐκ εἰσίν, ἀδικήσουσι δέ.

ἐπεὶ δ' ὃ μὲν τοιοῦτος οἷος μὴ διὰ τὸ πεπεῖσθαι διώκειν τὰς καθ' ὑπερβολὴν καὶ παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον σωματικὰς ἡδονάς, ὃ δὲ πέπεισται διὰ τὸ τοιοῦτος εἶναι οἷος διώκειν αὐτάς, ἐκεῖνος μὲν οὖν εὐμετάπειστος, οὗτος δὲ οὔ· ἡ γὰρ ἀρετὴ καὶ μοχθηρία τὴν ἀρχὴν ἣ μὲν φθείρει ἣ δὲ σῴζει, ἐν δὲ ταῖς πράξεσι τὸ οὗ ἕνεκα ἀρχή, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς μαθηματικοῖς αἱ ὑποθέσεις· οὔτε δὴ ἐκεῖ ὁ λόγος διδασκαλικὸς τῶν ἀρχῶν οὔτε ἐνταῦθα, ἀλλ' ἀρετὴ ἢ φυσικὴ ἢ ἐθιστὴ τοῦ ὀρθοδοξεῖν περὶ τὴν ἀρχήν. σώφρων μὲν οὖν ὁ τοιοῦτος, ἀκόλαστος δ' ὁ ἐναντίος.

ἔστι δέ τις διὰ πάθος ἐκστατικὸς παρὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον, ὃν ὥστε μὲν μὴ πράττειν κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον κρατεῖ τὸ πάθος, ὥστε δ' εἶναι τοιοῦτον οἷον πεπεῖσθαι διώκειν ἀνέδην δεῖν τὰς τοιαύτας ἡδονὰς οὐ κρατεῖ· οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ἀκρατής, βελτίων ὢν τοῦ ἀκολάστου, οὐδὲ φαῦλος ἁπλῶς· σῴζεται γὰρ τὸ βέλτιστον, ἡ ἀρχή. ἄλλος δ' ἐναντίος, ὁ ἐμμενετικὸς καὶ οὐκ ἐκστατικὸς διά γε τὸ πάθος. φανερὸν δὴ ἐκ τούτων ὅτι ἣ μὲν σπουδαία ἕξις, ἣ δὲ φαύλη.

πότερον οὖν ἐγκρατής ἐστιν ὁ ὁποιῳοῦν λόγῳ καὶ ὁποιᾳοῦν προαιρέσει ἐμμένων ἢ ὁ τῇ ὀρθῇ, καὶ ἀκρατὴς δὲ ὁ ὁποιᾳοῦν μὴ ἐμμένων προαιρέσει καὶ ὁποιῳοῦν λόγῳ ἢ ὁ τῷ μὴ ψευδεῖ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ προαιρέσει τῇ ὀρθῇ, ὥσπερ ἠπορήθη πρότερον; ἢ κατὰ μὲν συμβεβηκὸς ὁποιᾳοῦν, καθ' αὐτὸ δὲ τῷ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ ὀρθῇ προαιρέσει ὃ μὲν ἐμμένει ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐμμένει; εἰ γάρ τις τοδὶ διὰ τοδὶ αἱρεῖται ἢ διώκει, [1151b] καθ' αὑτὸ μὲν τοῦτο διώκει καὶ αἱρεῖται, κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς δὲ τὸ πρότερον. ἁπλῶς δὲ λέγομεν τὸ καθ' αὑτό. ὥστε ἔστι μὲν ὡς ὁποιᾳοῦν δόξῃ ὃ μὲν ἐμμένει ὃ δ' ἐξίσταται, ἁπλῶς δὲ ὁ τῇ ἀληθεῖ.

ENGLISH

contrary to decision, the other in accordance with decision. Still, they are alike in their actions. As Demodocus said against the Milesians, "The Milesians aren't stupid, but they act just like the stupid"; so too the uncontrolled aren't unjust, but they will do wrong.[9]

The one is the sort of person to pursue bodily pleasures that are excessive and contrary to correct reason without being convinced he should; the other is convinced he should because he is the sort of person to pursue them. So the former is easily persuaded to change, while the latter is not. For excellence preserves the first principle and wickedness destroys it; and in actions, that for the sake of which we act is the first principle, as the hypotheses are in mathematics. Neither there nor here does argument teach the first principles; it is excellence, either natural or habituated, that teaches right belief about the first principle. Such a person, then, is moderate, and his opposite is self-indulgent.

But there is someone who, through feeling, gets carried away contrary to correct reason: feeling masters him so far that he doesn't act in accordance with correct reason, but not so far as to make him the sort of person who is convinced that he ought to pursue such pleasures without restraint. This is the uncontrolled person. He is better than the self-indulgent one, and not bad without qualification, since the best thing in him, the first principle, is preserved. Opposed to him is another person, who abides by it and is not carried away, at least not through feeling. It is evident from this, then, that the one state is excellent and the other bad.

Is the self-controlled person, then, the one who abides by any reason and any decision whatever, or the one who abides by the correct one? And is the uncontrolled person the one who fails to abide by any decision and any reason whatever, or the one who fails to abide by reason that isn't false and by the correct decision, as was asked earlier in raising the puzzle? Or is it any whatever incidentally, but in itself the true reason and the correct decision that the one abides by and the other doesn't? For if someone chooses or pursues one

9 Demodocus of Leros was a sixth-century BC poet known for barbed epigrams.

GREEK

ENGLISH

thing for the sake of another, [1151b] he pursues and chooses the second in itself, and the first incidentally. And by "without qualification" we mean "in itself." So in a sense it is any belief whatever that the one abides by and the other abandons, but without qualification it is the true one.

1151b εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἳ ἐμμενετικοὶ τῇ δόξῃ εἰσίν, οὓς καλοῦσιν ἰσχυρογνώμονας, οἱ δύσπειστοι καὶ οὐκ εὐμετάπειστοι· οἳ ὅμοιον μέν τι ἔχουσι τῷ ἐγκρατεῖ, ὥσπερ ὁ ἄσωτος τῷ ἐλευθερίῳ καὶ ὁ θρασὺς τῷ θαρραλέῳ, εἰσὶ δ' ἕτεροι κατὰ πολλά. ὃ μὲν γὰρ διὰ πάθος καὶ ἐπιθυμίαν οὐ μεταβάλλει ὁ ἐγκρατής, ἐπεὶ εὔπειστος, ὅταν τύχῃ, ἔσται ὁ ἐγκρατής· οἳ δὲ οὐχ ὑπὸ λόγου, ἐπεὶ ἐπιθυμίας γε λαμβάνουσι, καὶ ἄγονται πολλοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἡδονῶν. εἰσὶ δὲ ἰσχυρογνώμονες οἱ ἰδιογνώμονες καὶ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς καὶ οἱ ἄγροικοι, οἱ μὲν ἰδιογνώμονες δι' ἡδονὴν καὶ λύπην· χαίρουσι γὰρ νικῶντες ἐὰν μὴ μεταπείθωνται, καὶ λυποῦνται ἐὰν ἄκυρα τὰ αὐτῶν ᾖ ὥσπερ ψηφίσματα· ὥστε μᾶλλον τῷ ἀκρατεῖ ἐοίκασιν ἢ τῷ ἐγκρατεῖ.

There are some people who are prone to abide by their beliefs, whom people call stubborn: they are hard to persuade and not easily persuaded to change. They have something similar to the self-controlled person, as the prodigal has to the generous and the rash to the confident, but they differ in many respects. For it is feeling and appetite that the self-controlled person doesn't change for, since, when the occasion arises, he will be easily persuaded; whereas it is reason that these people don't change for, since they do take on appetites, and many of them are led by pleasures. The stubborn include the opinionated, the ignorant, and the boorish. The opinionated are so because of pleasure and pain: they enjoy winning if they aren't persuaded to change, and are pained if their views are annulled, like decrees. So they resemble the uncontrolled person more than the self-controlled.

εἰσὶ δέ τινες οἳ τοῖς δόξασιν οὐκ ἐμμένουσιν οὐ δι' ἀκρασίαν, οἷον ἐν τῷ Φιλοκτήτῃ τῷ Σοφοκλέους ὁ Νεοπτόλεμος· καίτοι δι' ἡδονὴν οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν, ἀλλὰ καλήν· τὸ γὰρ ἀληθεύειν αὐτῷ καλὸν ἦν, ἐπείσθη δ' ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀδυσσέως ψεύδεσθαι. οὐ γὰρ πᾶς ὁ δι' ἡδονήν τι πράττων οὔτ' ἀκόλαστος οὔτε φαῦλος οὔτ' ἀκρατής, ἀλλ' ὁ δι' αἰσχράν.

There are some who don't abide by their beliefs, but not through lack of self-control—for example, Neoptolemus in Sophocles' *Philoctetes*. It was, admittedly, because of pleasure that he didn't abide by his belief, but a fine pleasure: telling the truth was fine in his eyes, and he had been persuaded by Odysseus to lie. For not everyone who does something because of pleasure is self-indulgent, or bad, or uncontrolled; only the one who does it because of a shameful pleasure.

ἐπεὶ δ' ἔστι τις καὶ τοιοῦτος οἷος ἧττον ἢ δεῖ τοῖς σωματικοῖς χαίρειν, καὶ οὐκ ἐμμένων τῷ λόγῳ, ὁ τοιοῦτος τούτου καὶ τοῦ ἀκρατοῦς μέσος ὁ ἐγκρατής· ὁ μὲν γὰρ ἀκρατὴς οὐκ ἐμμένει τῷ λόγῳ διὰ τὸ μᾶλλόν τι, οὗτος δὲ διὰ τὸ ἧττόν τι· ὁ δ' ἐγκρατὴς ἐμμένει καὶ οὐδὲ δι' ἕτερον μεταβάλλει. δεῖ δέ, εἴπερ ἡ ἐγκράτεια σπουδαῖον, ἀμφοτέρας τὰς ἐναντίας ἕξεις φαύλας εἶναι, ὥσπερ καὶ φαίνονται· ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ τὴν ἑτέραν ἐν ὀλίγοις καὶ ὀλιγάκις εἶναι φανεράν, ὥσπερ ἡ σωφροσύνη τῇ ἀκολασίᾳ δοκεῖ ἐναντίον εἶναι μόνον, οὕτω καὶ ἡ ἐγκράτεια τῇ ἀκρασίᾳ.

Since there is also the sort of person who enjoys bodily things less than he should, and so fails to abide by reason, the self-controlled person is intermediate between him and the uncontrolled person. For the uncontrolled person fails to abide by reason because of something too much, and this person because of something too little; while the self-controlled person abides by it and doesn't change for either reason. If self-control is something excellent, both the states opposed to it must be bad, as they also appear to be. But because the second is evident in few people and on few occasions, just as moderation seems to be opposed

GREEK

ENGLISH

only to self-indulgence, so self-control seems to be opposed only to lack of self-control.

ἐπεὶ δὲ καθ' ὁμοιότητα πολλὰ λέγεται, καὶ ἡ ἐγκράτεια ἡ τοῦ σώφρονος καθ' ὁμοιότητα ἠκολούθηκεν· ὅ τε γὰρ ἐγκρατὴς οἷος μηδὲν παρὰ τὸν λόγον διὰ τὰς σωματικὰς ἡδονὰς ποιεῖν καὶ ὁ σώφρων, [1152a] ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν ἔχων ὃ δ' οὐκ ἔχων φαύλας ἐπιθυμίας, καὶ ὃ μὲν τοιοῦτος οἷος μὴ ἥδεσθαι παρὰ τὸν λόγον, ὃ δ' οἷος ἥδεσθαι ἀλλὰ μὴ ἄγεσθαι. ὅμοιοι δὲ καὶ ὁ ἀκρατὴς καὶ ἀκόλαστος, ἕτεροι μὲν ὄντες, ἀμφότεροι δὲ τὰ σωματικὰ ἡδέα διώκουσιν, ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν καὶ οἰόμενος δεῖν, ὃ δ' οὐκ οἰόμενος.

Since many things are spoken of by resemblance, the "self-control" of the moderate person has also come to be spoken of by resemblance. For both the self-controlled person and the moderate one are the sort to do nothing contrary to reason because of bodily pleasures; [1152a] but the self-controlled person has bad appetites and the moderate one doesn't, and the moderate person is the sort not to feel pleasure contrary to reason, while the self-controlled one is the sort to feel it but not be led by it. The uncontrolled and the self-indulgent person are also alike: they are different, but both pursue bodily pleasures—the self-indulgent person thinking he should, the uncontrolled one not thinking so.

1152a οὐδ' ἅμα φρόνιμον καὶ ἀκρατῆ ἐνδέχεται εἶναι τὸν αὐτόν· ἅμα γὰρ φρόνιμος καὶ σπουδαῖος τὸ ἦθος δέδεικται ὤν. ἔτι οὐ τῷ εἰδέναι μόνον φρόνιμος ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ πρακτικός· ὁ δ' ἀκρατὴς οὐ πρακτικός —τὸν δὲ δεινὸν οὐδὲν κωλύει ἀκρατῆ εἶναι· διὸ καὶ δοκοῦσιν ἐνίοτε φρόνιμοι μὲν εἶναί τινες ἀκρατεῖς δέ, διὰ τὸ τὴν δεινότητα διαφέρειν τῆς φρονήσεως τὸν εἰρημένον τρόπον ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις λόγοις, καὶ κατὰ μὲν τὸν λόγον ἐγγὺς εἶναι, διαφέρειν δὲ κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν—οὐδὲ δὴ ὡς ὁ εἰδὼς καὶ θεωρῶν, ἀλλ' ὡς ὁ καθεύδων ἢ οἰνωμένος. καὶ ἑκὼν μέν (τρόπον γάρ τινα εἰδὼς καὶ ὃ ποιεῖ καὶ οὗ ἕνεκα), πονηρὸς δ' οὔ· ἡ γὰρ προαίρεσις ἐπιεικής· ὥσθ' ἡμιπόνηρος.

Nor can the same person be at once practically wise and uncontrolled; for it has been shown that someone practically wise is at the same time excellent in character. Besides, one is practically wise not only by knowing but by acting on what one knows, and the uncontrolled person doesn't act on it. (Nothing prevents a clever person, however, from being uncontrolled. That is why some people sometimes seem to be practically wise but uncontrolled: because cleverness differs from practical wisdom in the way described in our earlier discussion, and the two are close as regards reason but differ as regards decision.) Nor, then, is the uncontrolled person like someone who knows and is contemplating, but like someone asleep or drunk. He acts voluntarily (for in a way he knows both what he is doing and for the sake of what), but he is not wicked, since his decision is decent; so he is half-wicked.

καὶ οὐκ ἄδικος· οὐ γὰρ ἐπίβουλος· ὃ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῶν οὐκ ἐμμενετικὸς οἷς ἂν βουλεύσηται, ὃ δὲ μελαγχολικὸς οὐδὲ βουλευτικὸς ὅλως. καὶ ἔοικε δὴ ὁ ἀκρατὴς πόλει ἣ ψηφίζεται μὲν ἅπαντα τὰ δέοντα καὶ νόμους ἔχει σπουδαίους, χρῆται δὲ οὐδέν, ὥσπερ Ἀναξανδρίδης ἔσκωψεν ἡ πόλις ἐβούλεθ', ᾗ νόμων οὐδὲν μέλει· ὁ δὲ πονηρὸς χρωμένῃ μὲν τοῖς νόμοις, πονηροῖς δὲ χρωμένῃ. ἔστι δ' ἀκρασία καὶ ἐγκράτεια περὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς τῶν πολλῶν ἕξεως· ὃ μὲν γὰρ ἐμμένει μᾶλλον ὃ δ' ἧττον τῆς τῶν πλείστων δυνάμεως.

And he isn't unjust, since he isn't a schemer: one kind of uncontrolled person doesn't abide by what he has deliberated, while the melancholic kind doesn't deliberate at all. The uncontrolled person, then, is like a city that passes all the right decrees and has excellent laws but makes no use of them, as Anaxandrides joked: "The city willed it, the one that cares nothing for its laws." The wicked person, by contrast, is like a city that does use its laws, but uses bad ones. Lack of self-control and self-control concern what goes beyond the state of most people: the self-controlled person abides by

GREEK	ENGLISH
	his reasoning more, and the uncontrolled person less, than most people are capable of.[10]
εὐιατοτέρα δὲ τῶν ἀκρασιῶν, ἣν οἱ μελαγχολικοὶ ἀκρατεύονται, τῶν βουλευομένων μὲν μὴ ἐμμενόντων δέ, καὶ οἱ δι' ἐθισμοῦ ἀκρατεῖς τῶν φυσικῶν· ῥᾷον γὰρ ἔθος μετακινῆσαι φύσεως· διὰ γὰρ τοῦτο καὶ τὸ ἔθος χαλεπόν, ὅτι τῇ φύσει ἔοικεν, ὥσπερ καὶ Εὔηνος λέγει φημὶ πολυχρόνιον μελέτην ἔμεναι, φίλε, καὶ δή ταύτην ἀνθρώποισι τελευτῶσαν φύσιν εἶναι. τί μὲν οὖν ἐστὶν ἐγκράτεια καὶ τί ἀκρασία καὶ τί καρτερία καὶ τί μαλακία, καὶ πῶς ἔχουσιν αἱ ἕξεις αὗται πρὸς ἀλλήλας, εἴρηται.	Of the kinds of lack of self-control, the kind the melancholic have is more easily cured than that of people who deliberate but don't abide by it; and those who are uncontrolled through habituation are more easily cured than those who are so by nature, since habit is easier to change than nature. Habit, too, is hard to change precisely because it resembles nature, as Evenus also says: "I say that habit is long practice, my friend, and that in the end it becomes nature for human beings." We have now said what self-control, lack of self-control, endurance, and softness are, and how these states are related to one another.[11]

PLEASURE

Aristotle answers arguments that pleasure is not good and argues that some pleasure may be the chief good.

GREEK	ENGLISH
1152b περὶ δὲ ἡδονῆς καὶ λύπης θεωρῆσαι τοῦ τὴν πολιτικὴν φιλοσοφοῦντος· οὗτος γὰρ τοῦ τέλους ἀρχιτέκτων, πρὸς ὃ βλέποντες ἕκαστον τὸ μὲν κακὸν τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν ἁπλῶς λέγομεν. ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐπισκέψασθαι περὶ αὐτῶν· τήν τε γὰρ ἀρετὴν καὶ τὴν κακίαν τὴν ἠθικὴν περὶ λύπας καὶ ἡδονὰς ἔθεμεν, καὶ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν οἱ πλεῖστοι μεθ' ἡδονῆς εἶναί φασιν· διὸ καὶ τὸν μακάριον ὠνομάκασιν ἀπὸ τοῦ χαίρειν. τοῖς μὲν οὖν δοκεῖ οὐδεμία ἡδονὴ εἶναι ἀγαθόν, οὔτε καθ' αὑτὸ οὔτε κατὰ συμβεβηκός· οὐ γὰρ εἶναι ταὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡδονήν· τοῖς δ' ἔνιαι μὲν εἶναι, αἱ δὲ πολλαὶ φαῦλαι. ἔτι δὲ τούτων τρίτον, εἰ καὶ πᾶσαι ἀγαθόν, ὅμως μὴ ἐνδέχεσθαι εἶναι τὸ ἄριστον ἡδονήν.	It belongs to the person who studies political philosophy to examine pleasure and pain; for he is the master-builder of the end by looking to which we call each thing bad or good without qualification. Besides, examining them is one of our necessary tasks. For we laid it down that excellence and vice of character are concerned with pains and pleasures, and most people say that happiness involves pleasure—which is also why they have derived the word for "blessed" from "enjoying." Now some people think that no pleasure is a good, either in itself or incidentally, since the good and pleasure are not the same thing. Others think that some pleasures are good but most are bad. And there is a third view besides these: that even if all pleasures are good, still the best thing cannot be pleasure.[12]
ὅλως μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἀγαθόν, ὅτι πᾶσα ἡδονὴ γένεσίς ἐστιν εἰς φύσιν αἰσθητή, οὐδεμία δὲ γένεσις συγγενὴς τοῖς τέλεσιν, οἷον οὐδεμία οἰκοδόμησις οἰκίᾳ. ἔτι ὁ σώφρων φεύγει τὰς ἡδονάς. ἔτι ὁ φρόνιμος τὸ ἄλυπον διώκει, οὐ τὸ ἡδύ. ἔτι ἐμπόδιον τῷ φρονεῖν αἱ ἡδοναί, καὶ ὅσῳ μᾶλλον χαίρει, μᾶλλον, οἷον τῇ τῶν ἀφροδισίων· οὐδένα γὰρ ἂν δύνασθαι νοῆσαί τι ἐν αὐτῇ. ἔτι τέχνη οὐδεμία ἡδονῆς· καίτοι πᾶν ἀγαθὸν τέχνης ἔργον. ἔτι παιδία καὶ	It is held not to be a good at all, then, because every pleasure is a perceptible process of coming to be toward a natural state, and no process of coming to be is of the same kind as its end, as no building process is of the same kind as a house. Again, the moderate person avoids pleasures. Again, the practically wise person pursues freedom from pain, not what is pleasant. Again, pleas-

10 Anaxandrides was a comic poet of the fourth century BC.
11 Evenus of Paros was a sophist and poet of the fifth century BC.
12 Aristotle alludes to a popular derivation of makarios, "blessed," from chairein, "to enjoy."

GREEK

θηρία διώκει τὰς ἡδονάς. τοῦ δὲ μὴ πάσας σπουδαίας, ὅτι εἰσὶ καὶ αἰσχραὶ καὶ ὀνειδιζόμεναι, καὶ ὅτι βλαβεραί· νοσώδη γὰρ ἔνια τῶν ἡδέων. ὅτι δ' οὐ τἄριστον ἡδονή, ὅτι οὐ τέλος ἀλλὰ γένεσις. τὰ μὲν οὖν λεγόμενα σχεδὸν ταῦτ' ἐστίν.

ὅτι δ' οὐ συμβαίνει διὰ ταῦτα μὴ εἶναι ἀγαθὸν μηδὲ τὸ ἄριστον, ἐκ τῶνδε δῆλον. πρῶτον μέν, ἐπεὶ τὸ ἀγαθὸν διχῶς (τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς τὸ δὲ τινί), καὶ αἱ φύσεις καὶ αἱ ἕξεις ἀκολουθήσουσιν, ὥστε καὶ αἱ κινήσεις καὶ αἱ γενέσεις, καὶ αἱ φαῦλαι δοκοῦσαι εἶναι αἳ μὲν ἁπλῶς φαῦλαι τινὶ δ' οὔ ἀλλ' αἱρεταὶ τῷδε, ἔνιαι δ' οὐδὲ τῷδε ἀλλὰ ποτὲ καὶ ὀλίγον χρόνον αἱρεταί, ἁπλῶς δ' οὔ· αἳ δ' οὐδ' ἡδοναί, ἀλλὰ φαίνονται, ὅσαι μετὰ λύπης καὶ ἰατρείας ἕνεκεν, οἷον αἱ τῶν καμνόντων.

ἔτι ἐπεὶ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ τὸ μὲν ἐνέργεια τὸ δ' ἕξις, κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς αἱ καθιστᾶσαι εἰς τὴν φυσικὴν ἕξιν ἡδεῖαί εἰσιν· ἔστι δ' ἡ ἐνέργεια ἐν ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις τῆς ὑπολοίπου ἕξεως καὶ φύσεως, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἄνευ λύπης καὶ ἐπιθυμίας εἰσὶν ἡδοναί, [1153a] οἷον αἱ τοῦ θεωρεῖν ἐνέργειαι, τῆς φύσεως οὐκ ἐνδεοῦς οὔσης. σημεῖον δ' ὅτι οὐ τῷ αὐτῷ ἡδεῖ χαίρουσιν ἀναπληρουμένης τε τῆς φύσεως καὶ καθεστηκυίας, ἀλλὰ καθεστηκυίας μὲν τοῖς ἁπλῶς ἡδέσιν, ἀναπληρουμένης δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐναντίοις· καὶ γὰρ ὀξέσι καὶ πικροῖς χαίρουσιν, ὧν οὐδὲν οὔτε φύσει ἡδὺ οὔθ' ἁπλῶς ἡδύ. ὥστ' οὐδ' ἡδοναί· ὡς γὰρ τὰ ἡδέα πρὸς ἄλληλα διέστηκεν, οὕτω καὶ αἱ ἡδοναὶ αἱ ἀπὸ τούτων.

ENGLISH

ures hinder thinking, and the more one enjoys them, the more they hinder it—sexual pleasure, for example, since no one could think anything while engaged in it. Again, there is no craft of pleasure; yet every good is the product of a craft. Again, children and animals pursue pleasures. That not all pleasures are excellent is argued from the fact that some are shameful and objects of reproach, and that some are harmful, since some pleasant things cause disease. That pleasure is not the best thing is argued from the fact that it is not an end but a process of coming to be. These, roughly, are the things people say.

But that these considerations don't show that pleasure is not a good, or not the best thing, is clear from the following. First, since the good is spoken of in two ways (one thing is good without qualification, another good for someone), natures and states will follow suit, and so therefore will movements and processes of coming to be. And of those that seem bad, some will be bad without qualification but not bad for a particular person, rather choiceworthy for him; some will not be choiceworthy even for him, except at certain times and for a short while, and not without qualification; and others are not even pleasures but only appear to be—those that involve pain and are for the sake of a cure, like the pleasures of sick people.

Again, since one aspect of the good is activity and another is state, the processes that restore us to our natural state are pleasant only incidentally. The activity in the appetites is the activity of the part of our state and nature that remains intact—since there are also pleasures without pain and appetite, [1153a] such as the activities of contemplating, when one's nature is not deficient in anything. A sign of this is that people don't enjoy the same pleasant thing while their nature is being replenished as when it is settled: when it is settled they enjoy things pleasant without qualification, but while it is being replenished they enjoy even the opposites—sharp and bitter things, none of which is pleasant either by nature or without qualification. So these are not pleasures without qualification either; for as pleasant things differ from one another, so do the pleasures that come from them.

1153a

GREEK

ἔτι οὐκ ἀνάγκη ἕτερόν τι εἶναι βέλτιον τῆς ἡδονῆς, ὥσπερ τινές φασι τὸ τέλος τῆς γενέσεως· οὐ γὰρ γενέσεις εἰσὶν οὐδὲ μετὰ γενέσεως πᾶσαι, ἀλλ' ἐνέργειαι καὶ τέλος· οὐδὲ γινομένων συμβαίνουσιν ἀλλὰ χρωμένων· καὶ τέλος οὐ πασῶν ἕτερόν τι, ἀλλὰ τῶν εἰς τὴν τελέωσιν ἀγομένων τῆς φύσεως. διὸ καὶ οὐ καλῶς ἔχει τὸ αἰσθητὴν γένεσιν φάναι εἶναι τὴν ἡδονήν, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον λεκτέον ἐνέργειαν τῆς κατὰ φύσιν ἕξεως, ἀντὶ δὲ τοῦ αἰσθητὴν ἀνεμπόδιστον. δοκεῖ δὲ γένεσίς τισιν εἶναι, ὅτι κυρίως ἀγαθόν· τὴν γὰρ ἐνέργειαν γένεσιν οἴονται εἶναι, ἔστι δ' ἕτερον. τὸ δ' εἶναι φαύλας ὅτι νοσώδη ἔνια ἡδέα, τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ ὅτι ὑγιεινὰ ἔνια φαῦλα πρὸς χρηματισμόν. ταύτῃ οὖν φαῦλα ἄμφω, ἀλλ' οὐ φαῦλα κατά γε τοῦτο, ἐπεὶ καὶ τὸ θεωρεῖν ποτὲ βλάπτει πρὸς ὑγίειαν.

ENGLISH

Again, it isn't necessary that something else be better than pleasure, in the way some say the end is better than the process of coming to be. For pleasures are not processes, and not all of them even involve a process; they are activities, and an end. They arise not when we are coming to be something but when we are using something; and not all of them have some end distinct from themselves, only those of people being brought to the completion of their nature. That is why it isn't right to say that pleasure is a perceptible process of coming to be; rather, it should be called an activity of the natural state, and instead of "perceptible," "unimpeded." Some people think it is a process of coming to be because it is good in the strict sense; for they think activity is a process of coming to be, but it is something different. To say pleasures are bad because some pleasant things cause disease is like saying healthy things are bad because some healthy things are bad for making money. Both are bad in this respect, but they are not bad on that account—after all, even contemplating is sometimes harmful to health.

ἐμποδίζει δὲ οὔτε φρονήσει οὔθ' ἕξει οὐδεμιᾷ ἡ ἀφ' ἑκάστης ἡδονή, ἀλλ' αἱ ἀλλότριαι, ἐπεὶ αἱ ἀπὸ τοῦ θεωρεῖν καὶ μανθάνειν μᾶλλον ποιήσουσι θεωρεῖν καὶ μανθάνειν. τὸ δὲ τέχνης μὴ εἶναι ἔργον ἡδονὴν μηδεμίαν εὐλόγως συμβέβηκεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἄλλης ἐνεργείας οὐδεμιᾶς τέχνη ἐστίν, ἀλλὰ τῆς δυνάμεως· καίτοι καὶ ἡ μυρεψικὴ τέχνη καὶ ἡ ὀψοποιητικὴ δοκεῖ ἡδονῆς εἶναι. τὸ δὲ τὸν σώφρονα φεύγειν καὶ τὸν φρόνιμον διώκειν τὸν ἄλυπον βίον, καὶ τὸ τὰ παιδία καὶ τὰ θηρία διώκειν, τῷ αὐτῷ λύεται πάντα.

Neither practical wisdom nor any other state is hindered by the pleasure that comes from it; only by alien pleasures. For the pleasures of contemplating and learning will make one contemplate and learn all the more. That no pleasure is the product of a craft is quite reasonable: there is no craft of any other activity either, only of the capacity for it—though the perfumer's craft and the cook's do seem to be crafts of pleasure. As for the arguments that the moderate person avoids pleasure, that the practically wise person pursues the painless life, and that children and animals pursue pleasure—they are all answered by the same point.

ἐπεὶ γὰρ εἴρηται πῶς ἀγαθαὶ ἁπλῶς καὶ πῶς οὐκ ἀγαθαὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ἡδοναί, τὰς τοιαύτας καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ παιδία διώκει, καὶ τὴν τούτων ἀλυπίαν ὁ φρόνιμος, τὰς μετ' ἐπιθυμίας καὶ λύπης, καὶ τὰς σωματικάς (τοιαῦται γὰρ αὗται) καὶ τὰς τούτων ὑπερβολάς, καθ' ἃς ὁ ἀκόλαστος ἀκόλαστος. διὸ ὁ σώφρων φεύγει ταύτας, ἐπεὶ εἰσὶν ἡδοναὶ καὶ σώφρονος.

For since we have said in what sense pleasures are good without qualification, and in what sense not all of them are good, it is pleasures of this latter sort that beasts and children pursue, and it is freedom from the pain of these that the practically wise person pursues: the pleasures that involve appetite and pain, that is, the bodily ones (for these are of that kind), and the excesses of these, in virtue of which the self-indulgent person is self-indulgent. That is why the moderate person avoids these; for the moderate person has pleasures too.

1153b

GREEK

ἀλλὰ μὴν ὅτι καὶ ἡ λύπη κακόν, ὁμολογεῖται, καὶ φευκτόν· ἢ μὲν γὰρ ἁπλῶς κακόν, ἢ δὲ τῷ πῇ ἐμποδιστική. τῷ δὲ φευκτῷ τὸ ἐναντίον ᾗ φευκτόν τι καὶ κακόν, ἀγαθόν. ἀνάγκη οὖν τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθόν τι εἶναι. ὡς γὰρ Σπεύσιππος ἔλυεν, οὐ συμβαίνει ἡ λύσις, ὥσπερ τὸ μεῖζον τῷ ἐλάττονι καὶ τῷ ἴσῳ ἐναντίον· οὐ γὰρ ἂν φαίη ὅπερ κακόν τι εἶναι τὴν ἡδονήν. τἄριστόν τ' οὐδὲν κωλύει ἡδονήν τινα εἶναι, εἰ ἔνιαι φαῦλαι ἡδοναί, ὥσπερ καὶ ἐπιστήμην τινὰ ἐνίων φαύλων οὐσῶν. ἴσως δὲ καὶ ἀναγκαῖον, εἴπερ ἑκάστης ἕξεώς εἰσιν ἐνέργειαι ἀνεμπόδιστοι, εἴθ' ἡ πασῶν ἐνέργειά ἐστιν εὐδαιμονία εἴτε ἡ τινὸς αὐτῶν, ἂν ᾗ ἀνεμπόδιστος, αἱρετωτάτην εἶναι· τοῦτο δ' ἐστὶν ἡδονή.

ὥστε εἴη ἄν τις ἡδονὴ τὸ ἄριστον, τῶν πολλῶν ἡδονῶν φαύλων οὐσῶν, εἰ ἔτυχεν, ἁπλῶς. καὶ διὰ τοῦτο πάντες τὸν εὐδαίμονα ἡδὺν οἴονται βίον εἶναι, καὶ ἐμπλέκουσι τὴν ἡδονὴν εἰς τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν, εὐλόγως· οὐδεμία γὰρ ἐνέργεια τέλειος ἐμποδιζομένη, ἡ δ' εὐδαιμονία τῶν τελείων· διὸ προσδεῖται ὁ εὐδαίμων τῶν ἐν σώματι ἀγαθῶν καὶ τῶν ἐκτὸς καὶ τῆς τύχης, ὅπως μὴ ἐμποδίζηται ταῦτα. οἱ δὲ τὸν τροχιζόμενον καὶ τὸν δυστυχίαις μεγάλαις περιπίπτοντα εὐδαίμονα φάσκοντες εἶναι, ἐὰν ᾖ ἀγαθός, ἢ ἑκόντες ἢ ἄκοντες οὐδὲν λέγουσιν. διὰ δὲ τὸ προσδεῖσθαι τῆς τύχης δοκεῖ τισὶ ταὐτὸν εἶναι ἡ εὐτυχία τῇ εὐδαιμονίᾳ, οὐκ οὖσα, ἐπεὶ καὶ αὐτὴ ὑπερβάλλουσα ἐμπόδιός ἐστιν, καὶ ἴσως οὐκέτι εὐτυχίαν καλεῖν δίκαιον· πρὸς γὰρ τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν ὁ ὅρος αὐτῆς.

καὶ τὸ διώκειν δ' ἅπαντα καὶ θηρία καὶ ἀνθρώπους τὴν ἡδονὴν σημεῖόν τι τοῦ εἶναί πως τὸ ἄριστον αὐτήν· φήμη δ' οὔτις πάμπαν ἀπόλλυται, ἥν τινα λαοί πολλοί ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ οὐχ ἡ αὐτὴ οὔτε φύσις οὔθ' ἕξις ἡ ἀρίστη οὔτ' ἔστιν οὔτε δοκεῖ, οὐδ' ἡδονὴν διώκουσι τὴν αὐτὴν πάντες, ἡδονὴν μέντοι πάντες. ἴσως δὲ καὶ διώκουσιν οὐχ ἣν οἴονται οὐδ' ἣν ἄν φαῖεν, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτήν· πάντα γὰρ φύσει ἔχει τι θεῖον. ἀλλ' εἰλήφασι τὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος κληρονομίαν αἱ σωματικαὶ ἡδοναὶ διὰ τὸ πλειστάκις τε παραβάλλειν εἰς

ENGLISH

Again, it is agreed that pain is bad and to be avoided. Some pain is bad without qualification; some is bad by being in some way an impediment. But the contrary of what is to be avoided, insofar as it is to be avoided and bad, is good. So pleasure must be some kind of good. For the way Speusippus tried to resolve this does not work—that pleasure is contrary both to pain and to the good, as the greater is contrary both to the smaller and to the equal. For he would not say that pleasure is essentially something bad. And nothing prevents the chief good from being some pleasure, even if some pleasures are bad, just as it might be some kind of scientific knowledge even though some kinds are bad. Perhaps it is even necessary. If each state has its unimpeded activities, then whether happiness is the activity of all of them or of some one of them, that activity, if it is unimpeded, must be the most choiceworthy thing; and this is pleasure.

So the chief good would be some pleasure, even though most pleasures may well be bad without qualification. And this is why everyone thinks the happy life is pleasant and weaves pleasure into happiness—reasonably enough. For no activity is complete when it is impeded, and happiness is something complete. That is why the happy person needs, in addition, the goods of the body, external goods and fortune, so as not to be impeded in these respects. Those who say that someone being broken on the wheel, or someone who falls into great misfortunes, is happy provided he is good are talking nonsense, whether they mean to or not. And because happiness needs fortune in addition, some people think good fortune is the same as happiness. But it isn't, since good fortune itself, when excessive, is an impediment—and then perhaps it is no longer right to call it good fortune, since its limit is defined by its relation to happiness.

And the fact that all creatures, beasts and humans alike, pursue pleasure is some sign that it is in a way the chief good: "No report is ever wholly lost that many peoples…" But since neither the same nature nor the same state is best for all, or seems so, they do not all pursue the same pleasure either—though they all pursue pleasure. Perhaps, too, they pursue not the pleasure they think they do, or would say they do, but the same one; for all things by nature have something divine in them.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	αὐτὰς καὶ πάντας μετέχειν αὐτῶν· διὰ τὸ μόνας οὖν γνωρίμους εἶναι ταύτας μόνας οἴονται εἶναι.	But the bodily pleasures have taken over the inheritance of the name, because we most often steer our course toward them and everyone shares in them. So because these are the only ones people know, they think these are the only ones there are.
1154a	φανερὸν δὲ καὶ ὅτι, εἰ μὴ ἡδονὴ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια, οὐκ ἔσται ζῆν ἡδέως τὸν εὐδαίμονα· τίνος γὰρ ἕνεκα δέοι ἂν αὐτῆς, εἴπερ μὴ ἀγαθόν, ἀλλὰ καὶ λυπηρῶς ἐνδέχεται ζῆν; οὔτε κακὸν γὰρ οὔτ' ἀγαθὸν ἡ λύπη, εἴπερ μηδ' ἡδονή· ὥστε διὰ τί ἂν φεύγοι; οὐδὲ δὴ ἡδίων ὁ βίος ὁ τοῦ σπουδαίου, εἰ μὴ καὶ αἱ ἐνέργειαι αὐτοῦ.	It is also clear that if pleasure is not a good and an activity, the happy person will not live pleasantly. For why would he need pleasure, if it is not a good and he can live painfully as well? For pain is neither bad nor good if pleasure is not; so why would he avoid it? Nor will the excellent person's life be any pleasanter, unless his activities are too.
	περὶ δὲ δὴ τῶν σωματικῶν ἡδονῶν ἐπισκεπτέον τοῖς λέγουσιν ὅτι ἔνιαί γε ἡδοναὶ αἱρεταὶ σφόδρα, οἷον αἱ καλαί, ἀλλ' οὐχ αἱ σωματικαὶ καὶ περὶ ἃς ὁ ἀκόλαστος. διὰ τί οὖν αἱ ἐναντίαι λῦπαι μοχθηραί; κακῷ γὰρ ἀγαθὸν ἐναντίον. ἢ οὕτως ἀγαθαὶ αἱ ἀναγκαῖαι, ὅτι καὶ τὸ μὴ κακὸν ἀγαθόν ἐστιν; ἢ μέχρι του ἀγαθαί; τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἕξεων καὶ κινήσεων ὅσων μὴ ἔστι τοῦ βελτίονος ὑπερβολή, οὐδὲ τῆς ἡδονῆς· ὅσων δ' ἔστι, καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς. ἔστιν δὲ τῶν σωματικῶν ἀγαθῶν ὑπερβολή, καὶ ὁ φαῦλος τῷ διώκειν τὴν ὑπερβολήν ἐστιν, ἀλλ' οὐ τὰς ἀναγκαίας· πάντες γὰρ χαίρουσί πως καὶ ὄψοις καὶ οἴνοις καὶ ἀφροδισίοις, ἀλλ' οὐχ ὡς δεῖ.	About the bodily pleasures, though, we must examine the view of those who say that some pleasures—the fine ones, for instance—are highly choiceworthy, but not the bodily ones and those the self-indulgent person is concerned with. Why, then, are the contrary pains bad? For the contrary of a bad thing is good. Or are the necessary pleasures good in the sense that what is not bad is good too? Or are they good up to a point? For with states and processes that admit of no excess of the better, there is no excess of the pleasure either; with those that do admit of it, there is excess of the pleasure too. Now there is such a thing as excess of bodily goods, and the bad person is bad by pursuing the excess, not the necessary pleasures. For everyone enjoys fine food, wine and sex in some way, but not everyone as they should.
	ἐναντίως δ' ἐπὶ τῆς λύπης· οὐ γὰρ τὴν ὑπερβολὴν φεύγει, ἀλλ' ὅλως· οὐ γάρ ἐστι τῇ ὑπερβολῇ λύπη ἐναντία ἀλλ' ἢ τῷ διώκοντι τὴν ὑπερβολήν.	With pain it is the other way round: the bad person avoids not the excessive pain but pain altogether. For the pain contrary to the excess exists only for the one who pursues the excess.
	ἐπεὶ δ' οὐ μόνον δεῖ τἀληθὲς εἰπεῖν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ αἴτιον τοῦ ψεύδους· τοῦτο γὰρ συμβάλλεται πρὸς τὴν πίστιν· ὅταν γὰρ εὔλογον φανῇ τὸ διὰ τί φαίνεται ἀληθὲς οὐκ ὂν ἀληθές, πιστεύειν ποιεῖ τῷ ἀληθεῖ μᾶλλον· ὥστε λεκτέον διὰ τί φαίνονται αἱ σωματικαὶ ἡδοναὶ αἱρετώτεραι. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν δὴ ὅτι ἐκκρούει τὴν λύπην· καὶ διὰ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς τῆς λύπης, ὡς οὔσης ἰατρείας, τὴν ἡδονὴν διώκουσι τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν καὶ ὅλως τὴν σωματικήν. σφοδραὶ δὲ γίνονται αἱ ἰατρεῖαι, διὸ καὶ διώκονται, διὰ τὸ παρὰ τὸ ἐναντίον φαίνεσθαι.	We must state not only the truth, however, but also the cause of the error; for this contributes to conviction. When a reasonable explanation appears of why something appears true that is not true, it makes us more convinced of the truth. So we must say why the bodily pleasures appear more choiceworthy. First, then, it is because they drive out pain; and because of the excesses of pain, people pursue excessive pleasure, and bodily pleasure in general, as a cure. And these cures are intense—which is why they are pursued—because they appear alongside their contrary.
	καὶ οὐ σπουδαῖον δὴ δοκεῖ ἡ ἡδονὴ διὰ δύο ταῦτα, ὥσπερ εἴρηται, ὅτι αἳ μὲν φαύλης φύσεώς εἰσι πράξεις (ἢ ἐκ γενετῆς, ὥσπερ θηρίου, ἢ δι' ἔθος, οἷον αἱ τῶν φαύλων	Pleasure is thought not to be a worthwhile thing for these two reasons, as has been said: some pleasures are actions of a bad nature (either bad

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἀνθρώπων), αἳ δ' ἰατρεῖαι ὅτι ἐνδεοῦς, καὶ ἔχειν βέλτιον ἢ γίνεσθαι· 1154b αἳ δὲ συμβαίνουσι τελεουμένων· κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς οὖν σπουδαῖαι. ἔτι διώκονται διὰ τὸ σφοδραὶ εἶναι ὑπὸ τῶν ἄλλαις μὴ δυναμένων χαίρειν· αὐτοὶ γοῦν αὑτοῖς δίψας τινὰς παρασκευάζουσιν. ὅταν μὲν οὖν ἀβλαβεῖς, ἀνεπιτίμητον, ὅταν δὲ βλαβεράς, φαῦλον. οὔτε γὰρ ἔχουσιν ἕτερα ἐφ' οἷς χαίρουσιν, τό τε μηδέτερον πολλοῖς λυπηρὸν διὰ τὴν φύσιν. ἀεὶ γὰρ πονεῖ τὸ ζῷον, ὥσπερ καὶ οἱ φυσιολόγοι μαρτυροῦσι, τὸ ὁρᾶν, τὸ ἀκούειν φάσκοντες εἶναι λυπηρόν· ἀλλ' ἤδη συνήθεις ἐσμέν, ὡς φασίν.

from birth, as a beast's is, or through habit, as with bad people); others are cures, because they belong to something in need, and being in a good condition is better than coming into it; 1154b and these cures arise while we are being brought to completion, so they are worthwhile only incidentally. Further, bodily pleasures are pursued because they are intense, by those who cannot enjoy other pleasures; at any rate, such people contrive thirsts of a sort for themselves. When these are harmless, this is beyond reproach; when harmful, it is bad. For they have nothing else to enjoy, and for many people the neutral state is painful because of their nature. For an animal is always under strain, as the natural scientists also testify when they say that seeing and hearing are painful; but by now we are used to it, as they say.

1154b ὁμοίως δ' ἐν μὲν τῇ νεότητι διὰ τὴν αὔξησιν ὥσπερ οἱ οἰνωμένοι διάκεινται, καὶ ἡδὺ ἡ νεότης. οἱ δὲ μελαγχολικοὶ τὴν φύσιν δέονται ἀεὶ ἰατρείας· καὶ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα δακνόμενον διατελεῖ διὰ τὴν κρᾶσιν, καὶ ἀεὶ ἐν ὀρέξει σφοδρᾷ εἰσίν· ἐξελαύνει δὲ ἡδονὴ λύπην ἥ τ' ἐναντία καὶ ἡ τυχοῦσα, ἐὰν ᾖ ἰσχυρά· καὶ διὰ ταῦτα ἀκόλαστοι καὶ φαῦλοι γίνονται. αἱ δ' ἄνευ λυπῶν οὐκ ἔχουσιν ὑπερβολήν· αὗται δὲ τῶν φύσει ἡδέων καὶ μὴ κατὰ συμβεβηκός. λέγω δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἡδέα τὰ ἰατρεύοντα· ὅτι γὰρ συμβαίνει ἰατρεύεσθαι τοῦ ὑπομένοντος ὑγιοῦς πράττοντός τι, διὰ τοῦτο ἡδὺ δοκεῖ εἶναι· φύσει δ' ἡδέα, ἃ ποιεῖ πρᾶξιν τῆς τοιᾶσδε φύσεως.

Similarly, in youth people are in a condition like that of the drunk because they are growing, and youth is pleasant. People of a melancholic nature, on the other hand, are always in need of a cure; for their body is continually being stung because of its mixture, and they are always in a state of intense desire. And pleasure drives out pain—both the pleasure contrary to it and any chance pleasure, if it is strong. That is why they become self-indulgent and bad. But pleasures without pains do not admit of excess; these are pleasures in things pleasant by nature, not incidentally. By things incidentally pleasant I mean those that cure; for it is because the cure comes about through the action of the part that remains healthy that the cure seems pleasant. Things pleasant by nature are those that produce action of a given nature.

οὐκ ἀεὶ δ' οὐθὲν ἡδὺ τὸ αὐτὸ διὰ τὸ μὴ ἁπλῆν ἡμῶν εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, ἀλλ' ἐνεῖναί τι καὶ ἕτερον, καθὸ φθαρτοί, ὥστε ἄν τι θάτερον πράττῃ, τοῦτο τῇ ἑτέρᾳ φύσει παρὰ φύσιν, ὅταν δ' ἰσάζῃ, οὔτε λυπηρὸν δοκεῖ οὔθ' ἡδὺ τὸ πραττόμενον· ἐπεὶ εἴ του ἡ φύσις ἁπλῆ εἴη, ἀεὶ ἡ αὐτὴ πρᾶξις ἡδίστη ἔσται. διὸ ὁ θεὸς ἀεὶ μίαν καὶ ἁπλῆν χαίρει ἡδονήν· οὐ γὰρ μόνον κινήσεώς ἐστιν ἐνέργεια ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκινησίας, καὶ ἡδονὴ μᾶλλον ἐν ἠρεμίᾳ ἐστὶν ἢ ἐν κινήσει. μεταβολὴ δὲ πάντων γλυκύ, κατὰ τὸν ποιητήν, διὰ πονηρίαν τινά· ὥσπερ γὰρ ἄνθρωπος εὐμετάβολος ὁ πονηρός, καὶ ἡ φύσις ἡ δεομένη μεταβολῆς· οὐ γὰρ ἁπλῆ οὐδ' ἐπιεικής.

Nor is the same thing always pleasant, because our nature is not simple: there is something else in us as well, insofar as we are perishable. So if one element is active, this is contrary to the nature of the other, and when they balance, what is done seems neither painful nor pleasant. For if anyone's nature were simple, the same action would always be the most pleasant. That is why the god always enjoys a single, simple pleasure; for there is an activity not only of motion but also of motionlessness, and pleasure is found more in rest than in motion. But "change in all things is sweet," as the poet says, because of a kind of badness. For just as the bad person is the one prone to change, so too

GREEK	ENGLISH
	is the nature that needs change; for it is neither simple nor decent.
περὶ μὲν οὖν ἐγκρατείας καὶ ἀκρασίας καὶ περὶ ἡδονῆς καὶ λύπης εἴρηται, καὶ τί ἕκαστον καὶ πῶς τὰ μὲν ἀγαθὰ αὐτῶν ἐστὶ τὰ δὲ κακά· λοιπὸν δὲ καὶ περὶ φιλίας ἐροῦμεν.	So much, then, for self-control and lack of self-control, and for pleasure and pain: what each is, and how some of them are good and others bad. It remains for us to speak about friendship as well.[13]

13 The Greek *philia* covers more than English "friendship": it includes family affection, partnerships and civic ties.

Book VIII

Friendship

Aristotle distinguishes three kinds of friendship and discusses friendship between unequals and within communities.

GREEK

ENGLISH

1155a μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ φιλίας ἔποιτ' ἂν διελθεῖν· ἔστι γὰρ ἀρετή τις ἢ μετ' ἀρετῆς, ἔτι δ' ἀναγκαιότατον εἰς τὸν βίον. ἄνευ γὰρ φίλων οὐδεὶς ἕλοιτ' ἂν ζῆν, ἔχων τὰ λοιπὰ ἀγαθὰ πάντα· καὶ γὰρ πλουτοῦσι καὶ ἀρχὰς καὶ δυναστείας κεκτημένοις δοκεῖ φίλων μάλιστ' εἶναι χρεία· τί γὰρ ὄφελος τῆς τοιαύτης εὐετηρίας ἀφαιρεθείσης εὐεργεσίας, ἣ γίγνεται μάλιστα καὶ ἐπαινετωτάτη πρὸς φίλους; ἢ πῶς ἂν τηρηθείη καὶ σῴζοιτ' ἄνευ φίλων; ὅσῳ γὰρ πλείων, τοσούτῳ ἐπισφαλεστέρα. ἐν πενίᾳ τε καὶ ταῖς λοιπαῖς δυστυχίαις μόνην οἴονται καταφυγὴν εἶναι τοὺς φίλους. καὶ νέοις δὲ πρὸς τὸ ἀναμάρτητον καὶ πρεσβυτέροις πρὸς θεραπείαν καὶ τὸ ἐλλεῖπον τῆς πράξεως δι' ἀσθένειαν βοηθείας, τοῖς τ' ἐν ἀκμῇ πρὸς τὰς καλὰς πράξεις· σύν τε δύ' ἐρχομένω· καὶ γὰρ νοῆσαι καὶ πρᾶξαι δυνατώτεροι.

After this it would be fitting to discuss friendship. For it is a kind of excellence, or involves excellence, and besides, it is most necessary for life. No one would choose to live without friends, even if he had all the other goods. For the rich and those who hold offices and positions of power seem to need friends most of all. For what is the use of such prosperity if it is stripped of the chance to do good, which is exercised most, and is most praiseworthy, toward friends? Or how could it be guarded and preserved without friends? The greater it is, the more precarious. And in poverty and the other misfortunes, people think friends are their only refuge. Friends help the young avoid error; they help the old by caring for them and making up for the actions they are too weak to perform; and they help those in their prime toward fine actions—"when two go together"—for they are more able both to think and to act.

φύσει τ' ἐνυπάρχειν ἔοικε πρὸς τὸ γεγεννημένον τῷ γεννήσαντι καὶ πρὸς τὸ γεννῆσαν τῷ γεννηθέντι, οὐ μόνον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν ὄρνισι καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν ζῴων, καὶ τοῖς ὁμοεθνέσι πρὸς ἄλληλα, καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, ὅθεν τοὺς φιλανθρώπους ἐπαινοῦμεν. ἴδοι δ' ἄν τις καὶ ἐν ταῖς πλάναις ὡς οἰκεῖον ἅπας ἄνθρωπος ἀνθρώπῳ καὶ φίλον. ἔοικε δὲ καὶ τὰς πόλεις συνέχειν ἡ φιλία, καὶ οἱ νομοθέται μᾶλλον περὶ αὐτὴν σπουδάζειν ἢ τὴν δικαιοσύνην· ἡ γὰρ ὁμόνοια ὅμοιόν τι τῇ φιλίᾳ ἔοικεν εἶναι, ταύτης δὲ μάλιστ' ἐφίενται καὶ τὴν στάσιν ἔχθραν οὖσαν μάλιστα ἐξελαύνουσιν· καὶ φίλων μὲν ὄντων οὐδὲν δεῖ δικαιοσύνης, δίκαιοι δ' ὄντες προσδέονται φιλίας, καὶ τῶν δικαίων τὸ μάλιστα φιλικὸν εἶναι δοκεῖ.

It seems to be present by nature in a parent toward its offspring and in offspring toward the parent, not only among human beings but also among birds and most animals; and in members of the same kind toward one another, especially among human beings—which is why we praise those who love their fellow human beings. Even on one's travels one can see how every human being is akin and dear to every other. Friendship also seems to hold cities together, and lawgivers seem to care more about it than about justice. For concord seems to be something like friendship, and this is what they aim at most, while civil strife, which is enmity, is what they most try to drive out. When people are friends they have no need of justice, but when they are just they need friendship as well; and the most just thing of all seems to be something friendly.

GREEK	ENGLISH
οὐ μόνον δ' ἀναγκαῖόν ἐστιν ἀλλὰ καὶ καλόν· τοὺς γὰρ φιλοφίλους ἐπαινοῦμεν, ἥ τε πολυφιλία δοκεῖ τῶν καλῶν ἕν τι εἶναι· καὶ ἔτι τοὺς αὐτοὺς οἴονται ἄνδρας ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι καὶ φίλους.	It is not only necessary but also fine. We praise those who love their friends, and having many friends seems to be one of the fine things. And further, people think that the same men are good men and friends.
διαμφισβητεῖται δὲ περὶ αὐτῆς οὐκ ὀλίγα. οἳ μὲν γὰρ ὁμοιότητά τινα τιθέασιν αὐτὴν καὶ τοὺς ὁμοίους φίλους, ὅθεν τὸν ὅμοιόν φασιν ὡς τὸν ὅμοιον, καὶ κολοιὸν ποτὶ κολοιόν, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· οἳ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίας κεραμεῖς πάντας τοὺς τοιούτους ἀλλήλοις φασὶν εἶναι. 1155b καὶ περὶ αὐτῶν τούτων ἀνώτερον ἐπιζητοῦσι καὶ φυσικώτερον, Εὐριπίδης μὲν φάσκων ἐρᾶν μὲν ὄμβρου γαῖαν ξηρανθεῖσαν, ἐρᾶν δὲ σεμνὸν οὐρανὸν πληρούμενον ὄμβρου πεσεῖν ἐς γαῖαν, καὶ Ἡράκλειτος τὸ ἀντίξουν συμφέρον καὶ ἐκ τῶν διαφερόντων καλλίστην ἁρμονίαν καὶ πάντα κατ' ἔριν γίνεσθαι· ἐξ ἐναντίας δὲ τούτοις ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἐμπεδοκλῆς· τὸ γὰρ ὅμοιον τοῦ ὁμοίου ἐφίεσθαι.	There is a good deal of dispute about it. Some take it to be a kind of likeness and say that those who are alike are friends—hence the sayings "like to like," "jackdaw to jackdaw," and so on. Others, on the contrary, say that all such people are "potters" to one another. 1155b On these very questions some inquire at a higher level and in terms of nature: Euripides says that "the parched earth longs for rain, and the majestic heaven, filled with rain, longs to fall to earth"; Heraclitus, that what opposes is beneficial, that the finest harmony comes from things that differ, and that everything comes about through strife; and others, Empedocles among them, take the opposite view, that like aims at like.[1]
1155b τὰ μὲν οὖν φυσικὰ τῶν ἀπορημάτων ἀφείσθω (οὐ γὰρ οἰκεῖα τῆς παρούσης σκέψεως)· ὅσα δ' ἐστὶν ἀνθρωπικὰ καὶ ἀνήκει εἰς τὰ ἤθη καὶ τὰ πάθη, ταῦτ' ἐπισκεψώμεθα, οἷον πότερον ἐν πᾶσι γίνεται φιλία ἢ οὐχ οἷόν τε μοχθηροὺς ὄντας φίλους εἶναι, καὶ πότερον ἓν εἶδος τῆς φιλίας ἐστὶν ἢ πλείω. οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἓν οἰόμενοι, ὅτι ἐπιδέχεται τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον, οὐχ ἱκανῷ πεπιστεύκασι σημείῳ· δέχεται γὰρ τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον καὶ τὰ ἕτερα τῷ εἴδει. εἴρηται δ' ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἔμπροσθεν.	Let us set aside the puzzles that belong to the study of nature, since they are not proper to the present inquiry, and examine those that are human and bear on character and feelings. For instance: does friendship arise among all people, or is it impossible for bad people to be friends? And is there one kind of friendship or more than one? Those who think there is only one, because it admits of more and less, have relied on an insufficient sign; for things that differ in kind also admit of more and less. But we have spoken about these matters earlier.

WHAT IS LOVABLE

Aristotle says friendship requires mutual goodwill toward what is good, pleasant or useful.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τάχα δ' ἂν γένοιτο περὶ αὐτῶν φανερὸν γνωρισθέντος τοῦ φιλητοῦ. δοκεῖ γὰρ οὐ πᾶν φιλεῖσθαι ἀλλὰ τὸ φιλητόν, τοῦτο δ' εἶναι ἀγαθὸν ἢ ἡδὺ ἢ χρήσιμον· δόξειε δ' ἂν χρήσιμον εἶναι δι' οὗ γίνεται ἀγαθόν τι ἢ ἡδονή, ὥστε φιλητὰ ἂν εἴη τἀγαθόν τε καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ ὡς τέλη. πότερον οὖν τἀγαθὸν φιλοῦσιν ἢ τὸ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθόν; διαφωνεῖ γὰρ ἐνίοτε ταῦτα. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ περὶ τὸ ἡδύ. δοκεῖ δὲ τὸ αὑτῷ ἀγαθὸν φιλεῖν ἕκαστος, καὶ εἶναι ἁπλῶς μὲν τἀγαθὸν φιλητόν, ἑκάστῳ δὲ τὸ ἑκάστῳ· φιλεῖ δ' ἕκαστος οὐ τὸ ὂν	Perhaps these questions will become clear once we have identified what is lovable. For it seems that not everything is loved, but only what is lovable, and that this is what is good, pleasant or useful. And the useful would seem to be that through which some good or pleasure comes about, so that the good and the pleasant would be lovable as ends. Do people love the good, then, or what is good for themselves? For these sometimes diverge.

1 "Potters" alludes to the proverb "potter resents potter": people in the same line of work are rivals.

GREEK

αὐτῷ ἀγαθὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ φαινόμενον. διοίσει δ' οὐδέν· ἔσται γὰρ τὸ φιλητὸν φαινόμενον.

τριῶν δ' ὄντων δι' ἃ φιλοῦσιν, ἐπὶ μὲν τῇ τῶν ἀψύχων φιλήσει οὐ λέγεται φιλία· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἀντιφίλησις, οὐδὲ βούλησις ἐκείνῳ ἀγαθοῦ (γελοῖον γὰρ ἴσως τῷ οἴνῳ βούλεσθαι τἀγαθά, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, σῴζεσθαι βούλεται αὐτόν, ἵνα αὐτὸς ἔχῃ)· τῷ δὲ φίλῳ φασὶ δεῖν βούλεσθαι τἀγαθὰ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα. τοὺς δὲ βουλομένους οὕτω τἀγαθὰ εὔνους λέγουσιν, ἂν μὴ ταὐτὸ καὶ παρ' ἐκείνου γίνηται· εὔνοιαν γὰρ ἐν ἀντιπεπονθόσι φιλίαν εἶναι. ἢ προσθετέον μὴ λανθάνουσαν; πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσιν εὔνοι οἷς οὐχ ἑωράκασιν, ὑπολαμβάνουσι δὲ ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι ἢ χρησίμους· 1156a τοῦτο δὲ τὸ αὐτὸ κἂν ἐκείνων τις πάθοι πρὸς τοῦτον. εὔνοι μὲν οὖν οὗτοι φαίνονται ἀλλήλοις· φίλους δὲ πῶς ἄν τις εἴποι λανθάνοντας ὡς ἔχουσιν ἑαυτοῖς; δεῖ ἄρα εὐνοεῖν ἀλλήλοις καὶ βούλεσθαι τἀγαθὰ μὴ λανθάνοντας δι' ἕν τι τῶν εἰρημένων.

ENGLISH

And likewise with the pleasant. It seems that each person loves what is good for himself, and that while the good is lovable without qualification, what is lovable for each is what is good for each. And each loves not what is good for him but what appears so. But this will make no difference: the lovable will be what appears lovable.

There are three things, then, for which people love. The love of inanimate things is not called friendship, since there is no return of love, nor any wishing of good to the thing. (It would presumably be ridiculous to wish good things to wine; if anything, one wishes it to keep, so as to have it oneself.) But to a friend, people say, one must wish good things for his own sake. Those who wish good things in this way they call well-disposed, if the same wish does not come from the other person too; for goodwill, they say, is friendship when it is reciprocated. Or must we add "when it does not go unnoticed"? For many people are well-disposed toward those they have never seen but suppose to be decent or useful; 1156a and one of those might feel the same toward him. These people, then, are evidently well-disposed to one another; but how could anyone call them friends when they are unaware of how they are disposed toward each other? So friends must bear each other goodwill and wish each other good things, without its going unnoticed, for one of the reasons mentioned.

THREE KINDS OF FRIENDSHIP

Aristotle distinguishes friendships of utility, pleasure and character, and calls the last complete.

GREEK

1156a διαφέρει δὲ ταῦτα ἀλλήλων εἴδει· καὶ αἱ φιλήσεις ἄρα καὶ αἱ φιλίαι. τρία δὴ τὰ τῆς φιλίας εἴδη, ἰσάριθμα τοῖς φιλητοῖς· καθ' ἕκαστον γάρ ἐστιν ἀντιφίλησις οὐ λανθάνουσα, οἱ δὲ φιλοῦντες ἀλλήλους βούλονται τἀγαθὰ ἀλλήλοις ταύτῃ ᾗ φιλοῦσιν. οἱ μὲν οὖν διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον φιλοῦντες ἀλλήλους οὐ καθ' αὑτοὺς φιλοῦσιν, ἀλλ' ᾗ γίνεταί τι αὐτοῖς παρ' ἀλλήλων ἀγαθόν. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ δι' ἡδονήν· οὐ γὰρ τῷ ποιούς τινας εἶναι ἀγαπῶσι τοὺς εὐτραπέλους, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἡδεῖς αὐτοῖς. οἵ τε δὴ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον φιλοῦντες διὰ τὸ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθὸν στέργουσι, καὶ οἱ δι' ἡδονὴν διὰ τὸ αὐτοῖς ἡδύ, καὶ οὐχ ᾗ ὁ φιλούμενός ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ᾗ χρήσιμος ἢ ἡδύς.

ENGLISH

These reasons differ in kind, and so, then, do the forms of love and the friendships. There are, then, three kinds of friendship, equal in number to the lovable things; for with each of them there is a return of love that does not go unnoticed, and those who love each other wish good things to each other in the respect in which they love. Those who love each other for utility do not love each other for themselves, but insofar as they get some good from each other. Similarly with those who love for pleasure: they are fond of witty people not for being people of a certain character, but because they are pleasant to themselves. So those who love for utility are fond of the other because of what is

GREEK

ENGLISH

good for themselves, and those who love for pleasure because of what is pleasant to themselves—not insofar as the one they love is who he is, but insofar as he is useful or pleasant.

κατὰ συμβεβηκός τε δὴ αἱ φιλίαι αὗταί εἰσιν· οὐ γὰρ ᾗ ἐστὶν ὅσπερ ἐστὶν ὁ φιλούμενος, ταύτῃ φιλεῖται, ἀλλ' ᾗ πορίζουσιν οἱ μὲν ἀγαθόν τι οἱ δ' ἡδονήν. εὐδιάλυτοι δὴ αἱ τοιαῦταί εἰσι, μὴ διαμενόντων αὐτῶν ὁμοίων· ἐὰν γὰρ μηκέτι ἡδεῖς ἢ χρήσιμοι ὦσι, παύονται φιλοῦντες. τὸ δὲ χρήσιμον οὐ διαμένει, ἀλλ' ἄλλοτε ἄλλο γίνεται. ἀπολυθέντος οὖν δι' ὃ φίλοι ἦσαν, διαλύεται καὶ ἡ φιλία, ὡς οὔσης τῆς φιλίας πρὸς ἐκεῖνα. μάλιστα δ' ἐν τοῖς πρεσβύταις ἡ τοιαύτη δοκεῖ φιλία γίνεσθαι (οὐ γὰρ τὸ ἡδὺ οἱ τηλικοῦτοι διώκουσιν ἀλλὰ τὸ ὠφέλιμον), καὶ τῶν ἐν ἀκμῇ καὶ νέων ὅσοι τὸ συμφέρον διώκουσιν.

These friendships, then, are incidental; for the one loved is not loved insofar as he is the very person he is, but insofar as he provides, in the one case some good, in the other pleasure. So such friendships are easily dissolved, when the parties do not stay as they were; for if they are no longer pleasant or useful, the others stop loving them. And the useful does not last but is different at different times. So when the reason they were friends has gone, the friendship dissolves too, since the friendship was directed at those things. This kind of friendship seems to arise especially among the old (for people of that age pursue not the pleasant but the beneficial), and among those in their prime or young who pursue their own advantage.

οὐ πάνυ δ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι οὐδὲ συζῶσι μετ' ἀλλήλων· ἐνίοτε γὰρ οὐδ' εἰσὶν ἡδεῖς· οὐδὲ δὴ προσδέονται τῆς τοιαύτης ὁμιλίας, ἐὰν μὴ ὠφέλιμοι ὦσιν· ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον γάρ εἰσιν ἡδεῖς ἐφ' ὅσον ἐλπίδας ἔχουσιν ἀγαθοῦ. εἰς ταύτας δὲ καὶ τὴν ξενικὴν τιθέασιν. ἡ δὲ τῶν νέων φιλία δι' ἡδονὴν εἶναι δοκεῖ· κατὰ πάθος γὰρ οὗτοι ζῶσι, καὶ μάλιστα διώκουσι τὸ ἡδὺ αὑτοῖς καὶ τὸ παρόν· τῆς ἡλικίας δὲ μεταπιπτούσης καὶ τὰ ἡδέα γίνεται ἕτερα. διὸ ταχέως γίνονται φίλοι καὶ παύονται· ἅμα γὰρ τῷ ἡδεῖ ἡ φιλία μεταπίπτει, [1156b] τῆς δὲ τοιαύτης ἡδονῆς ταχεῖα ἡ μεταβολή. καὶ ἐρωτικοὶ δ' οἱ νέοι· κατὰ πάθος γὰρ καὶ δι' ἡδονὴν τὸ πολὺ τῆς ἐρωτικῆς· διόπερ φιλοῦσι καὶ ταχέως παύονται, πολλάκις τῆς αὐτῆς ἡμέρας μεταπίπτοντες.

Such people do not much live together, either; for sometimes they are not even pleasant to each other. Nor do they need that sort of company unless they are beneficial to each other; for they are pleasant only so far as they have hopes of some good. Friendship between host and guest is also placed among these. The friendship of the young seems to be for pleasure; for they live by feeling and pursue above all what is pleasant to themselves and what is at hand. And as their age changes, what they find pleasant changes too. That is why they become friends quickly and quickly stop; for the friendship shifts along with what is pleasant, [1156b] and such pleasure changes quickly. The young are also prone to erotic love; for erotic love mostly goes by feeling and is for pleasure. That is why they fall in love and quickly stop, often changing within the same day.[2]

1156b συνημερεύειν δὲ καὶ συζῆν οὗτοι βούλονται· γίνεται γὰρ αὐτοῖς τὸ κατὰ τὴν φιλίαν οὕτως.

But these people do want to spend their days together and live together; for this is how they get what their friendship is about.

τελεία δ' ἐστὶν ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν φιλία καὶ κατ' ἀρετὴν ὁμοίων· οὗτοι γὰρ τἀγαθὰ ὁμοίως βούλονται ἀλλήλοις ᾗ ἀγαθοί, ἀγαθοὶ δ' εἰσὶ καθ' αὑτούς. οἱ δὲ βουλόμενοι τἀγαθὰ τοῖς φίλοις ἐκείνων ἕνεκα μάλιστα φίλοι· δι' αὐτοὺς γὰρ οὕτως ἔχουσι, καὶ οὐ κατὰ συμβεβηκός· διαμένει οὖν ἡ τούτων φιλία ἕως ἂν ἀγαθοὶ ὦσιν, ἡ δ'

Complete friendship is the friendship of good people who are alike in excellence. For these wish good things to each other alike insofar as they are good, and they are good in themselves. And those who wish good things to their friends for the friends' sake are friends most of all, since they are

2 Guest-friendship was a formal, often hereditary, bond of hospitality between people of different cities.

GREEK

ἀρετὴ μόνιμον. καὶ ἔστιν ἑκάτερος ἁπλῶς ἀγαθὸς καὶ τῷ φίλῳ· οἱ γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἁπλῶς ἀγαθοὶ καὶ ἀλλήλοις ὠφέλιμοι. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡδεῖς· καὶ γὰρ ἁπλῶς οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἡδεῖς καὶ ἀλλήλοις· ἑκάστῳ γὰρ καθ' ἡδονήν εἰσιν αἱ οἰκεῖαι πράξεις καὶ αἱ τοιαῦται, τῶν ἀγαθῶν δὲ αἱ αὐταὶ ἢ ὅμοιαι. ἡ τοιαύτη δὲ φιλία μόνιμος εὐλόγως ἐστίν· συνάπτει γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ πάνθ' ὅσα τοῖς φίλοις δεῖ ὑπάρχειν.

πᾶσα γὰρ φιλία δι' ἀγαθόν ἐστιν ἢ δι' ἡδονήν, ἢ ἁπλῶς ἢ τῷ φιλοῦντι, καὶ καθ' ὁμοιότητά τινα· ταύτῃ δὲ πάνθ' ὑπάρχει τὰ εἰρημένα καθ' αὑτούς· †ταύτῃ γὰρ ὅμοια† καὶ τὰ λοιπά, τό τε ἁπλῶς ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡδὺ ἁπλῶς ἐστίν, μάλιστα δὲ ταῦτα φιλητά· καὶ τὸ φιλεῖν δὴ καὶ ἡ φιλία ἐν τούτοις μάλιστα καὶ ἀρίστη. σπανίας δ' εἰκὸς τὰς τοιαύτας εἶναι· ὀλίγοι γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦτοι. ἔτι δὲ προσδεῖται χρόνου καὶ συνηθείας· κατὰ τὴν παροιμίαν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν εἰδῆσαι ἀλλήλους πρὶν τοὺς λεγομένους ἅλας συναναλῶσαι· οὐδ' ἀποδέξασθαι δὴ πρότερον οὐδ' εἶναι φίλους, πρὶν ἂν ἑκάτερος ἑκατέρῳ φανῇ φιλητὸς καὶ πιστευθῇ.

οἱ δὲ ταχέως τὰ φιλικὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ποιοῦντες βούλονται μὲν φίλοι εἶναι, οὐκ εἰσὶ δέ, εἰ μὴ καὶ φιλητοί, καὶ τοῦτ' ἴσασιν· βούλησις μὲν γὰρ ταχεῖα φιλίας γίνεται, φιλία δ' οὔ.

αὕτη μὲν οὖν καὶ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον καὶ κατὰ τὰ λοιπὰ τελεία ἐστί, καὶ κατὰ πάντα ταὐτὰ γίνεται καὶ ὅμοια ἑκατέρῳ παρ' ἑκατέρου, ὅπερ δεῖ τοῖς φίλοις ὑπάρχειν. 1157a ἡ δὲ διὰ τὸ ἡδὺ ὁμοίωμα ταύτης ἔχει· καὶ γὰρ οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ἡδεῖς ἀλλήλοις. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον· καὶ γὰρ τοιοῦτοι ἀλλήλοις οἱ ἀγαθοί. μάλιστα δὲ καὶ ἐν τούτοις αἱ φιλίαι μένουσιν, ὅταν τὸ αὐτὸ γίνηται παρ' ἀλλήλων, οἷον ἡδονή, καὶ μὴ μόνον οὕτως ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, οἷον τοῖς εὐτραπέλοις, καὶ μὴ ὡς ἐραστῇ καὶ ἐρωμένῳ.

ENGLISH

so disposed because of who their friends are, and not incidentally. So their friendship lasts as long as they are good, and excellence is a lasting thing. Each of them is good without qualification and good for his friend; for the good are both good without qualification and beneficial to each other. And they are pleasant in the same way; for the good are pleasant both without qualification and to each other. For each person takes pleasure in actions that are his own and in actions like them, and the actions of the good are the same or similar. Such friendship is, reasonably enough, lasting; for it combines in itself all the things that friends should have.

For every friendship is for the sake of good or of pleasure, either without qualification or for the one who loves, and it rests on some likeness. In this friendship all the things mentioned belong to the friends in themselves; for in this friendship they are alike in the other respects as well, and what is good without qualification is also pleasant without qualification, and these are the most lovable things. So loving and friendship are found most, and at their best, among such people. Such friendships are likely to be rare, since such people are few. Further, friendship of this kind needs time and familiarity. As the proverb says, people cannot know each other until they have eaten the proverbial salt together; nor can they accept each other or be friends until each has shown himself lovable to the other and has won his trust.[3]

Those who are quick to treat each other in friendly ways want to be friends, but they are not, unless they are also lovable and know it. For the wish for friendship arises quickly, but friendship does not.

This friendship, then, is complete both in duration and in the other respects; and in every respect each gets from the other the same or similar things, which is what should hold between friends. 1157a Friendship for pleasure bears a resemblance to it, since the good are pleasant to each other too. So does friendship for utility, since the good are also useful to each other. And among these, too, friendships last best when the parties get the same thing from each other—pleasure, for instance—and not only that, but from the same

3 To eat a quantity of salt together was to share many meals, and so to spend a long time in each other's company.

GREEK

ENGLISH

source, as happens between witty people, and not as between a lover and his beloved.

1157a οὐ γὰρ ἐπὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἥδονται οὗτοι, ἀλλ' ὃ μὲν ὁρῶν ἐκεῖνον, ὃ δὲ θεραπευόμενος ὑπὸ τοῦ ἐραστοῦ· ληγούσης δὲ τῆς ὥρας ἐνίοτε καὶ ἡ φιλία λήγει (τῷ μὲν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδεῖα ἡ ὄψις, τῷ δ' οὐ γίνεται ἡ θεραπεία)· πολλοὶ δ' αὖ διαμένουσιν, ἐὰν ἐκ τῆς συνηθείας τὰ ἤθη στέρξωσιν, ὁμοήθεις ὄντες. οἱ δὲ μὴ τὸ ἡδὺ ἀντικαταλλαττόμενοι ἀλλὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἐν τοῖς ἐρωτικοῖς καὶ εἰσὶν ἧττον φίλοι καὶ διαμένουσιν. οἱ δὲ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ὄντες φίλοι ἅμα τῷ συμφέροντι διαλύονται· οὐ γὰρ ἀλλήλων ἦσαν φίλοι ἀλλὰ τοῦ λυσιτελοῦς.

For these two do not take pleasure in the same things: the lover takes pleasure in seeing his beloved, the beloved in being courted by the lover. And when the bloom of youth fades, the friendship sometimes fades too (for the one no longer finds the sight pleasant, and the other no longer gets the attention). But many, on the other hand, remain friends, if through familiarity they have come to love each other's characters, being alike in character. Those who exchange not pleasure but utility in their love affairs are both less truly friends and less lasting. And those who are friends for utility part as soon as the advantage does; for they were friends not of each other but of the profit.

δι' ἡδονὴν μὲν οὖν καὶ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ φαύλους ἐνδέχεται φίλους ἀλλήλοις εἶναι καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς φαύλοις καὶ μηδέτερον ὁποιῳοῦν, δι' αὐτοὺς δὲ δῆλον ὅτι μόνους τοὺς ἀγαθούς· οἱ γὰρ κακοὶ οὐ χαίρουσιν ἑαυτοῖς, εἰ μή τις ὠφέλεια γίνοιτο. καὶ μόνη δὲ ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν φιλία ἀδιάβλητός ἐστιν· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον οὐδενὶ πιστεῦσαι περὶ τοῦ ἐν πολλῷ χρόνῳ ὑφ' αὑτοῦ δεδοκιμασμένου· καὶ τὸ πιστεύειν ἐν τούτοις, καὶ τὸ μηδέποτ' ἂν ἀδικῆσαι, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα ἐν τῇ ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλίᾳ ἀξιοῦται. ἐν δὲ ταῖς ἑτέραις οὐδὲν κωλύει τὰ τοιαῦτα γίνεσθαι.

For pleasure and for utility, then, even bad people can be friends with each other, and decent people with bad ones, and someone who is neither with anyone at all; but clearly only good people can be friends for each other's own sake. For bad people take no delight in each other unless some benefit comes of it. And only the friendship of the good is proof against slander; for it is not easy to believe anyone about someone one has tested oneself over a long time. Among the good there is trust, and the assurance that neither would ever wrong the other, and all the other things expected in true friendship. In the other kinds, nothing prevents such things from happening.

ἐπεὶ γὰρ οἱ ἄνθρωποι λέγουσι φίλους καὶ τοὺς διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον, ὥσπερ αἱ πόλεις (δοκοῦσι γὰρ αἱ συμμαχίαι ταῖς πόλεσι γίνεσθαι ἕνεκα τοῦ συμφέροντος), καὶ τοὺς δι' ἡδονὴν ἀλλήλους στέργοντας, ὥσπερ οἱ παῖδες, ἴσως λέγειν μὲν δεῖ καὶ ἡμᾶς φίλους τοὺς τοιούτους, εἴδη δὲ τῆς φιλίας πλείω, καὶ πρώτως μὲν καὶ κυρίως τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν ᾗ ἀγαθοί, τὰς δὲ λοιπὰς καθ' ὁμοιότητα· ᾗ γὰρ ἀγαθόν τι καὶ ὅμοιόν τι, ταύτῃ φίλοι· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἡδὺ ἀγαθὸν τοῖς φιληδέσιν. οὐ πάνυ δ' αὗται συνάπτουσιν, οὐδὲ γίνονται οἱ αὐτοὶ φίλοι διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον καὶ διὰ τὸ ἡδύ· οὐ γὰρ πάνυ συνδυάζεται τὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός.

For people call friends even those who are friends for utility, as cities do (alliances between cities seem to be formed for the sake of advantage), and those who are fond of each other for pleasure, as children are. So perhaps we too should call such people friends, but say that there are several kinds of friendship: primarily and in the strict sense, the friendship of good people insofar as they are good, and the others by resemblance to it. For people are friends insofar as there is something good and something similar between them; and the pleasant is a good to those who love pleasure. But these two kinds do not combine very well, nor do the same people become friends for utility and for pleasure; for things that are incidental are not often coupled.

1157b

GREEK

εἰς ταῦτα δὲ τὰ εἴδη τῆς φιλίας νενεμημένης οἱ μὲν φαῦλοι ἔσονται φίλοι δι' ἡδονὴν ἢ τὸ χρήσιμον, ταύτῃ ὅμοιοι ὄντες, οἱ δ' ἀγαθοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς φίλοι· ᾗ γὰρ ἀγαθοί. οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ἁπλῶς φίλοι, ἐκεῖνοι δὲ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς καὶ τῷ ὁμοιῶσθαι τούτοις.

ὥσπερ δ' ἐπὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν οἳ μὲν καθ' ἕξιν οἳ δὲ κατ' ἐνέργειαν ἀγαθοὶ λέγονται, οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς φιλίας· οἱ μὲν γὰρ συζῶντες χαίρουσιν ἀλλήλοις καὶ πορίζουσι τἀγαθά, οἱ δὲ καθεύδοντες ἢ κεχωρισμένοι τοῖς τόποις οὐκ ἐνεργοῦσι μέν, οὕτω δ' ἔχουσιν ὥστ' ἐνεργεῖν φιλικῶς· οἱ γὰρ τόποι οὐ διαλύουσι τὴν φιλίαν ἁπλῶς, ἀλλὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν. ἐὰν δὲ χρόνιος ἡ ἀπουσία γίνηται, καὶ τῆς φιλίας δοκεῖ λήθην ποιεῖν· ὅθεν εἴρηται πολλὰς δὴ φιλίας ἀπροσηγορία διέλυσεν. οὐ φαίνονται δ' οὔθ' οἱ πρεσβῦται οὔθ' οἱ στρυφνοὶ φιλικοὶ εἶναι· βραχὺ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς τὸ τῆς ἡδονῆς, οὐδεὶς δὲ δύναται συνημερεύειν τῷ λυπηρῷ οὐδὲ τῷ μὴ ἡδεῖ· μάλιστα γὰρ ἡ φύσις φαίνεται τὸ λυπηρὸν φεύγειν, ἐφίεσθαι δὲ τοῦ ἡδέος.

οἱ δ' ἀποδεχόμενοι ἀλλήλους, μὴ συζῶντες δέ, εὔνοις ἐοίκασι μᾶλλον ἢ φίλοις. οὐδὲνγὰρ οὕτως ἐστὶ φίλων ὡς τὸ συζῆν· ὠφελείας μὲν γὰρ οἱ ἐνδεεῖς ὀρέγονται, συνημερεύειν δὲ καὶ οἱ μακάριοι· μονώταις γὰρ εἶναι τούτοις ἥκιστα προσήκει· συνδιάγειν δὲ μετ' ἀλλήλων οὐκ ἔστι μὴ ἡδεῖς ὄντας μηδὲ χαίροντας τοῖς αὐτοῖς, ὅπερ ἡ ἑταιρικὴ δοκεῖ ἔχειν.

μάλιστα μὲν οὖν ἐστὶ φιλία ἡ τῶν ἀγαθῶν, καθάπερ πολλάκις εἴρηται· δοκεῖ γὰρ φιλητὸν μὲν καὶ αἱρετὸν τὸ ἁπλῶς ἀγαθὸν ἢ ἡδύ, ἑκάστῳ δὲ τὸ αὐτῷ τοιοῦτον· ὁ δ' ἀγαθὸς τῷ ἀγαθῷ δι' ἄμφω ταῦτα. ἔοικε δ' ἡ μὲν φίλησις πάθει, ἡ δὲ φιλία ἕξει· ἡ γὰρ φίλησις οὐχ ἧττον πρὸς τὰ ἄψυχά ἐστιν, ἀντιφιλοῦσι δὲ μετὰ προαιρέσεως, ἡ δὲ προαίρεσις ἀφ' ἕξεως· καὶ τἀγαθὰ βούλονται τοῖς φιλουμένοις ἐκείνων ἕνεκα, οὐ κατὰ πάθος ἀλλὰ καθ' ἕξιν. καὶ φιλοῦντες τὸν φίλον τὸ αὑτοῖς ἀγαθὸν φιλοῦσιν· ὁ γὰρ ἀγαθὸς φίλος γινόμενος ἀγαθὸν γίνεται ᾧ φίλος. ἑκάτερος οὖν φιλεῖ τε τὸ αὐτῷ ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸ ἴσον ἀνταποδίδωσι τῇ βουλήσει καὶ τῷ ἡδεῖ· λέγεται γὰρ φιλότης ἰσότης, [1158a] μάλιστα δὲ τῇ τῶν ἀγαθῶν ταῦθ' ὑπάρχει.

ENGLISH

With friendship divided into these kinds, bad people will be friends for pleasure or for utility, being alike in that respect, while good people will be friends for each other's own sake, since they are friends insofar as they are good. These, then, are friends without qualification; the others are friends incidentally and by resembling these.

Just as with the excellences some people are called good in virtue of a state and others in virtue of an activity, so it is with friendship too. Those who live together enjoy each other and provide each other with good things; those who are asleep or separated by distance are not active as friends, but are so disposed that they would be. For distance does not dissolve friendship without qualification, only its activity. But if the absence is long, it seems to make people forget the friendship too—hence the saying, "Many a friendship has lack of talk undone." Neither old people nor sour people seem inclined to friendship; for there is little pleasure in them, and no one can spend his days with someone painful or unpleasant, since nature seems above all to avoid what is painful and to aim at what is pleasant.

Those who accept each other but do not live together seem more like well-wishers than friends. For nothing is so characteristic of friends as living together. Those in need long for benefit, but even the blessed want company for their days, since a solitary life suits them least of all. And people cannot spend their time together unless they are pleasant and enjoy the same things, as seems to be the case in the friendship of companions.

Friendship in the fullest sense, then, is the friendship of the good, as has been said many times. For what is good or pleasant without qualification seems to be lovable and choiceworthy, and for each person what is such for him; and the good person is lovable and choiceworthy to the good person on both counts. Loving seems like a feeling, friendship like a state. For loving is directed no less toward inanimate things, but loving in return involves decision, and decision comes from a state. And people wish good things to those they love for their sake, not from feeling but from a state. And in loving their friend they love what is good for themselves; for when a good person becomes a friend, he becomes a good for the one

GREEK

ENGLISH

whose friend he is. So each both loves what is good for himself and makes an equal return in wishing good and in pleasantness; for friendship, as the saying goes, is equality, [1158a] and these things belong most of all to the friendship of the good.

1158a ἐν δὲ τοῖς στρυφνοῖς καὶ πρεσβυτικοῖς ἧττον γίνεται ἡ φιλία, ὅσῳ δυσκολώτεροί εἰσι καὶ ἧττον ταῖς ὁμιλίαις χαίρουσιν· ταῦτα γὰρ δοκεῖ μάλιστ' εἶναι φιλικὰ καὶ ποιητικὰ φιλίας. διὸ νέοι μὲν γίνονται φίλοι ταχύ, πρεσβῦται δ' οὔ· οὐ γὰρ γίνονται φίλοι οἷς ἂν μὴ χαίρωσιν· ὁμοίως δ' οὐδ' οἱ στρυφνοί. ἀλλ' οἱ τοιοῦτοι εὖνοι μέν εἰσιν ἀλλήλοις· βούλονται γὰρ τἀγαθὰ καὶ ἀπαντῶσιν εἰς τὰς χρείας· φίλοι δ' οὐ πάνυ εἰσὶ διὰ τὸ μὴ συνημερεύειν μηδὲ χαίρειν ἀλλήλοις, ἃ δὴ μάλιστ' εἶναι δοκεῖ φιλικά. πολλοῖς δ' εἶναι φίλον κατὰ τὴν τελείαν φιλίαν οὐκ ἐνδέχεται, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἐρᾶν πολλῶν ἅμα (ἔοικε γὰρ ὑπερβολῇ, τὸ τοιοῦτο δὲ πρὸς ἕνα πέφυκε γίνεσθαι)· πολλοὺς δ' ἅμα τῷ αὐτῷ ἀρέσκειν σφόδρα οὐ ῥᾴδιον, ἴσως δ' οὐδ' ἀγαθοὺς εἶναι.

Among sour and elderly people friendship arises less, insofar as they are more ill-tempered and take less pleasure in company; for these things seem to be the most friendly and the most productive of friendship. That is why the young become friends quickly but the old do not; for people do not become friends with those they do not enjoy. And the same goes for sour people. Such people are well-disposed to each other—they wish each other good things and come to help in times of need—but they are hardly friends, because they do not spend their days together or enjoy each other, which seem to be the things most characteristic of friendship. It is not possible to be a friend to many in the complete kind of friendship, just as it is not possible to be in love with many at once (for love is like an excess, and that sort of thing is naturally directed toward one person). And it is not easy for many people to please the same person intensely at the same time—nor, perhaps, for many to be good.

δεῖ δὲ καὶ ἐμπειρίαν λαβεῖν καὶ ἐν συνηθείᾳ γενέσθαι, ὃ παγχάλεπον. διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον δὲ καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ πολλοῖς ἀρέσκειν ἐνδέχεται· πολλοὶ γὰρ οἱ τοιοῦτοι, καὶ ἐν ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ αἱ ὑπηρεσίαι. τούτων δὲ μᾶλλον ἔοικε φιλίᾳ ἡ διὰ τὸ ἡδύ, ὅταν ταὐτὰ ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν γίνηται καὶ χαίρωσιν ἀλλήλοις ἢ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, οἵαι τῶν νέων εἰσὶν αἱ φιλίαι· μᾶλλον γὰρ ἐν ταύταις τὸ ἐλευθέριον. ἡ δὲ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἀγοραίων. καὶ οἱ μακάριοι δὲ χρησίμων μὲν οὐδὲν δέονται, ἡδέων δέ· συζῆν μὲν γὰρ βούλονταί τισι, τὸ δὲ λυπηρὸν ὀλίγον μὲν χρόνον φέρουσιν, συνεχῶς δ' οὐδεὶς ἂν ὑπομείναι, οὐδ' αὐτὸ τὸ ἀγαθόν, εἰ λυπηρὸν αὐτῷ εἴη· διὸ τοὺς φίλους ἡδεῖς ζητοῦσιν.

One must also gain experience of the other and become familiar, which is very hard. But for utility and pleasure it is possible to please many; for there are many such people, and the services take little time. Of these two, the friendship for pleasure is more like friendship, when both get the same things from each other and enjoy each other or the same things, as in the friendships of the young; for there is more generosity of spirit in these. Friendship for utility is for traders. And the blessed have no need of useful friends, but they do need pleasant ones. For they want to live with someone, and while they can bear what is painful for a short time, no one could endure it continuously—not even the good itself, if it were painful to him. That is why they look for friends who are pleasant.

δεῖ δ' ἴσως καὶ ἀγαθοὺς τοιούτους ὄντας, καὶ ἔτι αὐτοῖς· οὕτω γὰρ ὑπάρξει αὐτοῖς ὅσα δεῖ τοῖς φίλοις. οἱ δ' ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις διῃρημένοις φαίνονται χρῆσθαι τοῖς φίλοις· ἄλλοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς εἰσὶ χρήσιμοι καὶ ἕτεροι ἡδεῖς, ἅμφω δ' οἱ αὐτοὶ οὐ πάνυ· οὔτε γὰρ ἡδεῖς μετ' ἀρετῆς ζητοῦσιν

Perhaps they should also look for friends who, besides being pleasant, are good, and good for them as well; for in that way they will have everything that friends should have. People in positions of

GREEK	ENGLISH
οὔτε χρησίμους εἰς τὰ καλά, ἀλλὰ τοὺς μὲν εὐτραπέλους τοῦ ἡδέος ἐφιέμενοι, τοὺς δὲ δεινοὺς πρᾶξαι τὸ ἐπιταχθέν, ταῦτα δ' οὐ πάνυ γίνεται ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ. ἡδὺς δὲ καὶ χρήσιμος ἅμα εἴρηται ὅτι ὁ σπουδαῖος· ἀλλ' ὑπερέχοντι οὐ γίνεται ὁ τοιοῦτος φίλος, ἐὰν μὴ καὶ τῇ ἀρετῇ ὑπερέχηται· εἰ δὲ μή, οὐκ ἰσάζει ἀνάλογον ὑπερεχόμενος. οὐ πάνυ δ' εἰώθασι τοιοῦτοι γίνεσθαι.	power appear to keep their friends in separate groups: some are useful to them and others pleasant, but hardly the same ones for both. For they do not look for pleasant friends who have excellence, nor for useful ones who serve fine ends; rather, when they aim at pleasure they look for witty people, and otherwise for people clever at carrying out orders, and these qualities hardly ever occur in the same person. We have said that the excellent person is both pleasant and useful; but such a person does not become the friend of someone who surpasses him, unless the other is surpassed by him in excellence. Otherwise, being surpassed, he does not achieve equality by proportion. But such people are not often found.
1158b εἰσὶ δ' οὖν αἱ εἰρημέναι φιλίαι ἐν ἰσότητι· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ γίνεται ἀπ' ἀμφοῖν καὶ βούλονται ἀλλήλοις, ἢ ἕτερον ἀνθ' ἑτέρου καταλλάττονται, οἷον ἡδονὴν ἀντ' ὠφελείας· ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἧττόν εἰσιν αὗται φιλίαι καὶ μένουσιν, εἴρηται. δοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ δι' ὁμοιότητα καὶ ἀνομοιότητα ταὐτοῦ εἶναί τε καὶ οὐκ εἶναι φιλίαι· καθ' ὁμοιότητα γὰρ τῆς κατ' ἀρετὴν φαίνονται φιλίαι (ἢ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ἡδὺ ἔχει ἢ δὲ τὸ χρήσιμον, ταῦτα δ' ὑπάρχει κἀκείνῃ), τῷ δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀδιάβλητον καὶ μόνιμον εἶναι, ταύτας δὲ ταχέως μεταπίπτειν ἄλλοις τε διαφέρειν πολλοῖς, οὐ φαίνονται φιλίαι, δι' ἀνομοιότητα ἐκείνης.	The friendships mentioned so far, then, involve equality: both parties get the same things from each other and wish the same things for each other, or else they exchange one thing for another, such as pleasure for benefit. That these are friendships to a lesser degree and last less has been said. And it is by likeness and unlikeness to the same thing that they seem both to be and not to be friendships. They seem to be friendships by their likeness to friendship based on excellence (one has the pleasant, the other the useful, and these belong to that friendship too); but because that friendship is proof against slander and lasting, while these change quickly and differ from it in many other respects, they do not seem to be friendships, owing to their unlikeness to it.

FRIENDSHIP BETWEEN UNEQUALS

Aristotle discusses friendships between unequals, such as parents and children, balanced by proportion.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἕτερον δ' ἐστὶ φιλίας εἶδος τὸ καθ' ὑπεροχήν, οἷον πατρὶ πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ ὅλως πρεσβυτέρῳ πρὸς νεώτερον, ἀνδρί τε πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ παντὶ ἄρχοντι πρὸς ἀρχόμενον. διαφέρουσι δ' αὗται καὶ ἀλλήλων· οὐ γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ γονεῦσι πρὸς τέκνα καὶ ἄρχουσι πρὸς ἀρχομένους, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πατρὶ πρὸς υἱὸν καὶ υἱῷ πρὸς πατέρα, οὐδ' ἀνδρὶ πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ γυναικὶ πρὸς ἄνδρα. ἑτέρα γὰρ ἑκάστου τούτων ἀρετὴ καὶ τὸ ἔργον, ἕτερα δὲ καὶ δι' ἃ φιλοῦσιν· ἕτεραι οὖν καὶ αἱ φιλήσεις καὶ αἱ φιλίαι. ταὐτὰ μὲν δὴ οὔτε γίνεται ἑκατέρῳ παρὰ θατέρου οὔτε δεῖ ζητεῖν· ὅταν δὲ γονεῦσι μὲν τέκνα ἀπονέμῃ ἃ δεῖ τοῖς γεννήσασι, γονεῖς δὲ υἱέσιν ἃ δεῖ τοῖς τέκνοις, μόνιμος ἡ τῶν τοιούτων καὶ ἐπιεικὴς ἔσται φιλία.	There is another kind of friendship, based on superiority, such as that of a father toward a son, and in general of an older person toward a younger one, of a husband toward a wife, and of any ruler toward the ruled. These also differ from one another. The friendship of parents toward children is not the same as that of rulers toward the ruled, nor even that of father toward son the same as that of son toward father, nor that of husband toward wife the same as that of wife toward husband. For each of these has a different excellence and function, and different reasons for loving; so the forms

GREEK

ENGLISH

of love and the friendships are different too. Each, then, does not get the same things from the other, nor should he look for them. But when children render to parents what is owed to those who gave them life, and parents render to sons what is owed to children, the friendship of such people will be lasting and decent.

ἀνάλογον δ' ἐν πάσαις ταῖς καθ' ὑπεροχὴν οὔσαις φιλίαις καὶ τὴν φίλησιν δεῖ γίνεσθαι, οἷον τὸν ἀμείνω μᾶλλον φιλεῖσθαι ἢ φιλεῖν, καὶ τὸν ὠφελιμώτερον, καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστον ὁμοίως· ὅταν γὰρ κατ' ἀξίαν ἡ φίλησις γίνηται, τότε γίνεταί πως ἰσότης, ὃ δὴ τῆς φιλίας εἶναι δοκεῖ.

In all friendships based on superiority, the love too must be proportional: the better person should be loved more than he loves, and so should the more beneficial one, and likewise with each of the others. For when love accords with merit, then there is in a way equality, which is thought to be characteristic of friendship.

οὐχ ὁμοίως δὲ τὸ ἴσον ἔν τε τοῖς δικαίοις καὶ ἐν τῇ φιλίᾳ φαίνεται ἔχειν· ἔστι γὰρ ἐν μὲν τοῖς δικαίοις ἴσον πρώτως τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν, τὸ δὲ κατὰ ποσὸν δευτέρως, ἐν δὲ τῇ φιλίᾳ τὸ μὲν κατὰ ποσὸν πρώτως, τὸ δὲ κατ' ἀξίαν δευτέρως. δῆλον δ', ἂν πολὺ διάστημα γένηται ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἢ εὐπορίας ἤ τινος ἄλλου· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι φίλοι εἰσὶν ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἀξιοῦσιν. ἐμφανέστατον δὲ τοῦτ' ἐπὶ τῶν θεῶν· πλεῖστον γὰρ οὗτοι πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὑπερέχουσιν. [1159a] δῆλον δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν βασιλέων· οὐδὲ γὰρ τούτοις ἀξιοῦσιν εἶναι φίλοι οἱ πολὺ καταδεέστεροι, οὐδὲ τοῖς ἀρίστοις ἢ σοφωτάτοις οἱ μηδενὸς ἄξιοι.

But equality does not seem to work in the same way in matters of justice as in friendship. In matters of justice, what is equal is primarily what accords with merit, and secondarily what accords with quantity; in friendship, it is primarily what accords with quantity, and secondarily what accords with merit. This becomes clear when a great gap arises in excellence or vice, in wealth, or in anything else: then people are no longer friends, and do not even expect to be. This is most evident in the case of the gods, since they surpass us most in all good things. [1159a] It is clear with kings too: those far beneath them do not expect to be their friends, nor do people of no worth expect to be friends with the best or wisest.

1159a ἀκριβὴς μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις οὐκ ἔστιν ὁρισμός, ἕως τίνος οἱ φίλοι· πολλῶν γὰρ ἀφαιρουμένων ἔτι μένει, πολὺ δὲ χωρισθέντος, οἷον τοῦ θεοῦ, οὐκέτι. ὅθεν καὶ ἀπορεῖται, μή ποτ' οὐ βούλονται οἱ φίλοι τοῖς φίλοις τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, οἷον θεοὺς εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἔτι φίλοι ἔσονται αὐτοῖς, οὐδὲ δὴ ἀγαθά· οἱ γὰρ φίλοι ἀγαθά. εἰ δὴ καλῶς εἴρηται ὅτι ὁ φίλος τῷ φίλῳ βούλεται τἀγαθὰ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα, μένειν ἂν δέοι οἷός ποτ' ἐστὶν ἐκεῖνος· ἀνθρώπῳ δὴ ὄντι βουλήσεται τὰ μέγιστα ἀγαθά. ἴσως δ' οὐ πάντα· αὑτῷ γὰρ μάλισθ' ἕκαστος βούλεται τἀγαθά.

In such cases there is no precise definition of how far people can still be friends. Much can be taken away and the friendship still remain; but when one party is far removed, as the god is, it no longer does. Hence the puzzle whether friends may not wish their friends the greatest of goods—to be gods, for instance. For then they will no longer be friends to them, and so not goods to them either, since friends are goods. If, then, it was rightly said that a friend wishes good things to his friend for that friend's sake, the friend would have to remain whatever sort of being he is. So it is to him as a human being that he will wish the greatest goods. But perhaps not all of them; for each person wishes good things most of all to himself.

οἱ πολλοὶ δὲ δοκοῦσι διὰ φιλοτιμίαν βούλεσθαι φιλεῖσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ φιλεῖν· διὸ φιλοκόλακες οἱ πολλοί· ὑπερεχόμενος γὰρ φίλος ὁ κόλαξ, ἢ προσποιεῖται τοιοῦτος καὶ μᾶλλον φιλεῖν ἢ φιλεῖσθαι· τὸ δὲ φιλεῖσθαι

Most people, out of love of honor, seem to wish to be loved rather than to love. That is why most people are fond of flatterers: a flatterer is a friend in an inferior position, or pretends to be one, and

GREEK

ἐγγὺς εἶναι δοκεῖ τοῦ τιμᾶσθαι, οὗ δὴ οἱ πολλοὶ ἐφίενται. οὐ δι' αὑτὸ δ' ἐοίκασιν αἱρεῖσθαι τὴν τιμήν, ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός· χαίρουσι γὰρ οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἐν ταῖς ἐξουσίαις τιμώμενοι διὰ τὴν ἐλπίδα (οἴονται γὰρ τεύξεσθαι παρ' αὐτῶν, ἄν του δέωνται· ὡς δὴ σημείῳ τῆς εὐπαθείας χαίρουσι τῇ τιμῇ)· οἱ δ' ὑπὸ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν καὶ εἰδότων ὀρεγόμενοι τιμῆς βεβαιῶσαι τὴν οἰκείαν δόξαν ἐφίενται περὶ αὑτῶν· χαίρουσι δή, ὅτι εἰσὶν ἀγαθοὶ πιστεύοντες τῇ τῶν λεγόντων κρίσει.

τῷ φιλεῖσθαι δὲ καθ' αὑτὸ χαίρουσιν· διὸ δόξειεν ἂν κρεῖττον εἶναι τοῦ τιμᾶσθαι, καὶ ἡ φιλία καθ' αὑτὴν αἱρετὴ εἶναι. δοκεῖ δ' ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν μᾶλλον ἢ ἐν τῷ φιλεῖσθαι εἶναι. σημεῖον δ' αἱ μητέρες τῷ φιλεῖν χαίρουσαι· ἔνιαι γὰρ διδόασι τὰ ἑαυτῶν τρέφεσθαι, καὶ φιλοῦσι μὲν εἰδυῖαι, ἀντιφιλεῖσθαι δ' οὐ ζητοῦσιν, ἐὰν ἀμφότερα μὴ ἐνδέχηται, ἀλλ' ἱκανὸν αὐταῖς ἔοικεν εἶναι ἐὰν ὁρῶσιν εὖ πράττοντας, καὶ αὐταὶ φιλοῦσιν αὐτοὺς κἂν ἐκεῖνοι μηδὲν ὦν μητρὶ προσήκει ἀπονέμωσι διὰ τὴν ἄγνοιαν. μᾶλλον δὲ τῆς φιλίας οὔσης ἐν τῷ φιλεῖν, καὶ τῶν φιλοφίλων ἐπαινουμένων, φίλων ἀρετὴ τὸ φιλεῖν ἔοικεν, ὥστ' ἐν οἷς τοῦτο γίνεται κατ' ἀξίαν, [1159b] οὗτοι μόνιμοι φίλοι καὶ ἡ τούτων φιλία. οὕτω δ' ἂν καὶ οἱ ἄνισοι μάλιστ' εἶεν φίλοι· ἰσάζοιντο γὰρ ἄν.

1159b ἡ δ' ἰσότης καὶ ὁμοιότης φιλότης, καὶ μάλιστα μὲν ἡ τῶν κατ' ἀρετὴν ὁμοιότης· μόνιμοι γὰρ ὄντες καθ' αὑτοὺς καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους μένουσι, καὶ οὔτε δέονται φαύλων οὔθ' ὑπηρετοῦσι τοιαῦτα, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰπεῖν καὶ διακωλύουσιν· τῶν ἀγαθῶν γὰρ μήτ' αὐτοὺς ἁμαρτάνειν μήτε τοῖς φίλοις ἐπιτρέπειν. οἱ δὲ μοχθηροὶ τὸ μὲν βέβαιον οὐκ ἔχουσιν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αὑτοῖς διαμένουσιν ὅμοιοι ὄντες· ἐπ' ὀλίγον δὲ χρόνον γίνονται φίλοι, χαίροντες τῇ ἀλλήλων μοχθηρίᾳ. οἱ χρήσιμοι δὲ καὶ ἡδεῖς ἐπὶ πλεῖον διαμένουσιν· ἕως γὰρ ἂν πορίζωσιν ἡδονὰς ἢ ὠφελείας ἀλλήλοις. ἐξ ἐναντίων δὲ μάλιστα μὲν δοκεῖ ἡ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον γίνεσθαι φιλία, οἷον πένης πλουσίῳ, ἀμαθὴς εἰδότι· οὗ γὰρ τυγχάνει τις ἐνδεὴς ὤν, τούτου ἐφιέμενος ἀντιδωρεῖται ἄλλο. ἐνταῦθα δ' ἄν τις ἕλκοι καὶ ἐραστὴν καὶ ἐρώμενον, καὶ καλὸν καὶ αἰσχρόν.

ENGLISH

to love more than he is loved. And being loved seems close to being honored, which is exactly what most people aim at. But they seem to choose honor not for its own sake but incidentally. Most people enjoy being honored by those in positions of power because of what they hope for: they think they'll get from them whatever they may need, and so they enjoy the honor as a sign of good treatment to come. Those who desire honor from decent people who know them are aiming to confirm their own opinion of themselves. So they enjoy it because they are confident that they are good, trusting the judgment of those who say so.

But people enjoy being loved for its own sake. So it would seem that being loved is better than being honored, and that friendship is choiceworthy for its own sake. Yet friendship seems to lie in loving rather than in being loved. A sign of this is the delight mothers take in loving. Some mothers give their children to others to raise, and they love them, knowing who they are, but don't seek to be loved in return if both aren't possible. It seems enough for them to see their children doing well, and they love them even if the children, not knowing them, give them nothing of what is due to a mother. Since friendship lies more in loving, and people who love their friends are praised, loving seems to be the excellence of friends. So those in whom this happens according to worth [1159b] are lasting friends, and theirs is a lasting friendship. This is also the way in which unequals can most of all be friends, since in this way they would be made equal.

Equality and likeness are friendship, and above all the likeness of those who are alike in excellence. Being steady in themselves, they also remain steady toward each other. They neither ask for base things nor render base services, but, so to speak, even prevent them; for it is characteristic of good people neither to go wrong themselves nor to let their friends do so. Wicked people, by contrast, have no constancy, since they don't even remain like themselves; they become friends for a short time, enjoying each other's wickedness. Useful and pleasant friends last longer—as long, that is, as they supply each other with pleasures or benefits. Friendship based on usefulness seems most of all to arise from opposites, as between a poor person and a rich one, or an ignorant person and

GREEK

διὸ φαίνονται καὶ οἱ ἐρασταὶ γελοῖοι ἐνίοτε, ἀξιοῦντες φιλεῖσθαι ὡς φιλοῦσιν· ὁμοίως δὴ φιλητοὺς ὄντας ἴσως ἀξιωτέον, μηδὲν δὲ τοιοῦτον ἔχοντας γελοῖον. ἴσως δὲ οὐδ' ἐφίεται τὸ ἐναντίον τοῦ ἐναντίου καθ' αὑτό, ἀλλὰ κατὰ συμβεβηκός, ἡ δ' ὄρεξις τοῦ μέσου ἐστίν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἀγαθόν, οἷον τῷ ξηρῷ οὐχ ὑγρῷ γενέσθαι ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον ἐλθεῖν, καὶ τῷ θερμῷ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ὁμοίως. ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἀφείσθω· καὶ γάρ ἐστιν ἀλλοτριώτερα.

ENGLISH

one who knows: whatever someone happens to lack, he aims at, and gives something else in exchange. One might drag the lover and the beloved in here too, and the beautiful and the ugly.

That is why lovers sometimes appear ridiculous, when they expect to be loved as they love. If they are equally lovable, perhaps they are entitled to expect it; but if they have nothing of the kind, it's ridiculous. Perhaps, though, opposite does not aim at opposite for its own sake but incidentally, and the desire is really for the mean, since that is what is good. For the dry, for example, the good is not to become wet but to arrive at the mean, and similarly for the hot and everything else. But let's set these questions aside, since they are rather foreign to our subject.

FRIENDSHIP, JUSTICE AND COMMUNITY

Aristotle links friendship and justice to the communities in which people live together.

GREEK

ἔοικε δέ, καθάπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴρηται, περὶ ταὐτὰ καὶ ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς εἶναι ἥ τε φιλία καὶ τὸ δίκαιον. ἐν ἁπάσῃ γὰρ κοινωνίᾳ δοκεῖ τι δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ φιλία δέ· προσαγορεύουσι γοῦν ὡς φίλους τοὺς σύμπλους καὶ τοὺς συστρατιώτας, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις κοινωνίαις. καθ' ὅσον δὲ κοινωνοῦσιν, ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν ἐστι φιλία· καὶ γὰρ τὸ δίκαιον. καὶ ἡ παροιμία κοινὰ τὰ φίλων, ὀρθῶς· ἐν κοινωνίᾳ γὰρ ἡ φιλία. ἔστι δ' ἀδελφοῖς μὲν καὶ ἑταίροις πάντα κοινά, τοῖς δ' ἄλλοις ἀφωρισμένα, καὶ τοῖς μὲν πλείω τοῖς δ' ἐλάττω· καὶ γὰρ τῶν φιλιῶν αἱ μὲν μᾶλλον αἱ δ' ἧττον.

διαφέρει δὲ καὶ τὰ δίκαια· 1160a οὐ γὰρ ταὐτὰ γονεῦσι πρὸς τέκνα καὶ ἀδελφοῖς πρὸς ἀλλήλους, οὐδ' ἑταίροις καὶ πολίταις, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων φιλιῶν. ἕτερα δὴ καὶ τὰ ἄδικα πρὸς ἑκάστους τούτων, καὶ αὔξησιν λαμβάνει τῷ μᾶλλον πρὸς φίλους εἶναι, οἷον χρήματα ἀποστερῆσαι ἑταῖρον δεινότερον ἢ πολίτην, καὶ μὴ βοηθῆσαι ἀδελφῷ ἢ ὀθνείῳ, καὶ πατάξαι πατέρα ἢ ὁντινοῦν ἄλλον. αὔξεσθαι δὲ πέφυκεν ἅμα τῇ φιλίᾳ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον, ὡς ἐν τοῖς αὐτοῖς ὄντα καὶ ἐπ' ἴσον διήκοντα.

ENGLISH

It seems, as was said at the beginning, that friendship and justice are concerned with the same things and found between the same people. In every community there seems to be some form of justice, and friendship too. At any rate, people address their fellow voyagers and fellow soldiers as friends, and likewise those in other communities. However far their community extends, so far does their friendship, since so far too does what is just between them. And the proverb "friends' things are common" is right, since friendship lies in community. Brothers and comrades have everything in common, while others hold certain defined things in common, some more and some less; for friendships too are some more so and some less.

What is just differs too. 1160a It isn't the same for parents toward children as for brothers toward each other, nor for comrades as for fellow citizens, and similarly with the other friendships. So the wrongs done to each of these are different as well, and they become graver the closer the friendship. It is more terrible, for example, to defraud a comrade of money than a fellow citizen, to fail to help a brother than a stranger, and to strike one's father than anyone else. It is natural for what is just to increase along with friendship, since they are found between the same people and extend equally far.

1160a

GREEK

αἱ δὲ κοινωνίαι πᾶσαι μορίοις ἐοίκασι τῆς πολιτικῆς· συμπορεύονται γὰρ ἐπί τινι συμφέροντι, καὶ ποριζόμενοί τι τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον· καὶ ἡ πολιτικὴ δὲ κοινωνία τοῦ συμφέροντος χάριν δοκεῖ καὶ ἐξ ἀρχῆς συνελθεῖν καὶ διαμένειν· τούτου γὰρ καὶ οἱ νομοθέται στοχάζονται, καὶ δίκαιόν φασιν εἶναι τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον. αἱ μὲν οὖν ἄλλαι κοινωνίαι κατὰ μέρη τοῦ συμφέροντος ἐφίενται, οἷον πλωτῆρες μὲν τοῦ κατὰ τὸν πλοῦν πρὸς ἐργασίαν χρημάτων ἤ τι τοιοῦτον, συστρατιῶται δὲ τοῦ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον, εἴτε χρημάτων εἴτε νίκης ἢ πόλεως ὀρεγόμενοι, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ φυλέται καὶ δημόται. ἔνιαι δὲ τῶν κοινωνιῶν δι' ἡδονὴν δοκοῦσι γίνεσθαι, θιασωτῶν καὶ ἐρανιστῶν· αὗται γὰρ θυσίας ἕνεκα καὶ συνουσίας.

ENGLISH

All communities seem to be parts of the political community. People band together for some advantage, to provide something they need for life; and the political community too seems both to have come together at the beginning and to persist for the sake of advantage. This is what lawgivers aim at, and they call just what is to the common advantage. The other communities aim at advantage in part: sailors at what concerns the voyage, with a view to making money or something of the sort; fellow soldiers at what concerns war, whether they are after money or victory or a city; and similarly fellow tribesmen and fellow demesmen. Some communities seem to arise for the sake of pleasure—those of religious guilds and dining clubs, which exist for the sake of sacrifice and companionship.[4]

πᾶσαι δ' αὗται ὑπὸ τὴν πολιτικὴν ἐοίκασιν εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ τοῦ παρόντος συμφέροντος ἡ πολιτικὴ ἐφίεται, ἀλλ' εἰς ἅπαντα τὸν βίον θυσίας τε ποιοῦντες καὶ περὶ ταύτας συνόδους, τιμάς τε ἀπονέμοντες τοῖς θεοῖς, καὶ αὑτοῖς ἀναπαύσεις πορίζοντες μεθ' ἡδονῆς. αἱ γὰρ ἀρχαῖαι θυσίαι καὶ σύνοδοι φαίνονται γίνεσθαι μετὰ τὰς τῶν καρπῶν συγκομιδὰς οἷον ἀπαρχαί· μάλιστα γὰρ ἐν τούτοις ἐσχόλαζον τοῖς καιροῖς. πᾶσαι δὴ φαίνονται αἱ κοινωνίαι μόρια τῆς πολιτικῆς εἶναι· ἀκολουθήσουσι δὲ αἱ τοιαῦται φιλίαι ταῖς τοιαύταις κοινωνίαις.

But all these seem to fall under the political community, since the political community aims not at the advantage of the moment but at what concerns the whole of life—people making sacrifices and holding gatherings around them, paying honors to the gods and providing themselves with relaxation and pleasure. For the ancient sacrifices and gatherings appear to have taken place after the harvest, as a kind of offering of first fruits, since that was the season when people had the most leisure. All communities, then, appear to be parts of the political community, and the particular kinds of friendship will correspond to the particular kinds of community.

CONSTITUTIONS AND HOUSEHOLDS

Aristotle compares constitutions and their corruptions with relations within the household.

GREEK

πολιτείας δ' ἐστὶν εἴδη τρία, ἴσαι δὲ καὶ παρεκβάσεις, οἷον φθοραὶ τούτων. εἰσὶ δ' αἱ μὲν πολιτεῖαι βασιλεία τε καὶ ἀριστοκρατία, τρίτη δὲ ἀπὸ τιμημάτων, ἣν τιμοκρατικὴν λέγειν οἰκεῖον φαίνεται, πολιτείαν δ' αὐτὴν εἰώθασιν οἱ πλεῖστοι καλεῖν. τούτων δὲ βελτίστη μὲν ἡ βασιλεία, χειρίστη δ' ἡ τιμοκρατία. παρέκβασις δὲ βασιλείας μὲν τυραννίς· 1160b ἄμφω γὰρ μοναρχίαι, διαφέρουσι δὲ πλεῖστον· ὁ μὲν γὰρ τύραννος τὸ αὑτῷ συμφέρον σκοπεῖ, ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων. οὐ γάρ ἐστι βασιλεὺς ὁ μὴ αὐτάρκης καὶ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ὑπερέχων· ὁ δὲ

ENGLISH

There are three kinds of constitution, and an equal number of deviations—corruptions, as it were, of these. The constitutions are kingship and aristocracy, and a third based on property assessments, which it seems fitting to call timocratic, though most people usually call it simply "polity." Of these the best is kingship and the worst timocracy. The deviation from kingship is tyranny. 1160b Both are monarchies, but they differ enormously: the tyrant looks to his own advantage, the king to that of

4 Tribes and demes were civic subdivisions of Athens; religious guilds and dining clubs were private associations whose members met for worship and shared meals.

GREEK

ENGLISH

τοιοῦτος οὐδενὸς προσδεῖται· τὰ ὠφέλιμα οὖν αὐτῷ μὲν οὐκ ἂν σκοποίη, τοῖς δ' ἀρχομένοις· ὁ γὰρ μὴ τοιοῦτος κληρωτὸς ἄν τις εἴη βασιλεύς. ἡ δὲ τυραννὶς ἐξ ἐναντίας ταύτῃ· τὸ γὰρ ἑαυτῷ ἀγαθὸν διώκει.

his subjects. For no one is a king who is not self-sufficient and superior in all good things, and such a person needs nothing further; so he would not look to what benefits himself but to what benefits his subjects. A king who wasn't like that would be a king chosen by lot, so to speak. Tyranny is the opposite of this, since the tyrant pursues his own good.[5]

1160b καὶ φανερώτερον ἐπὶ ταύτης ὅτι χειρίστη· κάκιστον δὲ τὸ ἐναντίον τῷ βελτίστῳ. μεταβαίνει δ' ἐκ βασιλείας εἰς τυραννίδα· φαυλότης γάρ ἐστι μοναρχίας ἡ τυραννίς, ὁ δὲ μοχθηρὸς βασιλεὺς τύραννος γίνεται. ἐξ ἀριστοκρατίας δὲ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν κακίᾳ τῶν ἀρχόντων, οἳ νέμουσι τὰ τῆς πόλεως παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν, καὶ πάντα ἢ τὰ πλεῖστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ τὰς ἀρχὰς ἀεὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς, περὶ πλείστου ποιούμενοι τὸ πλουτεῖν· ὀλίγοι δὴ ἄρχουσι καὶ μοχθηροὶ ἀντὶ τῶν ἐπιεικεστάτων. ἐκ δὲ τιμοκρατίας εἰς δημοκρατίαν· σύνοροι γάρ εἰσιν αὗται· πλήθους γὰρ βούλεται καὶ ἡ τιμοκρατία εἶναι, καὶ ἴσοι πάντες οἱ ἐν τῷ τιμήματι. ἥκιστα δὲ μοχθηρόν ἐστιν ἡ δημοκρατία· ἐπὶ μικρὸν γὰρ παρεκβαίνει τὸ τῆς πολιτείας εἶδος. μεταβάλλουσι μὲν οὖν μάλισθ' οὕτως αἱ πολιτεῖαι· ἐλάχιστον γὰρ οὕτω καὶ ῥᾷστα μεταβαίνουσιν.

And it is more evident in the case of tyranny that it is the worst, since the opposite of the best is the worst. Kingship changes into tyranny, since tyranny is the degenerate form of monarchy, and a bad king becomes a tyrant. Aristocracy changes into oligarchy through the vice of the rulers, who distribute what belongs to the city contrary to worth—all or most of the good things to themselves, and offices always to the same people—setting the highest value on being rich. So the rulers are few, and bad, instead of the most decent. Timocracy changes into democracy, since these border on each other: timocracy too aims to be rule by the many, and all who meet the property assessment are equal. Democracy is the least bad, since it deviates only slightly from the form of polity. These, then, are the ways in which constitutions most often change, since in these ways the change is smallest and easiest.

ὁμοιώματα δ' αὐτῶν καὶ οἷον παραδείγματα λάβοι τις ἂν καὶ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίαις. ἡ μὲν γὰρ πατρὸς πρὸς υἱεῖς κοινωνία βασιλείας ἔχει σχῆμα· τῶν τέκνων γὰρ τῷ πατρὶ μέλει· ἐντεῦθεν δὲ καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν Δία πατέρα προσαγορεύει· πατρικὴ γὰρ ἀρχὴ βούλεται ἡ βασιλεία εἶναι. ἐν Πέρσαις δ' ἡ τοῦ πατρὸς τυραννική· χρῶνται γὰρ ὡς δούλοις τοῖς υἱέσιν. τυραννικὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ δεσπότου πρὸς δούλους· τὸ γὰρ τοῦ δεσπότου συμφέρον ἐν αὐτῇ πράττεται. αὕτη μὲν οὖν ὀρθὴ φαίνεται, ἡ Περσικὴ δ' ἡμαρτημένη· τῶν διαφερόντων γὰρ αἱ ἀρχαὶ διάφοροι. ἀνδρὸς δὲ καὶ γυναικὸς ἀριστοκρατικὴ φαίνεται· κατ' ἀξίαν γὰρ ὁ ἀνὴρ ἄρχει, καὶ περὶ ταῦτα ἃ δεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα· ὅσα δὲ γυναικὶ ἁρμόζει, ἐκείνῃ ἀποδίδωσιν.

One can find likenesses of these, patterns as it were, in households too. The community of a father with his sons has the shape of kingship, since the father cares for his children. That is why Homer calls Zeus "father": kingship aims to be paternal rule. Among the Persians, however, a father's rule is tyrannical, since they treat their sons as slaves. The rule of a master over slaves is tyrannical too, since it is the master's advantage that is achieved in it. This latter seems to be correct, but the Persian kind mistaken, since different people call for different kinds of rule. The community of husband and wife seems aristocratic: the man rules according to worth, and in the matters in which a man should, and whatever suits a woman he hands over to her.

ἁπάντων δὲ κυριεύων ὁ ἀνὴρ εἰς ὀλιγαρχίαν μεθίστησιν· παρὰ τὴν ἀξίαν γὰρ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ, καὶ οὐχ ᾗ ἀμείνων. 1161a ἐνίοτε δὲ ἄρχουσιν αἱ γυναῖκες ἐπίκληροι οὖσαι· οὐ δὴ γίνονται κατ' ἀρετὴν αἱ ἀρχαί, ἀλλὰ διὰ πλοῦτον καὶ

When the man controls everything, he changes it into an oligarchy, since he does so contrary to worth and not insofar as he is better. 1161a Sometimes wives rule because they are heiresses; then

5 "Polity" translates *politeia*, the Greek word for "constitution" in general, which was also used as the name of this particular form.

GREEK	ENGLISH
δύναμιν, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς ὀλιγαρχίαις. τιμοκρατικῇ δ' ἔοικεν ἡ τῶν ἀδελφῶν· ἴσοι γάρ, πλὴν ἐφ' ὅσον ταῖς ἡλικίαις διαλλάττουσιν· διόπερ ἂν πολὺ ταῖς ἡλικίαις διαφέρωσιν, οὐκέτι ἀδελφικὴ γίνεται ἡ φιλία. δημοκρατία δὲ μάλιστα μὲν ἐν ταῖς ἀδεσπότοις τῶν οἰκήσεων (ἐνταῦθα γὰρ πάντες ἐξ ἴσου), καὶ ἐν αἷς ἀσθενὴς ὁ ἄρχων καὶ ἑκάστῳ ἐξουσία.	rule doesn't go by excellence but by wealth and power, just as in oligarchies. The community of brothers is like timocracy, since they are equal except insofar as they differ in age; that is why, if they differ greatly in age, the friendship is no longer brotherly. Democracy is found most of all in households without a master (for there everyone is on an equal footing), and in those where the ruler is weak and everyone may do as he likes.[6]
1161a καθ' ἑκάστην δὲ τῶν πολιτειῶν φιλία φαίνεται, ἐφ' ὅσον καὶ τὸ δίκαιον, βασιλεῖ μὲν πρὸς τοὺς βασιλευομένους ἐν ὑπεροχῇ εὐεργεσίας· εὖ γὰρ ποιεῖ τοὺς βασιλευομένους, εἴπερ ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἐπιμελεῖται αὐτῶν, ἵν' εὖ πράττωσιν, ὥσπερ νομεὺς προβάτων· ὅθεν καὶ Ὅμηρος τὸν Ἀγαμέμνονα ποιμένα λαῶν εἶπεν. τοιαύτη δὲ καὶ ἡ πατρική, διαφέρει δὲ τῷ μεγέθει τῶν εὐεργετημάτων· αἴτιος γὰρ τοῦ εἶναι, δοκοῦντος μεγίστου, καὶ τροφῆς καὶ παιδείας. καὶ τοῖς προγόνοις δὲ ταῦτα προσνέμεται· φύσει τε ἀρχικὸν πατὴρ υἱῶν καὶ πρόγονοι ἐκγόνων καὶ βασιλεὺς βασιλευομένων. ἐν ὑπεροχῇ δὲ αἱ φιλίαι αὗται, διὸ καὶ τιμῶνται οἱ γονεῖς. καὶ τὸ δίκαιον δὴ ἐν τούτοις οὐ ταὐτὸ ἀλλὰ τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ ἡ φιλία.	In each of the constitutions friendship appears to the same extent as justice does. A king's friendship toward his subjects lies in a superiority of benefaction. He does good to his subjects, if, being good, he takes care of them so that they do well, as a shepherd does his sheep; which is why Homer called Agamemnon "shepherd of the people." A father's friendship is of this kind too, but differs in the size of the benefits, since the father is responsible for the child's existence, which is thought the greatest benefit, and for its nurture and education. These things are attributed to ancestors as well. And by nature a father rules his sons, ancestors their descendants, and a king his subjects. These friendships involve superiority, which is also why parents are honored. What is just in these relationships, then, is not the same on both sides but according to worth; for so is the friendship.
καὶ ἀνδρὸς δὲ πρὸς γυναῖκα ἡ αὐτὴ φιλία καὶ ἐν ἀριστοκρατίᾳ· κατ' ἀρετὴν γάρ, καὶ τῷ ἀμείνονι πλέον ἀγαθόν, καὶ τὸ ἁρμόζον ἑκάστῳ· οὕτω δὲ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον. ἡ δὲ τῶν ἀδελφῶν τῇ ἑταιρικῇ ἔοικεν· ἴσοι γὰρ καὶ ἡλικιῶται, οἱ τοιοῦτοι δ' ὁμοπαθεῖς καὶ ὁμοήθεις ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολύ. ἔοικε δὲ ταύτῃ καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὴν τιμοκρατικήν· ἴσοι γὰρ οἱ πολῖται βούλονται καὶ ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι· ἐν μέρει δὴ τὸ ἄρχειν, καὶ ἐξ ἴσου· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἡ φιλία. ἐν δὲ ταῖς παρεκβάσεσιν, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ δίκαιον ἐπὶ μικρόν ἐστιν, οὕτω καὶ ἡ φιλία, καὶ ἥκιστα ἐν τῇ χειρίστῃ· ἐν τυραννίδι γὰρ οὐδὲν ἢ μικρὸν φιλίας.	The friendship of husband toward wife is the same as in an aristocracy. It goes by excellence: more good goes to the better, and to each what suits them; and so it is with what is just as well. The friendship of brothers is like that of comrades, since they are equal and of an age, and such people are for the most part alike in feelings and character. The friendship in a timocracy resembles this, since the citizens aim to be equal and decent; so they rule in turn and on equal terms, and so too with their friendship. In the deviations, just as there is little justice, so there is little friendship, and least of all in the worst: in a tyranny there is no friendship, or little.
ἐν οἷς γὰρ μηδὲν κοινόν ἐστι τῷ ἄρχοντι καὶ ἀρχομένῳ, οὐδὲ φιλία· οὐδὲ γὰρ δίκαιον· οἷον τεχνίτῃ πρὸς ὄργανον καὶ ψυχῇ πρὸς σῶμα καὶ δεσπότῃ πρὸς δοῦλον· 1161b ὠφελεῖται μὲν γὰρ πάντα ταῦτα ὑπὸ τῶν χρωμένων, φιλία δ' οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς τὰ ἄψυχα οὐδὲ δίκαιον. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ πρὸς ἵππον ἢ βοῦν, οὐδὲ πρὸς δοῦλον ᾗ δοῦλος. οὐδὲν	For where ruler and ruled have nothing in common, there is no friendship either, since there is no justice—as between a craftsman and his tool, the soul and the body, a master and his slave. 1161b All of these are benefited by those who use them,

6 An heiress (*epiklēros*) was a daughter with no brothers, through whom the family estate passed to her husband and children.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	γὰρ κοινόν ἐστιν· ὁ γὰρ δοῦλος ἔμψυχον ὄργανον, τὸ δ' ὄργανον ἄψυχος δοῦλος. ᾗ μὲν οὖν δοῦλος, οὐκ ἔστι φιλία πρὸς αὐτόν, ᾗ δ' ἄνθρωπος· δοκεῖ γὰρ εἶναί τι δίκαιον παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ πρὸς πάντα τὸν δυνάμενον κοινωνῆσαι νόμου καὶ συνθήκης· καὶ φιλία δή, καθ' ὅσον ἄνθρωπος.	but there is no friendship toward inanimate things, nor justice. Nor is there toward a horse or an ox, nor toward a slave insofar as he is a slave. For there is nothing in common: a slave is a living tool, and a tool a lifeless slave. Insofar as he is a slave, then, there is no friendship with him, but there is insofar as he is a human being. For there seems to be some justice between every human being and anyone able to share in law and agreement, and so friendship too, to the extent that he is a human being.
1161b	ἐπὶ μικρὸν δὴ καὶ ἐν ταῖς τυραννίσιν αἱ φιλίαι καὶ τὸ δίκαιον, ἐν δὲ ταῖς δημοκρατίαις ἐπὶ πλεῖον· πολλὰ γὰρ τὰ κοινὰ ἴσοις οὖσιν.	So in tyrannies friendship and justice extend only a little way, but in democracies further, since people who are equal have much in common.

FRIENDSHIP AMONG KIN

Aristotle describes friendship among parents, children, siblings, and husband and wife.

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ἐν κοινωνίᾳ μὲν οὖν πᾶσα φιλία ἐστίν, καθάπερ εἴρηται. ἀφορίσειε δ' ἄν τις τήν τε συγγενικὴν καὶ τὴν ἑταιρικήν. αἱ δὲ πολιτικαὶ καὶ φυλετικαὶ καὶ συμπλοϊκαί, καὶ ὅσαι τοιαῦται, κοινωνικαῖς ἐοίκασι μᾶλλον· οἷον γὰρ καθ' ὁμολογίαν τινὰ φαίνονται εἶναι. εἰς ταύτας δὲ τάξειεν ἄν τις καὶ τὴν ξενικήν. καὶ ἡ συγγενικὴ δὲ φαίνεται πολυειδὴς εἶναι, ἠρτῆσθαι δὲ πᾶσα ἐκ τῆς πατρικῆς· οἱ γονεῖς μὲν γὰρ στέργουσι τὰ τέκνα ὡς ἑαυτῶν τι ὄντα, τὰ δὲ τέκνα τοὺς γονεῖς ὡς ἀπ' ἐκείνων τι ὄντα.	All friendship, then, involves community, as has been said. But one might set apart the friendship of kin and that of comrades. The friendships of fellow citizens, fellow tribesmen, fellow voyagers and the like seem more like friendships of community, since they appear to rest on a sort of agreement. Among these one might also place the friendship between host and guest. The friendship of kin, too, seems to take many forms, but all of them depend on the paternal kind. Parents love their children as something of themselves, and children love their parents as something they come from.
	μᾶλλον δ' ἴσασιν οἱ γονεῖς τὰ ἐξ αὐτῶν ἢ τὰ γεννηθέντα ὅτι ἐκ τούτων, καὶ μᾶλλον συνωκείωται τὸ ἀφ' οὗ τῷ γεννηθέντι ἢ τὸ γενόμενον τῷ ποιήσαντι· τὸ γὰρ ἐξ αὐτοῦ οἰκεῖον τῷ ἀφ' οὗ, οἷον ὀδοὺς θρὶξ ὁτιοῦν τῷ ἔχοντι· ἐκείνῳ δ' οὐδὲν τὸ ἀφ' οὗ, ἢ ἧττον. καὶ τῷ πλήθει δὲ τοῦ χρόνου· οἳ μὲν γὰρ εὐθὺς γενόμενα στέργουσιν, τὰ δὲ προελθόντος χρόνου τοὺς γονεῖς, σύνεσιν ἢ αἴσθησιν λαβόντα. ἐκ τούτων δὲ δῆλον καὶ δι' ἃ φιλοῦσι μᾶλλον αἱ μητέρες.	Parents know their offspring better than children know that they come from their parents; and the source is more closely attached to what it generated than the thing produced is to what made it. For what comes from something belongs to its source—a tooth, say, or a hair, or anything else, to the one who has it—whereas the source doesn't belong to what comes from it at all, or less so. The length of time matters too: parents love their children as soon as they are born, but children love their parents only as time goes on, once they have gained understanding or perception. From this it is also clear why mothers love more.
	γονεῖς μὲν οὖν τέκνα φιλοῦσιν ὡς ἑαυτούς (τὰ γὰρ ἐξ αὐτῶν οἷον ἕτεροι αὐτοὶ τῷ κεχωρίσθαι), τέκνα δὲ γονεῖς ὡς ἀπ' ἐκείνων πεφυκότα, ἀδελφοὶ δ' ἀλλήλους τῷ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν πεφυκέναι· ἡ γὰρ πρὸς ἐκεῖνα ταυτότης	Parents, then, love their children as themselves (for what comes from them is a sort of other self, by being separated), children love their parents as

GREEK

ἀλλήλοις ταὐτὸ ποιεῖ· ὅθεν φασὶ ταὐτὸν αἷμα καὶ ῥίζαν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα. εἰσὶ δὴ ταὐτό πως καὶ ἐν διῃρημένοις. μέγα δὲ πρὸς φιλίαν καὶ τὸ σύντροφον καὶ τὸ καθ' ἡλικίαν· ἦλιξ γὰρ ἥλικα, καὶ οἱ συνήθεις ἑταῖροι· διὸ καὶ ἡ ἀδελφικὴ τῇ ἑταιρικῇ ὁμοιοῦται. 1162a ἀνεψιοὶ δὲ καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ συγγενεῖς ἐκ τούτων συνῳκείωνται· τῷ γὰρ ἀπὸ τῶν αὐτῶν εἶναι. γίνονται δ' οἳ μὲν οἰκειότεροι οἳ δ' ἀλλοτριώτεροι τῷ σύνεγγυς ἢ πόρρω τὸν ἀρχηγὸν εἶναι.

ENGLISH

having sprung from them, and brothers love each other by having sprung from the same parents; for their sameness in relation to the parents makes them the same as each other. That's why people speak of "the same blood," "the same root," and so on. They are, then, in a way the same thing, even in separate beings. Being brought up together and being of an age also count for a great deal in friendship: "like age delights in like," and people used to each other become comrades. That is why brotherly friendship resembles the friendship of comrades. 1162a Cousins and other relatives are bound together because of this, since they come from the same forebears. And they become closer or more distant according as the founder of the family is nearer or further off.

1162a ἔστι δ' ἡ μὲν πρὸς γονεῖς φιλία τέκνοις, καὶ ἀνθρώποις πρὸς θεούς, ὡς πρὸς ἀγαθὸν καὶ ὑπερέχον· εὖ γὰρ πεποιήκασι τὰ μέγιστα· τοῦ γὰρ εἶναι καὶ τραφῆναι αἴτιοι, καὶ γενομένοις τοῦ παιδευθῆναι· ἔχει δὲ καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον ἡ τοιαύτη φιλία μᾶλλον τῶν ὀθνείων, ὅσῳ καὶ κοινότερος ὁ βίος αὐτοῖς ἐστίν. ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀδελφικῇ ἅπερ καὶ ἐν τῇ ἑταιρικῇ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐν τοῖς ἐπιεικέσι, καὶ ὅλως ἐν τοῖς ὁμοίοις, ὅσῳ οἰκειότεροι καὶ ἐκ γενετῆς ὑπάρχουσι στέργοντες ἀλλήλους, καὶ ὅσῳ ὁμοηθέστεροι οἱ ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν καὶ σύντροφοι καὶ παιδευθέντες ὁμοίως· καὶ ἡ κατὰ τὸν χρόνον δοκιμασία πλείστη καὶ βεβαιοτάτη. ἀνάλογον δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς τῶν συγγενῶν τὰ φιλικά.

The friendship of children toward parents, like that of human beings toward gods, is friendship toward something good and superior; for they have conferred the greatest benefits. They are responsible for their children's existence and nurture, and, once they are born, for their education. This kind of friendship also has more pleasure and usefulness than friendship with outsiders, to the degree that they share more of their life. Friendship between brothers has the same features as friendship between comrades, and more so when they are decent, and generally when they are alike —to the degree that they are closer and have loved each other from birth, and to the degree that those born of the same parents, brought up together and educated alike, are more similar in character. And in their case the test of time is longest and most reliable. Among other relatives, the elements of friendship are in proportion.

ἀνδρὶ δὲ καὶ γυναικὶ φιλία δοκεῖ κατὰ φύσιν ὑπάρχειν· ἄνθρωπος γὰρ τῇ φύσει συνδυαστικὸν μᾶλλον ἢ πολιτικόν, ὅσῳ πρότερον καὶ ἀναγκαιότερον οἰκία πόλεως, καὶ τεκνοποιία κοινότερον τοῖς ζῴοις. τοῖς μὲν οὖν ἄλλοις ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ἡ κοινωνία ἐστίν, οἱ δ' ἄνθρωποι οὐ μόνον τῆς τεκνοποιίας χάριν συνοικοῦσιν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν εἰς τὸν βίον· εὐθὺς γὰρ διῄρηται τὰ ἔργα, καὶ ἕστιν ἕτερα ἀνδρὸς καὶ γυναικός· ἐπαρκοῦσιν οὖν ἀλλήλοις, εἰς τὸ κοινὸν τιθέντες τὰ ἴδια. διὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ τὸ χρήσιμον εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ τὸ ἡδὺ ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ φιλίᾳ. εἴη δ' ἂν καὶ δι' ἀρετήν, εἰ ἐπιεικεῖς εἶεν· ἔστι γὰρ ἑκατέρου ἀρετή, καὶ χαίροιεν ἂν τῷ τοιούτῳ.

Between husband and wife friendship seems to exist by nature. For a human being is by nature more inclined to live in pairs than in cities, in that the household is prior to the city and more necessary, and producing children is something shared more widely with the animals. In the other animals the community goes only this far, but human beings live together not only for the sake of producing children but also for the needs of life. For the tasks are divided from the start, and those of the man and the woman are different; so they supply each other's needs, putting what is their own into the common stock. For these reasons both usefulness and pleasure seem to be found in this friend-

GREEK	ENGLISH
	ship. It could also be based on excellence, if they are decent, since each has an excellence, and they would delight in that.
σύνδεσμος δὲ τὰ τέκνα δοκεῖ εἶναι· διὸ θᾶττον οἱ ἄτεκνοι διαλύονται· τὰ γὰρ τέκνα κοινὸν ἀγαθὸν ἀμφοῖν, συνέχει δὲ τὸ κοινόν. τὸ δὲ πῶς βιωτέον ἀνδρὶ πρὸς γυναῖκα καὶ ὅλως φίλῳ πρὸς φίλον, οὐδὲν ἕτερον φαίνεται ζητεῖσθαι ἢ πῶς δίκαιον· οὐ γὰρ ταὐτὸν φαίνεται τῷ φίλῳ πρὸς τὸν φίλον καὶ τὸν ὀθνεῖον καὶ τὸν ἑταῖρον καὶ τὸν συμφοιτητήν.	Children seem to be a bond, which is why childless couples separate more quickly: children are a good common to both, and what is common holds people together. The question of how a man should live with his wife, and generally a friend with a friend, seems to be no different from the question of how it is just for them to live. For what is just does not seem to be the same toward a friend as toward a stranger, a comrade, or a schoolfellow.

COMPLAINTS BETWEEN FRIENDS

Aristotle explains why complaints arise in friendships of utility and how benefits should be repaid.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τριττῶν δ' οὐσῶν φιλιῶν, καθάπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴρηται, καὶ καθ' ἑκάστην τῶν μὲν ἐν ἰσότητι φίλων ὄντων τῶν δὲ καθ' ὑπεροχήν (καὶ γὰρ ὁμοίως ἀγαθοὶ φίλοι γίνονται καὶ ἀμείνων χείρονι, 1162b ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἡδεῖς καὶ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον, ἰσάζοντες ταῖς ὠφελείαις καὶ διαφέροντες), τοὺς ἴσους μὲν κατ' ἰσότητα δεῖ τῷ φιλεῖν καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἰσάζειν, τοὺς δ' ἀνίσους τὸ ἀνάλογον ταῖς ὑπεροχαῖς ἀποδιδόναι. γίνεται δὲ τὰ ἐγκλήματα καὶ αἱ μέμψεις ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὸ χρήσιμον φιλίᾳ ἢ μόνῃ ἢ μάλιστα, εὐλόγως. οἱ μὲν γὰρ δι' ἀρετὴν φίλοι ὄντες εὖ δρᾶν ἀλλήλους προθυμοῦνται (τοῦτο γὰρ ἀρετῆς καὶ φιλίας), πρὸς τοῦτο δ' ἀμιλλωμένων οὐκ ἔστιν ἐγκλήματα οὐδὲ μάχαι· τὸν γὰρ φιλοῦντα καὶ εὖ ποιοῦντα οὐδεὶς δυσχεραίνει, ἀλλ' ἂν ᾖ χαρίεις, ἀμύνεται εὖ δρῶν.	There are three kinds of friendship, as was said at the beginning, and in each kind some are friends on equal terms and others on terms of superiority. For two equally good people become friends, but so do a better and a worse; 1162b and likewise with pleasant friends, and with friends for usefulness, who may be equal in the benefits they give or differ. Those who are equal must maintain equality by loving equally and in everything else, while those who are unequal must render what is proportionate to the superiority. Complaints and reproaches arise in friendship based on usefulness, either only or most of all, and understandably so. For those who are friends because of excellence are eager to do each other good, since this is characteristic of excellence and of friendship; and when they are competing in this, there are no complaints or quarrels. No one is annoyed with someone who loves him and does him good; if he is gracious, he retaliates by doing good in return.
1162b ὁ δ' ὑπερβάλλων, τυγχάνων οὗ ἐφίεται, οὐκ ἂν ἐγκαλοίη τῷ φίλῳ· ἕκαστος γὰρ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὀρέγεται. οὐ πάνυ δ' οὐδ' ἐν τοῖς δι' ἡδονήν· ἅμα γὰρ ἀμφοῖν γίνεται οὗ ὀρέγονται, εἰ τῷ συνδιάγειν χαίρουσιν· γελοῖος δ' ἂν φαίνοιτο καὶ ὁ ἐγκαλῶν τῷ μὴ τέρποντι, ἐξὸν μὴ συνημερεύειν. ἡ δὲ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἐγκληματική· ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ γὰρ χρώμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἀεὶ τοῦ πλείονος δέονται, καὶ ἔλαττον ἔχειν οἴονται τοῦ προσήκοντος, καὶ μέμφονται ὅτι οὐχ ὅσων δέονται τοσούτων τυγχάνουσιν ἄξιοι ὄντες· οἱ δ' εὖ ποιοῦντες οὐ δύνανται ἐπαρκεῖν τοσαῦτα ὅσων οἱ πάσχοντες δέονται. ἔοικε δέ, καθάπερ τὸ	And the one who outdoes the other, since he is getting what he aims at, would not complain against his friend, since each desires the good. Nor are complaints very common in friendships based on pleasure, since both get what they desire at once, if they enjoy spending time together; and someone who complained that another didn't please him would look ridiculous, since he is free not to spend his days with him. But friendship based on usefulness is full of complaints. Since they deal with each other for the sake of benefit,

GREEK	ENGLISH
δίκαιόν ἐστι διττόν, τὸ μὲν ἄγραφον τὸ δὲ κατὰ νόμον, καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸ χρήσιμον φιλίας ἡ μὲν ἠθικὴ ἡ δὲ νομικὴ εἶναι.	they always want more, think they have less than is due, and blame the other because they don't get as much as they need and deserve; while those doing the good can't supply as much as the recipients need. It seems that, just as what is just is of two kinds, unwritten and legal, so friendship based on usefulness is of two kinds, one based on character and the other legal.
γίνεται οὖν τὰ ἐγκλήματα μάλισθ' ὅταν μὴ κατὰ τὴν αὐτὴν συναλλάξωσι καὶ διαλύωνται. ἔστι δ' ἡ νομικὴ μὲν ἡ ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς, ἡ μὲν πάμπαν ἀγοραία ἐκ χειρὸς εἰς χεῖρα, ἡ δὲ ἐλευθεριωτέρα εἰς χρόνον, καθ' ὁμολογίαν δὲ τί ἀντὶ τίνος. δῆλον δ' ἐν ταύτῃ τὸ ὀφείλημα κοὐκ ἀμφίλογον, φιλικὸν δὲ τὴν ἀναβολὴν ἔχει· διόπερ ἐνίοις οὐκ εἰσὶ τούτων δίκαι, ἀλλ' οἴονται δεῖν στέργειν τοὺς κατὰ πίστιν συναλλάξαντας. ἡ δ' ἠθικὴ οὐκ ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς, ἀλλ' ὡς φίλῳ δωρεῖται ἢ ὁτιδήποτε ἄλλο· κομίζεσθαι δὲ ἀξιοῖ τὸ ἴσον ἢ πλέον, ὡς οὐ δεδωκὼς ἀλλὰ χρήσας· οὐχ ὁμοίως δὲ συναλλάξας καὶ διαλυόμενος ἐγκαλέσει.	So complaints arise most of all when people do not conclude the relationship in the same spirit in which they entered into it. The legal kind is on stated terms. One version is purely commercial, hand to hand; the other is more generous, allowing time, but still with an agreement about what is given for what. In this kind the debt is clear and not in dispute, but the delay has something friendly about it. That is why in some places there are no lawsuits over such things, and people think that those who have made a deal on trust must be content with it. The kind based on character is not on stated terms: one gives a gift, or whatever else it may be, as to a friend. But one expects to get back as much or more, as if one had not given but lent; and if one does not end the relationship on the terms on which one entered it, one will complain.
τοῦτο δὲ συμβαίνει διὰ τὸ βούλεσθαι μὲν πάντας ἢ τοὺς πλείστους τὰ καλά, προαιρεῖσθαι δὲ τὰ ὠφέλιμα· καλὸν δὲ τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν μὴ ἵνα ἀντιπάθῃ, [1163a] ὠφέλιμον δὲ τὸ εὐεργετεῖσθαι. δυναμένῳ δὴ ἀνταποδοτέον τὴν ἀξίαν ὧν ἔπαθεν καὶ ἑκόντι (ἄκοντα γὰρ φίλον οὐ ποιητέον· ὡς δὴ διαμαρτόντα ἐν τῇ ἀρχῇ καὶ εὖ παθόντα ὑφ' οὗ οὐκ ἔδει—οὐ γὰρ ὑπὸ φίλου, οὐδὲ δι' αὐτὸ τοῦτο δρῶντος—καθάπερ οὖν ἐπὶ ῥητοῖς εὐεργετηθέντα διαλυτέον)· καὶ †ὁμολογήσαι δ'† ἂν δυνάμενος ἀποδώσειν· ἀδυνατοῦντα δ' οὐδ' ὁ διδοὺς ἠξίωσεν ἄν. ὥστ' εἰ δυνατόν, ἀποδοτέον. ἐν ἀρχῇ δ' ἐπισκεπτέον ὑφ' οὗ εὐεργετεῖται καὶ ἐπὶ τίνι, ὅπως ἐπὶ τούτοις ὑπομένῃ ἢ μή. ἀμφισβήτησιν δ' ἔχει πότερα δεῖ τῇ τοῦ παθόντος ὠφελείᾳ μετρεῖν καὶ πρὸς ταύτην ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν, ἢ τῇ τοῦ δράσαντος εὐεργεσίᾳ.	This happens because all people, or most, wish for what is fine but decide on what is beneficial; and it is fine to do good without aiming to be repaid, [1163a] but beneficial to receive benefits. So one should, if able, repay the value of what one has received, and do so willingly (for one should not make a man one's friend against his will). One should settle up as though one had made a mistake at the start and been benefited by someone one should not have been—not by a friend, nor by someone doing it for its own sake—and so one should settle just as though one had been benefited on stated terms. And one would agree to repay if able; if one were unable, not even the giver would have expected it. So one should repay if possible. At the start one should consider by whom one is being benefited, and on what terms, so as to accept on those terms or not. It is disputed whether one should measure by the benefit to the recipient and make the return on that basis, or by the benefaction of the giver.
1163a οἱ μὲν γὰρ παθόντες τοιαῦτά φασι λαβεῖν παρὰ τῶν εὐεργετῶν ἃ μικρὰ ἦν ἐκείνοις καὶ ἐξῆν παρ' ἑτέρων	Recipients say that what they got from their benefactors was a small thing to them and could have

GREEK

λαβεῖν, κατασμικρίζοντες· οἱ δ' ἀνάπαλιν τὰ μέγιστα τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἃ παρ' ἄλλων οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ἐν κινδύνοις ἢ τοιαύταις χρείαις. ἆρ' οὖν διὰ μὲν τὸ χρήσιμον τῆς φιλίας οὔσης ἡ τοῦ παθόντος ὠφέλεια μέτρον ἐστίν; οὗτος γὰρ ὁ δεόμενος, καὶ ἐπαρκεῖ αὐτῷ ὡς κομιούμενος τὴν ἴσην· τοσαύτη οὖν γεγένηται ἡ ἐπικουρία ὅσον οὗτος ὠφέληται, καὶ ἀποδοτέον δὴ αὐτῷ ὅσον ἐπηύρετο, ἢ καὶ πλέον· κάλλιον γάρ. ἐν δὲ ταῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐγκλήματα μὲν οὐκ ἔστιν, μέτρῳ δ' ἔοικεν ἡ τοῦ δράσαντος προαίρεσις· τῆς ἀρετῆς γὰρ καὶ τοῦ ἤθους ἐν τῇ προαιρέσει τὸ κύριον.

ENGLISH

been had from others, belittling it. The givers, on the contrary, say it was the greatest of the things they had, that it couldn't have been had from others, and that it was given in danger or in some such need. Since the friendship is based on usefulness, isn't the recipient's benefit the measure? He is the one in need, and the other supplies him expecting to receive an equal return. So the help has been as great as the benefit he received, and he should repay as much as he gained, or even more, since that is finer. In friendships based on excellence there are no complaints, and the giver's decision seems to be the measure, since what is decisive in excellence and character lies in decision.

διαφέρονται δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς καθ' ὑπεροχὴν φιλίαις· ἀξιοῖ γὰρ ἑκάτερος πλέον ἔχειν, ὅταν δὲ τοῦτο γίνηται, διαλύεται ἡ φιλία. οἴεται γὰρ ὅ τε βελτίων προσήκειν αὐτῷ πλέον ἔχειν· τῷ γὰρ ἀγαθῷ νέμεσθαι πλέον· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ ὠφελιμώτερος· ἀχρεῖον γὰρ ὄντα οὗ φασι δεῖν ἴσον ἔχειν· λειτουργίαν τε γὰρ γίνεσθαι καὶ οὐ φιλίαν, εἰ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν ἔργων ἔσται τὰ ἐκ τῆς φιλίας. οἴονται γάρ, καθάπερ ἐν χρημάτων κοινωνίᾳ πλεῖον λαμβάνουσιν οἱ συμβαλλόμενοι πλεῖον, οὕτω δεῖν καὶ ἐν τῇ φιλίᾳ. ὁ δ' ἐνδεὴς καὶ ὁ χείρων ἀνάπαλιν· φίλου γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ εἶναι τὸ ἐπαρκεῖν τοῖς ἐνδεέσιν· τί γάρ, φασίν, ὄφελος σπουδαίῳ ἢ δυνάστῃ φίλον εἶναι, μηδέν γε μέλλοντα ἀπολαύειν;

People also fall out in friendships based on superiority, since each thinks he deserves more, and when this happens the friendship dissolves. The better person thinks he ought to have more, since more should be allotted to the good; and so does the more useful person, since, they say, someone useless shouldn't get an equal share: it becomes a public service and not a friendship if what comes from the friendship doesn't match the worth of what each does. For they think that, just as in a financial partnership those who contribute more take more, so it should be in friendship too. But the needy and inferior person thinks the opposite: it is the part of a good friend to help those in need. What's the use, they say, of being friends with an excellent or powerful person if you're going to get nothing out of it?

1163b ἔοικε δ' οὖν ἑκάτερος ὀρθῶς ἀξιοῦν, καὶ δεῖν ἑκατέρῳ πλέον νέμειν ἐκ τῆς φιλίας, οὐ τοῦ αὐτοῦ δέ, ἀλλὰ τῷ μὲν ὑπερέχοντι τιμῆς τῷ δ' ἐνδεεῖ κέρδους· τῆς μὲν γὰρ ἀρετῆς καὶ τῆς εὐεργεσίας ἡ τιμὴ γέρας, τῆς δ' ἐνδείας ἐπικουρία τὸ κέρδος. οὕτω δ' ἔχειν τοῦτο καὶ ἐν ταῖς πολιτείαις φαίνεται· οὐ γὰρ τιμᾶται ὁ μηδὲν ἀγαθὸν τῷ κοινῷ πορίζων· τὸ κοινὸν γὰρ δίδοται τῷ τὸ κοινὸν εὐεργετοῦντι, ἡ τιμὴ δὲ κοινόν. οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἅμα χρηματίζεσθαι ἀπὸ τῶν κοινῶν καὶ τιμᾶσθαι. ἐν πᾶσι γὰρ τὸ ἔλαττον οὐδεὶς ὑπομένει· τῷ δὴ περὶ χρήματα ἐλαττουμένῳ τιμὴν ἀπονέμουσι καὶ τῷ δωροδόκῳ χρήματα· τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν γὰρ ἐπανισοῖ καὶ σῴζει τὴν φιλίαν, καθάπερ εἴρηται.

It seems, then, that each is right in what he claims, and that each should be given more from the friendship—but not more of the same thing: the superior should get more honor, and the needy more gain. For honor is the prize of excellence and beneficence, while gain is the help that meets need. This seems to be how things are in constitutions too. Someone who provides nothing good to the community is not honored, since what is common is given to the one who benefits the community, and honor is something common. One cannot make money from the common funds and be honored at the same time. For no one puts up with having less in everything; so to the person who loses out in money they allot honor, and to the one who wants gifts, money. For what accords with worth equalizes and preserves the friendship, as has been said.

GREEK

οὕτω δὴ καὶ τοῖς ἀνίσοις ὁμιλητέον, καὶ τῷ εἰς χρήματα ὠφελουμένῳ ἢ εἰς ἀρετὴν τιμὴν ἀνταποδοτέον, ἀποδιδόντα τὰ ἐνδεχόμενα. τὸ δυνατὸν γὰρ ἡ φιλία ἐπιζητεῖ, οὐ τὸ κατ' ἀξίαν· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐν πᾶσι, καθάπερ ἐν ταῖς πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τιμαῖς καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς· οὐδεὶς γὰρ τὴν ἀξίαν ποτ' ἂν ἀποδοίη, εἰς δύναμιν δὲ ὁ θεραπεύων ἐπιεικὴς εἶναι δοκεῖ. διὸ κἂν δόξειεν οὐκ ἐξεῖναι υἱῷ πατέρα ἀπείπασθαι, πατρὶ δ' υἱόν· ὀφείλοντα γὰρ ἀποδοτέον, οὐδὲν δὲ ποιήσας ἄξιον τῶν ὑπηργμένων δέδρακεν, ὥστ' ἀεὶ ὀφείλει. οἷς δ' ὀφείλεται, ἐξουσία ἀφεῖναι· καὶ τῷ πατρὶ δή. ἅμα δ' ἴσως οὐδείς ποτ' ἂν ἀποστῆναι δοκεῖ μὴ ὑπερβάλλοντος μοχθηρίᾳ· χωρὶς γὰρ τῆς φυσικῆς φιλίας τὴν ἐπικουρίαν ἀνθρωπικὸν μὴ διωθεῖσθαι.

ENGLISH

This is how one should deal with unequals too: someone who is benefited in money or in excellence should repay with honor, repaying what he can. For friendship seeks what is possible, not what accords with worth, since that isn't possible in every case—as with the honors paid to the gods and to parents. No one could ever repay what they deserve, but someone who serves them as far as he can is thought to be decent. That is why it would seem that a son may not disown his father, though a father may disown his son. One who owes must repay, and a son has done nothing worthy of what he has received, so he is always in debt. But those to whom something is owed are free to release the debtor, and so a father is too. At the same time, perhaps no one would ever part from his son unless the son were exceedingly wicked; for, apart from natural friendship, it is only human not to spurn the help a son would give.

τῷ δὲ φευκτὸν ἢ οὐ σπουδαστὸν τὸ ἐπαρκεῖν, μοχθηρῷ ὄντι· εὖ πάσχειν γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ βούλονται, τὸ δὲ ποιεῖν φεύγουσιν ὡς ἀλυσιτελές. περὶ μὲν οὖν τούτων ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω.

But for the son, if he is wicked, helping his father is something to be avoided, or at least not something to be eager about. For most people wish to receive benefits but avoid conferring them as unprofitable. So much, then, for these matters.

Book IX

Friendship, continued
Aristotle discusses obligations between friends, self-love, and why the happy person needs friends.

GREEK

ἐν πάσαις δὲ ταῖς ἀνομοιοειδέσι φιλίαις τὸ ἀνάλογον ἰσάζει καὶ σῴζει τὴν φιλίαν, καθάπερ εἴρηται, οἷον καὶ ἐν τῇ πολιτικῇ τῷ σκυτοτόμῳ ἀντὶ τῶν ὑποδημάτων ἀμοιβὴ γίνεται κατ' ἀξίαν, καὶ τῷ ὑφάντῃ καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς. 1164a ἐνταῦθα μὲν οὖν πεπόρισται κοινὸν μέτρον τὸ νόμισμα, καὶ πρὸς τοῦτο δὴ πάντα ἀναφέρεται καὶ τούτῳ μετρεῖται· ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐρωτικῇ ἐνίοτε μὲν ὁ ἐραστὴς ἐγκαλεῖ ὅτι ὑπερφιλῶν οὐκ ἀντιφιλεῖται, οὐδὲν ἔχων φιλητόν, εἰ οὕτως ἔτυχεν, πολλάκις δ' ὁ ἐρώμενος ὅτι πρότερον ἐπαγγελλόμενος πάντα νῦν οὐδὲν ἐπιτελεῖ. συμβαίνει δὲ τὰ τοιαῦτα, ἐπειδὰν ὃ μὲν δι' ἡδονὴν τὸν ἐρώμενον φιλῇ, ὃ δὲ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον τὸν ἐραστήν, ταῦτα δὲ μὴ ἀμφοῖν ὑπάρχῃ.

ENGLISH

In all friendships between partners of unlike kinds, it is proportion that equalizes and preserves the friendship, as has been said. In the political kind, for example, the shoemaker gets a return for his shoes according to worth, and so do the weaver and the rest. 1164a Here, then, a common measure has been provided, namely money, and everything is referred to it and measured by it. But in love affairs the lover sometimes complains that his surpassing love is not returned, though he may, as it happens, have nothing lovable about him; while the beloved often complains that the lover, who once promised everything, now delivers nothing. Such things happen when the lover loves the beloved for pleasure and the beloved loves the lover for usefulness, and they don't both have what is wanted.

1164a διὰ ταῦτα γὰρ τῆς φιλίας οὔσης διάλυσις γίνεται, ἐπειδὰν μὴ γίνηται ὧν ἕνεκα ἐφίλουν· οὐ γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἔστεργον ἀλλὰ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα, οὐ μόνιμα ὄντα· διὸ τοιαῦται καὶ αἱ φιλίαι. ἡ δὲ τῶν ἠθῶν καθ' αὑτὴν οὖσα μένει, καθάπερ εἴρηται. διαφέρονται δ' ὅταν ἕτερα γίνηται αὐτοῖς καὶ μὴ ὧν ὀρέγονται· ὅμοιον γὰρ τῷ μηδὲν γίνεσθαι, ὅταν οὗ ἐφίεται μὴ τυγχάνῃ, οἷον καὶ τῷ κιθαρῳδῷ ὁ ἐπαγγελλόμενος, καὶ ὅσῳ ἄμεινον ᾄσειεν, τοσούτῳ πλείω· εἰς ἕω δ' ἀπαιτοῦντι τὰς ὑποσχέσεις ἀνθ' ἡδονῆς ἡδονὴν ἀποδεδωκέναι ἔφη.

For since the friendship was based on these things, it dissolves when the things for which they loved each other no longer come about. They didn't love each other but what each had, which was not lasting; so these friendships are not lasting either. But friendship of character, being based on the people themselves, endures, as has been said. People also quarrel when they get something different and not what they desire; for not getting what one aims at is like getting nothing. Take the man who made promises to a lyre singer: the better he sang, the more he would get. In the morning, when the singer asked him to keep his promises, he said he had repaid pleasure with pleasure.

εἰ μὲν οὖν ἑκάτερος τοῦτο ἐβούλετο, ἱκανῶς ἂν εἶχεν· εἰ δ' ὃ μὲν τέρψιν ὃ δὲ κέρδος, καὶ ὃ μὲν ἔχει ὃ δὲ μή, οὐκ ἂν εἴη τὰ κατὰ τὴν κοινωνίαν καλῶς· ὧν γὰρ δεόμενος τυγχάνει, τούτοις καὶ προσέχει, κἀκείνου γε χάριν ταῦτα δώσει. τὴν ἀξίαν δὲ ποτέρου τάξαι ἐστί, τοῦ προϊεμένου ἢ τοῦ προλαβόντος; ὁ γὰρ προϊέμενος ἔοικ' ἐπιτρέπειν ἐκείνῳ. ὅπερ φασὶ καὶ Πρωταγόραν ποιεῖν· ὅτε γὰρ διδάξειεν ἀδήποτε, τιμῆσαι τὸν μαθόντα ἐκέλευεν ὅσου δοκεῖ ἄξια ἐπίστασθαι, καὶ ἐλάμβανε τοσοῦτον. ἐν τοῖς

If this is what each of them had wanted, it would have been fine. But if one wants enjoyment and the other gain, and one has it and the other doesn't, their association will not be on a good footing; for what a person needs is what he sets his mind on, and it is for that that he will give what he gives. But whose place is it to fix the value—the one who gives first, or the one who receives first?

GREEK

τοιούτοις δ' ἐνίοις ἀρέσκει τὸ μισθὸς δ' ἀνδρί. οἱ δὲ προλαμβάνοντες τὸ ἀργύριον, εἶτα μηδὲν ποιοῦντες ὧν ἔφασαν διὰ τὰς ὑπερβολὰς τῶν ἐπαγγελιῶν, εἰκότως ἐν ἐγκλήμασι γίνονται· οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἃ ὡμολόγησαν.

τοῦτο δ' ἴσως ποιεῖν οἱ σοφισταὶ ἀναγκάζονται διὰ τὸ μηδένα ἂν δοῦναι ἀργύριον ὧν ἐπίστανται. οὗτοι μὲν οὖν ὧν ἔλαβον τὸν μισθόν, μὴ ποιοῦντες εἰκότως ἐν ἐγκλήμασίν εἰσιν. ἐν οἷς δὲ μὴ γίνεται διομολογία τῆς ὑπουργίας, οἱ μὲν δι' αὐτοὺς προϊέμενοι εἴρηται ὅτι ἀνέγκλητοι (τοιαύτη γὰρ ἡ κατ' ἀρετὴν φιλία), 1164b τὴν ἀμοιβήν τε ποιητέον κατὰ τὴν προαίρεσιν (αὕτη γὰρ τοῦ φίλου καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς)· οὕτω δ' ἔοικε καὶ τοῖς φιλοσοφίας κοινωνήσασιν· οὐ γὰρ πρὸς χρήμαθ' ἡ ἀξία μετρεῖται, τιμή τ' ἰσόρροπος οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο, ἀλλ' ἴσως ἱκανόν, καθάπερ καὶ πρὸς θεοὺς καὶ πρὸς γονεῖς, τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον.

1164b μὴ τοιαύτης δ' οὔσης τῆς δόσεως ἀλλ' ἐπί τινι, μάλιστα μὲν ἴσως δεῖ τὴν ἀνταπόδοσιν γίνεσθαι δοκοῦσαν ἀμφοῖν κατ' ἀξίαν εἶναι, εἰ δὲ τοῦτο μὴ συμβαίνοι, οὐ μόνον ἀναγκαῖον δόξειεν ἂν τὸν προέχοντα τάττειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ δίκαιον· ὅσον γὰρ οὗτος ὠφελήθη ἢ ἀνθ' ὅσου τὴν ἡδονὴν εἵλετ' ἄν, τοσοῦτον ἀντιλαβὼν ἕξει τὴν παρὰ τούτου ἀξίαν. καὶ γὰρ ἐν τοῖς ὠνίοις οὕτω φαίνεται γινόμενον, ἐνιαχοῦ τ' εἰσὶ νόμοι τῶν ἑκουσίων συμβολαίων δίκας μὴ εἶναι, ὡς δέον, ᾧ ἐπίστευσε, διαλυθῆναι πρὸς τοῦτον καθάπερ ἐκοινώνησεν. ᾧ γὰρ ἐπετράφθη, τοῦτον οἴεται δικαιότερον εἶναι τάξαι τοῦ ἐπιτρέψαντος.

τὰ πολλὰ γὰρ οὐ τοῦ ἴσου τιμῶσιν οἱ ἔχοντες καὶ οἱ βουλόμενοι λαβεῖν· τὰ γὰρ οἰκεῖα καὶ ἃ διδόασιν ἑκάστοις

ENGLISH

The one who gives first seems to leave it to the other. This is what they say Protagoras used to do: whenever he taught anything, he would tell the learner to assess how much he thought his knowledge was worth, and he took that much. In such cases some people are content with "a wage for a friend." But those who take the money in advance and then, because of their extravagant promises, do none of what they said they would, understandably face complaints, since they don't fulfill what they agreed to.[1]

Perhaps the sophists are forced to do this because no one would give money for what they know. These people, then, understandably face complaints, since they don't do what they took the fee for. But where there is no prior agreement about the service, those who give first for the other's own sake are beyond complaint, as has been said (for friendship based on excellence is like that), 1164b and the return should be made according to the giver's decision (for decision is what belongs to a friend and to excellence). It seems that it is this way too with those who have shared in philosophy together. Its worth is not measured in money, and no honor could balance it; but perhaps it is enough, as with the gods and with parents, to give what one can.[2]

But if the gift was not of this kind but was made with a return in view, the best thing, perhaps, is for the repayment to be one that both think accords with worth. If that doesn't happen, it would seem not only necessary but also just for the one who received first to fix it. For if the giver gets back as much as the other was benefited, or as much as he would have paid for the pleasure, he will have the value due from him. This is evidently what happens in buying and selling too. And in some places there are laws that there be no lawsuits over voluntary contracts, on the grounds that one should settle with the person one trusted in the same spirit in which one entered into dealings with him. For it is thought more just for the person who was trusted to fix the value than for the one who trusted him.

For in most cases those who have a thing and those who want to get it do not value it equally,

1 Protagoras was a leading sophist of the fifth century BC. The quoted phrase begins a proverbial line: "let the wage stated to a friend be sure."

GREEK

φαίνεται πολλοῦ ἄξια· ἀλλ' ὅμως ἡ ἀμοιβὴ γίνεται πρὸς τοσοῦτον ὅσον ἂν τάττωσιν οἱ λαμβάνοντες. δεῖ δ' ἴσως οὐ τοσούτου τιμᾶν ὅσου ἔχοντι φαίνεται ἄξιον, ἀλλ' ὅσου πρὶν ἔχειν ἐτίμα.

ENGLISH

since what is one's own, and what one gives, always seems worth a great deal to each person. Nevertheless the return is made at whatever amount the recipients fix. But perhaps one should value a thing not at what it seems worth once one has it, but at what one valued it at before having it.

CONFLICTING OBLIGATIONS

Aristotle weighs conflicting obligations to parents, friends and benefactors, and when to end a friendship.

GREEK

ἀπορίαν δ' ἔχει καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, οἷον πότερον δεῖ πάντα τῷ πατρὶ ἀπονέμειν καὶ πείθεσθαι, ἢ κάμνοντα μὲν ἰατρῷ πιστεύειν, στρατηγὸν δὲ χειροτονητέον τὸν πολεμικόν· ὁμοίως δὲ φίλῳ μᾶλλον ἢ σπουδαίῳ ὑπηρετητέον, καὶ εὐεργέτῃ ἀνταποδοτέον χάριν μᾶλλον ἢ ἑταίρῳ προετέον, ἐὰν ἄμφω μὴ ἐνδέχηται. ἆρ' οὖν πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα ἀκριβῶς μὲν διορίσαι οὐ ῥᾴδιον; πολλὰς γὰρ καὶ παντοίας ἔχει διαφορὰς καὶ μεγέθει καὶ μικρότητι καὶ τῷ καλῷ καὶ ἀναγκαίῳ. ὅτι δ' οὐ πάντα τῷ αὐτῷ ἀποδοτέον, οὐκ ἄδηλον· καὶ τὰς μὲν εὐεργεσίας ἀνταποδοτέον ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ μᾶλλον ἢ χαριστέον ἑταίροις, ὥσπερ καὶ δάνειον ᾧ ὀφείλει ἀποδοτέον μᾶλλον ἢ ἑταίρῳ δοτέον.

ἴσως δ' οὐδὲ τοῦτ' ἀεί, οἷον τῷ λυτρωθέντι παρὰ λῃστῶν πότερα τὸν λυσάμενον ἀντιλυτρωτέον, κἂν ὁστισοῦν ᾖ, ἢ μὴ ἑαλωκότι ἀπαιτοῦντι δὲ ἀποδοτέον, [1165a] ἢ τὸν πατέρα λυτρωτέον; δόξειε γὰρ ἂν καὶ ἑαυτοῦ μᾶλλον τὸν πατέρα. ὅπερ οὖν εἴρηται, καθόλου μὲν τὸ ὀφείλημα ἀποδοτέον, ἐὰν δ' ὑπερτείνῃ ἡ δόσις τῷ καλῷ ἢ τῷ ἀναγκαίῳ, πρὸς ταῦτ' ἀποκλιτέον. ἐνίοτε γὰρ οὐδ' ἐστὶν ἴσον τὸ τὴν προϋπαρχὴν ἀμείψασθαι, ἐπειδὰν ὃ μὲν σπουδαῖον εἰδὼς εὖ ποιήσῃ, τῷ δὲ ἡ ἀνταπόδοσις γίνηται ὃν οἴεται μοχθηρὸν εἶναι. οὐδὲ γὰρ τῷ δανείσαντι ἐνίοτε ἀντιδανειστέον· ὃ μὲν γὰρ οἰόμενος κομιεῖσθαι ἐδάνεισεν ἐπιεικεῖ ὄντι, ὃ δ' οὐκ ἐλπίζει κομιεῖσθαι παρὰ πονηροῦ. εἴτε τοίνυν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὕτως ἔχει, οὐκ ἴσον τὸ ἀξίωμα· εἴτ' ἔχει μὲν μὴ οὕτως οἴονται δέ, οὐκ ἂν δόξαιεν ἄτοπα ποιεῖν.

ENGLISH

Questions like these also raise difficulties: whether one should give one's father everything and obey him in everything, or whether one should trust a doctor when ill, and elect a skilled soldier as general; and similarly whether one should serve a friend rather than an excellent person, and repay a benefactor's kindness rather than make a gift to a comrade, if one can't do both. Isn't it true that it's not easy to determine all such things precisely? For they involve many differences of every kind—in how great or small the matter is, and in what is fine and what is necessary. But it is clear enough that one shouldn't give everything to the same person; and that, for the most part, one should return benefits rather than do favors for comrades, just as one should repay a loan to one's creditor rather than give the money to a comrade.

But perhaps not even this holds always. For example, should someone who has been ransomed from bandits ransom his ransomer in turn, whoever he may be—or repay him if he asks for it, even though he hasn't been captured— [1165a] or should he ransom his own father? For it would seem that one should ransom one's father even before oneself. As has been said, then, in general one should repay the debt; but if giving instead outweighs it in fineness or necessity, one should lean toward that. For sometimes it isn't even fair to return the original favor, when one person benefited another knowing him to be excellent, while the return would go to someone the other thinks is wicked. Sometimes one shouldn't even lend in return to someone who has lent to one: he lent to a decent person expecting to get it back, while the other has no hope of getting it back from a scoundrel. If that is really how things are, then the claim

2 The sophists were paid teachers of the fifth and fourth centuries BC who claimed to teach success in public life.

GREEK

ENGLISH

is not equal; and if it isn't so but they think it is, they would not seem to be acting strangely.

1165a ὅπερ οὖν πολλάκις εἴρηται, οἱ περὶ τὰ πάθη καὶ τὰς πράξεις λόγοι ὁμοίως ἔχουσι τὸ ὡρισμένον τοῖς περὶ ἃ εἰσιν. ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὐ ταὐτὰ πᾶσιν ἀποδοτέον, οὐδὲ τῷ πατρὶ πάντα, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τῷ Διὶ θύεται, οὐκ ἄδηλον· ἐπεὶ δ' ἕτερα γονεῦσι καὶ ἀδελφοῖς καὶ ἑταίροις καὶ εὐεργέταις, ἑκάστοις τὰ οἰκεῖα καὶ τὰ ἁρμόττοντα ἀπονεμητέον. οὕτω δὲ καὶ ποιεῖν φαίνονται· εἰς γάμους μὲν γὰρ καλοῦσι τοὺς συγγενεῖς· τούτοις γὰρ κοινὸν τὸ γένος καὶ αἱ περὶ τοῦτο δὴ πράξεις· καὶ εἰς τὰ κήδη δὲ μάλιστ' οἴονται δεῖν τοὺς συγγενεῖς ἀπαντᾶν διὰ ταὐτό.

As has often been said, then, accounts of feelings and actions have just as much definiteness as the things they are about. That we should not render the same things to everyone, nor everything to our father—just as we don't sacrifice everything to Zeus—is clear enough. And since different things are due to parents, brothers, companions and benefactors, we should render to each what is proper and fitting for them. This is in fact what people seem to do. They invite their relatives to weddings, since these share the family and so the actions that concern it; and it is relatives above all, people think, who should attend funerals, for the same reason.

δόξειε δ' ἂν τροφῆς μὲν γονεῦσι δεῖν μάλιστ' ἐπαρκεῖν, ὡς ὀφείλοντας, καὶ τοῖς αἰτίοις τοῦ εἶναι κάλλιον ὂν ἢ ἑαυτοῖς εἰς ταῦτ' ἐπαρκεῖν· καὶ τιμὴν δὲ γονεῦσι καθάπερ θεοῖς, οὐ πᾶσαν δέ· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὴν αὐτὴν πατρὶ καὶ μητρί, οὐδ' αὖ τὴν τοῦ σοφοῦ ἢ τὴν τοῦ στρατηγοῦ, ἀλλὰ τὴν πατρικήν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ μητρικήν. καὶ παντὶ δὲ τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ τιμὴν καθ' ἡλικίαν, ὑπαναστάσει καὶ κατακλίσει καὶ τοῖς τοιούτοις· πρὸς ἑταίρους δ' αὖ καὶ ἀδελφοὺς παρρησίαν καὶ ἁπάντων κοινότητα. καὶ συγγενέσι δὲ καὶ φυλέταις καὶ πολίταις καὶ τοῖς λοιποῖς ἅπασιν ἀεὶ πειρατέον τὸ οἰκεῖον ἀπονέμειν, καὶ συγκρίνειν τὰ ἑκάστοις ὑπάρχοντα κατ' οἰκειότητα καὶ ἀρετὴν ἢ χρῆσιν. τῶν μὲν οὖν ὁμογενῶν ῥᾴων ἡ σύγκρισις, τῶν δὲ διαφερόντων ἐργωδεστέρα.

It would seem that we should above all provide for our parents' sustenance, since we owe it to them, and that it is finer to provide in this way for those who are the causes of our existence than for ourselves. And we should give honor to parents as to gods—but not every kind of honor. Not the same honor to father and mother, nor again the honor due to a wise man or to a general, but to a father the honor proper to a father, and likewise to a mother the honor proper to a mother. To every older person, too, we should give the honor due to their age, by standing up for them, offering them a place at table, and the like. To companions and brothers, on the other hand, we owe frankness and a sharing of everything. And to relatives, fellow tribesmen, fellow citizens and all the rest we should always try to render what is proper, and to compare what belongs to each according to closeness of relation and excellence or usefulness. Comparing people of the same kind is easier; comparing those who differ is more laborious.

οὐ μὴν διά γε τοῦτο ἀποστατέον, ἀλλ' ὡς ἂν ἐνδέχηται, οὕτω διοριστέον.

Still, that is no reason to give up; we must draw the distinctions as far as it is possible to do so.

ἔχει δ' ἀπορίαν καὶ περὶ τοῦ διαλύεσθαι τὰς φιλίας 1165b ἢ μὴ πρὸς τοὺς μὴ διαμένοντας. ἢ πρὸς μὲν τοὺς διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἢ τὸ ἡδὺ φίλους ὄντας, ὅταν μηκέτι ταῦτ' ἔχωσιν, οὐδὲν ἄτοπον διαλύεσθαι; ἐκείνων γὰρ ἦσαν φίλοι· ὧν ἀπολιπόντων εὔλογον τὸ μὴ φιλεῖν. ἐγκαλέσειε δ' ἄν τις, εἰ διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον ἢ τὸ ἡδὺ ἀγαπῶν προσεποιεῖτο διὰ τὸ ἦθος. ὃ γὰρ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴπομεν, πλεῖσται διαφοραὶ γίνονται τοῖς φίλοις, ὅταν μὴ ὁμοίως οἴωνται καὶ ὦσι φίλοι. ὅταν μὲν οὖν διαψευσθῇ τις καὶ ὑπολάβῃ

There is also a puzzle about whether friendships should be dissolved 1165b or not, in the case of friends who do not stay as they were. Or is there nothing strange in breaking off with those who were friends because of usefulness or pleasure, once these are no longer there? It was these things they were friends of, and when they have gone it is reasonable that the love should go too. But someone might complain if the other, who liked

GREEK	ENGLISH
φιλεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ ἦθος, μηδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐκείνου πράττοντος, ἑαυτὸν αἰτιῶτ᾽ ἄν· ὅταν δ᾽ ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκείνου προσποιήσεως ἀπατηθῇ, δίκαιον ἐγκαλεῖν τῷ ἀπατήσαντι, καὶ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῖς τὸ νόμισμα κιβδηλεύουσιν, ὅσῳ περὶ τιμιώτερον ἡ κακουργία.	him for usefulness or pleasure, pretended to like him for his character. For, as we said at the beginning, most disagreements between friends arise when they are not friends in the way they think they are. So when someone has deceived himself and supposed he was loved for his character, though the other did nothing of the kind to suggest it, he would have himself to blame; but when he has been deceived by the other's pretense, it is just to complain against the deceiver—more so than against counterfeiters of coinage, inasmuch as the wrongdoing concerns something more precious.
1165b ἐὰν δ᾽ ἀποδέχηται ὡς ἀγαθόν, γένηται δὲ μοχθηρὸς καὶ δοκῇ, ἆρ᾽ ἔτι φιλητέον; ἢ οὐ δυνατόν, εἴπερ μὴ πᾶν φιλητὸν ἀλλὰ τἀγαθόν; οὔτε δὲ φιλητὸν τὸ πονηρὸν οὔτε δεῖ· φιλοπόνηρον γὰρ οὐ χρὴ εἶναι, οὐδ᾽ ὁμοιοῦσθαι φαύλῳ· εἴρηται δ᾽ ὅτι τὸ ὅμοιον τῷ ὁμοίῳ φίλον. ἆρ᾽ οὖν εὐθὺς διαλυτέον; ἢ οὐ πᾶσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ἀνιάτοις κατὰ τὴν μοχθηρίαν; ἐπανόρθωσιν δ᾽ ἔχουσι μᾶλλον βοηθητέον εἰς τὸ ἦθος ἢ τὴν οὐσίαν, ὅσῳ βέλτιον καὶ τῆς φιλίας οἰκειότερον. δόξειε δ᾽ ἂν ὁ διαλυόμενος οὐδὲν ἄτοπον ποιεῖν· οὐ γὰρ τῷ τοιούτῳ φίλος ἦν· ἀλλοιωθέντα οὖν ἀδυνατῶν ἀνασῶσαι ἀφίσταται. εἰ δ᾽ ὃ μὲν διαμένοι ὃ δ᾽ ἐπιεικέστερος γίνοιτο καὶ πολὺ διαλλάττοι τῇ ἀρετῇ, ἆρα χρηστέον φίλῳ; ἢ οὐκ ἐνδέχεται;	But if one accepts another as good, and he turns bad and is seen to be so, should one still love him? Or is that impossible, if not everything is lovable but only the good? What is bad is not lovable, and ought not to be; for one should not be a lover of the bad, nor become like someone base—and it has been said that like is friend to like. Should one then break off at once? Or not in every case, but only with those who are incurable in their wickedness? Those who can be set right should be helped with their character even more than with their property, inasmuch as this is better and more proper to friendship. Yet the person who breaks off would not seem to be doing anything strange, since it was not to someone like this that he was a friend; so when his friend has changed and he cannot restore him, he withdraws. But if one stayed the same while the other became better and far surpassed him in excellence, should the latter still treat him as a friend? Or is that not possible?
ἐν μεγάλῃ δὲ διαστάσει μάλιστα δῆλον γίνεται, οἷον ἐν ταῖς παιδικαῖς φιλίαις· εἰ γὰρ ὃ μὲν διαμένοι τὴν διάνοιαν παῖς ὃ δ᾽ ἀνὴρ εἴη οἷος κράτιστος, πῶς ἂν εἶεν φίλοι μήτ᾽ ἀρεσκόμενοι τοῖς αὐτοῖς μήτε χαίροντες καὶ λυπούμενοι; οὐδὲ γὰρ περὶ ἀλλήλους ταῦθ᾽ ὑπάρξει αὐτοῖς, ἄνευ δὲ τούτων οὐκ ἦν φίλους εἶναι· συμβιοῦν γὰρ οὐχ οἷόν τε. εἴρηται δὲ περὶ τούτων. ἆρ᾽ οὖν οὐθὲν ἀλλοιότερον πρὸς αὐτὸν ἑκτέον ἢ εἰ μὴ ἐγεγόνει φίλος μηδέποτε; ἢ δεῖ μνείαν ἔχειν τῆς γενομένης συνηθείας, καὶ καθάπερ φίλοις μᾶλλον ἢ ὀθνείοις οἰόμεθα δεῖν χαρίζεσθαι, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς γενομένοις ἀπονεμητέον τι διὰ τὴν προγενομένην φιλίαν, ὅταν μὴ δι᾽ ὑπερβολὴν μοχθηρίας διάλυσις γένηται.	This becomes clearest when the gap is large, as in friendships from childhood. If one stayed a child in his thinking while the other became a man of the very best kind, how could they be friends, when they neither approve of the same things nor take pleasure and pain in the same things? They will not even have these in common regarding each other, and without them, as we saw, they cannot be friends, since they cannot share a life. But this has been discussed. Should one, then, behave toward him no differently than if he had never been a friend at all? Or should one keep in mind the intimacy there once was, and, just as we think we should do favors for friends rather than for strangers, so too render something to former

GREEK

ENGLISH

friends because of the friendship that existed before—provided the break did not come about through an excess of wickedness?

FRIENDSHIP AND ONE'S RELATION TO ONESELF

Aristotle argues that the marks of friendship derive from the good person's relation to himself.

GREEK

ENGLISH

1166a τὰ φιλικὰ δὲ τὰ πρὸς τοὺς πέλας, καὶ οἷς αἱ φιλίαι ὁρίζονται, ἔοικεν ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἐληλυθέναι. τιθέασι γὰρ φίλον τὸν βουλόμενον καὶ πράττοντα τἀγαθὰ ἢ τὰ φαινόμενα ἐκείνου ἕνεκα, ἢ τὸν βουλόμενον εἶναι καὶ ζῆν τὸν φίλον αὐτοῦ χάριν· ὅπερ αἱ μητέρες πρὸς τὰ τέκνα πεπόνθασι, καὶ τῶν φίλων οἱ προσκεκρουκότες. οἳ δὲ τὸν συνδιάγοντα καὶ ταὐτὰ αἱρούμενον, ἢ τὸν συναλγοῦντα καὶ συγχαίροντα τῷ φίλῳ· μάλιστα δὲ καὶ τοῦτο περὶ τὰς μητέρας συμβαίνει. τούτων δέ τινι καὶ τὴν φιλίαν ὁρίζονται.

The features of friendship toward our neighbors, and those by which friendships are defined, seem to have come from the features of a person's relation to himself. People take a friend to be someone who wishes and does good things, or apparent goods, for the other's sake; or someone who wishes his friend to exist and live for the friend's own sake—which is how mothers feel toward their children, and how friends feel who have had a falling-out. Others take a friend to be someone who spends time with the other and chooses the same things, or who shares his friend's pains and joys—and this too happens most of all with mothers. And it is by one of these features that people define friendship as well.

πρὸς ἑαυτὸν δὲ τούτων ἕκαστον τῷ ἐπιεικεῖ ὑπάρχει (τοῖς δὲ λοιποῖς, ᾗ τοιοῦτοι ὑπολαμβάνουσιν εἶναι· ἔοικε δέ, καθάπερ εἴρηται, μέτρον ἑκάστων ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ ὁ σπουδαῖος εἶναι)· οὗτος γὰρ ὁμογνωμονεῖ ἑαυτῷ, καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὀρέγεται κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν ψυχήν· καὶ βούλεται δὴ ἑαυτῷ τἀγαθὰ καὶ τὰ φαινόμενα καὶ πράττει (τοῦ γὰρ ἀγαθοῦ τἀγαθὸν διαπονεῖν) καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἕνεκα (τοῦ γὰρ διανοητικοῦ χάριν, ὅπερ ἕκαστος εἶναι δοκεῖ)· καὶ ζῆν δὲ βούλεται ἑαυτὸν καὶ σῴζεσθαι, καὶ μάλιστα τοῦτο ᾧ φρονεῖ. ἀγαθὸν γὰρ τῷ σπουδαίῳ τὸ εἶναι, ἕκαστος δ' ἑαυτῷ βούλεται τἀγαθά, γενόμενος δ' ἄλλος αἱρεῖται οὐδεὶς πάντ' ἔχειν ἐκεῖνο τὸ γενόμενον (ἔχει γὰρ καὶ νῦν ὁ θεὸς τἀγαθόν) ἀλλ' ὢν ὅ τι ποτ' ἐστίν· δόξειε δ' ἂν τὸ νοοῦν ἕκαστος εἶναι ἢ μάλιστα.

Each of these holds of the decent person in relation to himself (and of everyone else insofar as they suppose themselves to be decent; for, as has been said, excellence and the excellent person seem to be the measure in each case). He is of one mind with himself, and desires the same things with his whole soul. He wishes for himself what is good and what appears so, and does it (for it belongs to the good person to work hard at the good), and does it for his own sake—that is, for the sake of the thinking part of him, which is what each person seems to be. He also wishes himself to live and be preserved, and above all the part with which he thinks. For existence is good for the excellent person, and each person wishes good things for himself; but no one would choose to have everything on condition of becoming someone else, so that it is that new being that has it (after all, the god possesses the good even now); he wants it while remaining whatever he is. And it would seem that the thinking part is what each person is, or is most of all.

συνδιάγειν τε ὁ τοιοῦτος ἑαυτῷ βούλεται· ἡδέως γὰρ αὐτὸ ποιεῖ· τῶν τε γὰρ πεπραγμένων ἐπιτερπεῖς αἱ μνῆμαι, καὶ τῶν μελλόντων ἐλπίδες ἀγαθαί, αἱ τοιαῦται δ' ἡδεῖαι. καὶ θεωρημάτων δ' εὐπορεῖ τῇ διανοίᾳ. συναλγεῖ τε καὶ

Such a person also wishes to spend time with himself, since he does so with pleasure: his memories of what he has done are delightful, and his hopes for the future are good, and such things are pleas-

GREEK

συνήδεται μάλισθ' ἑαυτῷ· πάντοτε γάρ ἐστι τὸ αὐτὸ λυπηρόν τε καὶ ἡδύ, καὶ οὐκ ἄλλοτ' ἄλλο· ἀμεταμέλητος γὰρ ὡς εἰπεῖν. τῷ δὴ πρὸς αὐτὸν ἕκαστα τούτων ὑπάρχειν τῷ ἐπιεικεῖ, πρὸς δὲ τὸν φίλον ἔχειν ὥσπερ πρὸς αὐτόν (ἔστι γὰρ ὁ φίλος ἄλλος αὐτός), καὶ ἡ φιλία τούτων εἶναί τι δοκεῖ, καὶ φίλοι οἷς ταῦθ' ὑπάρχει.

πρὸς αὐτὸν δὲ πότερον ἔστιν ἢ οὐκ ἔστι φιλία, ἀφείσθω ἐπὶ τοῦ παρόντος· δόξειε δ' ἂν ταύτῃ εἶναι φιλία, ᾗ ἐστὶ δύο ἢ πλείω, ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων, [1166b] καὶ ὅτι ἡ ὑπερβολὴ τῆς φιλίας τῇ πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁμοιοῦται. φαίνεται δὲ τὰ εἰρημένα καὶ τοῖς πολλοῖς ὑπάρχειν, καίπερ οὖσι φαύλοις. ἆρ' οὖν ᾗ τ' ἀρέσκουσιν ἑαυτοῖς καὶ ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐπιεικεῖς εἶναι, ταύτῃ μετέχουσιν αὐτῶν; ἐπεὶ τῶν γε κομιδῇ φαύλων καὶ ἀνοσιουργῶν οὐδενὶ ταῦθ' ὑπάρχει, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φαίνεται. σχεδὸν δὲ οὐδὲ τοῖς φαύλοις· διαφέρονται γὰρ ἑαυτοῖς, καὶ ἑτέρων μὲν ἐπιθυμοῦσιν ἄλλα δὲ βούλονται, οἷον οἱ ἀκρατεῖς· αἱροῦνται γὰρ ἀντὶ τῶν δοκούντων ἑαυτοῖς ἀγαθῶν εἶναι τὰ ἡδέα βλαβερὰ ὄντα· οἱ δ' αὖ διὰ δειλίαν καὶ ἀργίαν ἀφίστανται τοῦ πράττειν ἃ οἴονται ἑαυτοῖς βέλτιστα εἶναι.

1166b οἷς δὲ πολλὰ καὶ δεινὰ πέπρακται καὶ διὰ τὴν μοχθηρίαν μισοῦνται, καὶ φεύγουσι τὸ ζῆν καὶ ἀναιροῦσιν ἑαυτούς. ζητοῦσί τε οἱ μοχθηροὶ μεθ' ὧν συνημερεύσουσιν, ἑαυτοὺς δὲ φεύγουσιν· ἀναμιμνήσκονται γὰρ πολλῶν καὶ δυσχερῶν, καὶ τοιαῦθ' ἕτερα ἐλπίζουσι, καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ὄντες, μεθ' ἑτέρων δ' ὄντες ἐπιλανθάνονται. οὐδέν τε φιλητὸν ἔχοντες οὐδὲν φιλικὸν πάσχουσι πρὸς ἑαυτούς. οὐδὲ δὴ συγχαίρουσιν οὐδὲ συναλγοῦσιν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἑαυτοῖς· στασιάζει γὰρ αὐτῶν ἡ ψυχή, καὶ τὸ μὲν διὰ μοχθηρίαν ἀλγεῖ ἀπεχόμενόν τινων, τὸ δ' ἥδεται, καὶ τὸ μὲν δεῦρο τὸ δ' ἐκεῖσε ἕλκει ὥσπερ διασπῶντα. εἰ δὲ μὴ οἷόν τε ἅμα λυπεῖσθαι καὶ ἥδεσθαι, ἀλλὰ μετὰ μικρόν γε λυπεῖται ὅτι ἥσθη, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐβούλετο ἡδέα ταῦτα γενέσθαι αὐτῷ· μεταμελείας γὰρ οἱ φαῦλοι γέμουσιν.

ENGLISH

ant. His mind is also well stocked with objects of contemplation. He shares his own pains and pleasures more than anyone, since it is always the same thing that is painful or pleasant to him, not one thing at one time and another at another; he has, so to speak, nothing to regret. Since each of these, then, holds of the decent person in relation to himself, and he is related to his friend as he is to himself (for the friend is another self), friendship too seems to be one of these things, and those who have them seem to be friends.

Whether there is or is not friendship toward oneself may be set aside for the present. Judging from what has been said, it would seem to be friendship insofar as a person is two or more parts, [1166b] and because the extreme of friendship resembles one's friendship toward oneself. But the features we have described seem to belong to most people too, base though they are. Is it, then, insofar as they are pleased with themselves and suppose themselves to be decent that they share in them? Certainly none of those who are utterly base and who commit impious deeds has them, or even seems to. But they hardly belong even to the base: such people are at odds with themselves, and have appetites for some things while wishing for others, like the uncontrolled, who choose pleasant things that are harmful instead of what seems to them to be good. 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 flee from life and do away with themselves. Wicked people seek others to spend their days with, and flee from themselves; for when they are by themselves they recall many disagreeable things and anticipate others like them, but in others' company they forget. Having nothing lovable about them, they feel nothing friendly toward themselves. Nor, then, do such people share their own joys or pains. Their soul is at war with itself: one part, because of its wickedness, is pained at holding back from certain things, while another part is pleased, and one pulls this way and the other that, as if tearing the person apart. And even if it is not possible to be pained and pleased at the same time, still after a little while he is pained that he was pleased, and

GREEK

ENGLISH

wishes these things had never been pleasant to him; for base people are full of regret.

οὐ δὴ φαίνεται ὁ φαῦλος οὐδὲ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν φιλικῶς διακεῖσθαι διὰ τὸ μηδὲν ἔχειν φιλητόν. εἰ δὴ τὸ οὕτως ἔχειν λίαν ἐστὶν ἄθλιον, φευκτέον τὴν μοχθηρίαν διατεταμένως καὶ πειρατέον ἐπιεικῆ εἶναι· οὕτω γὰρ καὶ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν φιλικῶς ἂν ἔχοι καὶ ἑτέρῳ φίλος γένοιτο.

So the base person does not appear to be disposed in a friendly way even toward himself, because he has nothing lovable about him. If being in this condition is utterly wretched, we should strain every nerve to flee wickedness and try to be decent; for in that way one would be both friendly toward oneself and a friend to another.

GOODWILL AND CONCORD

Aristotle distinguishes goodwill and concord from friendship and asks why benefactors love those they help.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἡ δ' εὔνοια φιλικῷ μὲν ἔοικεν, οὐ μὴν ἔστι γε φιλία· γίνεται γὰρ εὔνοια καὶ πρὸς ἀγνῶτας καὶ λανθάνουσα, φιλία δ' οὔ. καὶ πρότερον δὲ ταῦτ' εἴρηται. ἀλλ' οὐδὲ φίλησίς ἐστιν. οὐ γὰρ ἔχει διάτασιν οὐδ' ὄρεξιν, τῇ φιλήσει δὲ ταῦτ' ἀκολουθεῖ· καὶ ἡ μὲν φίλησις μετὰ συνηθείας, ἡ δ' εὔνοια καὶ ἐκ προσπαίου, οἷον καὶ περὶ τοὺς ἀγωνιστὰς συμβαίνει· 1167a εὔνοι γὰρ αὐτοῖς γίνονται καὶ συνθέλουσιν, συμπράξαιεν δ' ἂν οὐδέν· ὅπερ γὰρ εἴπομεν, προσπαίως εὖνοι γίνονται καὶ ἐπιπολαίως στέργουσιν.

Goodwill resembles friendship, but it is not friendship; for goodwill arises even toward people we do not know, and without their being aware of it, but friendship does not. This has been said before as well. But neither is it affection. It has no intensity or longing, which go along with affection; and affection comes with familiarity, whereas goodwill can arise all of a sudden, as happens, for example, with competitors in the games. 1167a Spectators come to feel goodwill toward them and share their wishes, but would do nothing to help them; as we said, they feel goodwill suddenly and have only a superficial fondness.

1167a ἔοικε δὴ ἀρχὴ φιλίας εἶναι, ὥσπερ τοῦ ἐρᾶν ἡ διὰ τῆς ὄψεως ἡδονή· μὴ γὰρ προησθεὶς τῇ ἰδέᾳ οὐδεὶς ἐρᾷ, ὁ δὲ χαίρων τῷ εἴδει οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἐρᾷ, ἀλλ' ὅταν καὶ ἀπόντα ποθῇ καὶ τῆς παρουσίας ἐπιθυμῇ· οὕτω δὴ καὶ φίλους οὐχ οἷόν τ' εἶναι μὴ εὔνους γενομένους, οἱ δ' εὖνοι οὐδὲν μᾶλλον φιλοῦσιν· βούλονται γὰρ μόνον τἀγαθὰ οἷς εἰσὶν εὖνοι, συμπράξαιεν δ' ἂν οὐδέν, οὐδ' ὀχληθεῖεν ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν. διὸ μεταφέρων φαίη τις ἂν αὐτὴν ἀργὴν εἶναι φιλίαν, χρονιζομένην δὲ καὶ εἰς συνήθειαν ἀφικνουμένην γίνεσθαι φιλίαν, οὐ τὴν διὰ τὸ χρήσιμον οὐδὲ τὴν διὰ τὸ ἡδύ· οὐδὲ γὰρ εὔνοια ἐπὶ τούτοις γίνεται.

Goodwill, then, seems to be the beginning of friendship, just as the pleasure of the eye is the beginning of erotic love. No one falls in love without first being pleased by the other's looks; yet someone who delights in another's appearance is not thereby in love, but only when he also longs for the other when absent and desires his presence. In the same way, people cannot be friends without first having come to feel goodwill, yet those who feel goodwill do not for that reason love; for they only wish good things for those they feel goodwill toward, but would do nothing to help them, and would not go to any trouble on their behalf. So one might say, by a figure of speech, that goodwill is idle friendship, and that when it lasts over time and reaches familiarity it becomes friendship—not the kind based on usefulness or on pleasure, since goodwill does not arise on those grounds either.

ὁ μὲν γὰρ εὐεργετηθεὶς ἀνθ' ὧν πέπονθεν ἀπονέμει τὴν εὔνοιαν, τὰ δίκαια δρῶν· ὁ δὲ βουλόμενός τιν' εὐπραγεῖν,

The person who has received a benefit renders goodwill in return for what he has received, and

GREEK

ἐλπίδα ἔχων εὐπορίας δι' ἐκείνου, οὐκ ἔοικ' εὔνους ἐκείνῳ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἑαυτῷ, καθάπερ οὐδὲ φίλος, εἰ θεραπεύει αὐτὸν διά τινα χρῆσιν. ὅλως δ' εὔνοια δι' ἀρετὴν καὶ ἐπιείκειάν τινα γίνεται, ὅταν τῳ φανῇ καλός τις ἢ ἀνδρεῖος ἤ τι τοιοῦτον, καθάπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἀγωνιστῶν εἴπομεν.

φιλικὸν δὲ καὶ ἡ ὁμόνοια φαίνεται. διόπερ οὐκ ἔστιν ὁμοδοξία· τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ καὶ ἀγνοοῦσιν ἀλλήλους ὑπάρξειεν ἄν· οὐδὲ τοὺς περὶ ὁτουοῦν ὁμογνωμονοῦντας ὁμονοεῖν φασίν, οἷον τοὺς περὶ τῶν οὐρανίων (οὐ γὰρ φιλικὸν τὸ περὶ τούτων ὁμονοεῖν), ἀλλὰ τὰς πόλεις ὁμονοεῖν φασίν, ὅταν περὶ τῶν συμφερόντων ὁμογνωμονῶσι καὶ ταὐτὰ προαιρῶνται καὶ πράττωσι τὰ κοινῇ δόξαντα. περὶ τὰ πρακτὰ δὴ ὁμονοοῦσιν, καὶ τούτων περὶ τὰ ἐν μεγέθει καὶ ἐνδεχόμενα ἀμφοῖν ὑπάρχειν ἢ πᾶσιν, οἷον αἱ πόλεις, ὅταν πᾶσι δοκῇ τὰς ἀρχὰς αἱρετὰς εἶναι, ἢ συμμαχεῖν Λακεδαιμονίοις, ἢ ἄρχειν Πιττακὸν ὅτε καὶ αὐτὸς ἤθελεν.

ὅταν δ' ἑκάτερος ἑαυτὸν βούληται, ὥσπερ οἱ ἐν ταῖς Φοινίσσαις, στασιάζουσιν· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ὁμονοεῖν τὸ αὐτὸ ἑκάτερον ἐννοεῖν ὁδήποτε, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, οἷον ὅταν καὶ ὁ δῆμος [1167b] καὶ οἱ ἐπιεικεῖς τοὺς ἀρίστους ἄρχειν· οὕτω γὰρ πᾶσι γίνεται οὗ ἐφίενται. πολιτικὴ δὴ φιλία φαίνεται ἡ ὁμόνοια, καθάπερ καὶ λέγεται· περὶ τὰ συμφέροντα γάρ ἐστι καὶ τὰ εἰς τὸν βίον ἥκοντα. ἔστι δ' ἡ τοιαύτη ὁμόνοια ἐν τοῖς ἐπιεικέσιν· οὗτοι γὰρ καὶ ἑαυτοῖς ὁμονοοῦσι καὶ ἀλλήλοις, ἐπὶ τῶν αὐτῶν ὄντες ὡς εἰπεῖν (τῶν τοιούτων γὰρ μένει τὰ βουλήματα καὶ οὐ μεταρρεῖ ὥσπερ εὔριπος), βούλονταί τε τὰ δίκαια καὶ τὰ συμφέροντα, τούτων δὲ καὶ κοινῇ ἐφίενται.

1167b τοὺς δὲ φαύλους οὐχ οἷόν τε ὁμονοεῖν πλὴν ἐπὶ μικρόν, καθάπερ καὶ φίλους εἶναι, πλεονεξίας ἐφιεμένους ἐν τοῖς

ENGLISH

so is doing what is just. But someone who wishes another to prosper because he hopes to do well through him seems to have goodwill not toward that person but rather toward himself, just as he is not a friend either if he courts him for some use. In general, goodwill arises because of excellence and a certain decency, when someone seems to another to be fine or brave or something of the sort, as we said in the case of competitors.

Concord, too, appears to be a feature of friendship. That is why it is not mere agreement in opinion, since that could exist even among people who do not know one another. Nor do people say that those who agree about just anything are in concord—about the heavenly bodies, for instance (being in concord about these has nothing to do with friendship). Rather, they say that cities are in concord when they agree about what is advantageous, decide on the same things, and carry out what they have resolved in common. So concord concerns matters of action, and among these, matters of some magnitude which both parties, or all, can have: for example, cities are in concord when everyone resolves that offices should be elective, or that they should ally with the Spartans, or that Pittacus should rule, at the time when he himself was willing to.[3]

But when each of two parties wants the thing for himself, like the pair in the *Phoenician Women*, they fall into strife. For concord is not each having the same thing in mind, whatever it may be, but having it in mind for the same person—as when both the common people [1167b] and the decent want the best people to rule; for in this way everyone gets what they are aiming at. Concord, then, appears to be political friendship, as it is in fact called; for it concerns what is advantageous and what bears on life. Concord of this kind exists among decent people. They are in concord both with themselves and with one another, since they stand on the same ground, so to speak (for the wishes of such people stay fixed, and do not ebb and flow like the currents of a tidal strait), and they wish for what is just and advantageous, and aim at these in common as well.[4]

Base people, however, cannot be in concord except to a small extent, just as they cannot be

GREEK

ENGLISH

ὠφελίμοις, ἐν δὲ τοῖς πόνοις καὶ ταῖς λειτουργίαις ἐλλείποντας· ἑαυτῷ δ' ἕκαστος βουλόμενος ταῦτα τὸν πέλας ἐξετάζει καὶ κωλύει· μὴ γὰρ τηρούντων τὸ κοινὸν ἀπόλλυται. συμβαίνει οὖν αὐτοῖς στασιάζειν, ἀλλήλους μὲν ἐπαναγκάζοντας, αὐτοὺς δὲ μὴ βουλομένους τὰ δίκαια ποιεῖν.

friends either, since they aim at getting more than their share of benefits and fall short in labors and public services. And each, wishing these things for himself, scrutinizes his neighbor and gets in his way; for if people do not watch over the common good, it is ruined. So the result is that they fall into strife, compelling one another to do what is just but unwilling to do it themselves.

οἱ δ' εὐεργέται τοὺς εὐεργετηθέντας δοκοῦσι μᾶλλον φιλεῖν ἢ οἱ εὖ παθόντες τοὺς δράσαντας, καὶ ὡς παρὰ λόγον γινόμενον ἐπιζητεῖται. τοῖς μὲν οὖν πλείστοις φαίνεται ὅτι οἳ μὲν ὀφείλουσι τοῖς δὲ ὀφείλεται· καθάπερ οὖν ἐπὶ τῶν δανείων οἱ μὲν ὀφείλοντες βούλονται μὴ εἶναι οἷς ὀφείλουσιν, οἱ δὲ δανείσαντες καὶ ἐπιμελοῦνται τῆς τῶν ὀφειλόντων σωτηρίας, οὕτω καὶ τοὺς εὐεργετήσαντας βούλεσθαι εἶναι τοὺς παθόντας ὡς κομιουμένους τὰς χάριτας, τοῖς δ' οὐκ εἶναι ἐπιμελὲς τὸ ἀνταποδοῦναι. Ἐπίχαρμος μὲν οὖν τάχ' ἂν φαίη ταῦτα λέγειν αὐτοὺς ἐκ πονηροῦ θεωμένους, ἔοικε δ' ἀνθρωπικῷ· ἀμνήμονες γὰρ οἱ πολλοί, καὶ μᾶλλον εὖ πάσχειν ἢ ποιεῖν ἐφίενται.

Benefactors seem to love those they have benefited more than those who have been treated well love those who treated them well, and this is investigated as though it were contrary to reason. Most people think the reason is that the one party is in debt and the other is owed. So just as with loans, where debtors wish their creditors did not exist, while lenders even take care for their debtors' safety, so too, it is thought, benefactors wish those they have benefited to exist so that they will receive gratitude in return, while the beneficiaries are not concerned to repay. Epicharmus might perhaps say that those who say this are watching from a bad seat; but it seems true to human nature, since most people are forgetful, and aim to be treated well rather than to treat others well.[5]

δόξειε δ' ἂν φυσικώτερον εἶναι τὸ αἴτιον, καὶ οὐδ' ὅμοιον τὸ περὶ τοὺς δανείσαντας· οὐ γάρ ἐστι φίλησις περὶ ἐκείνους, ἀλλὰ τοῦ σῴζεσθαι βούλησις τῆς κομιδῆς ἕνεκα· οἱ δ' εὖ πεποιηκότες φιλοῦσι καὶ ἀγαπῶσι τοὺς πεπονθότας κἂν μηδὲν ὦσι χρήσιμοι μηδ' εἰς ὕστερον γένοιντ' ἄν. ὅπερ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν τεχνιτῶν συμβέβηκεν· πᾶς γὰρ τὸ οἰκεῖον ἔργον ἀγαπᾷ μᾶλλον ἢ ἀγαπηθείη ἂν ὑπὸ τοῦ ἔργου ἐμψύχου γενομένου· 1168a μάλιστα δ' ἴσως τοῦτο περὶ τοὺς ποιητὰς συμβαίνει· ὑπεραγαπῶσι γὰρ οὗτοι τὰ οἰκεῖα ποιήματα, στέργοντες ὥσπερ τέκνα. τοιούτῳ δὴ ἔοικε καὶ τὸ τῶν εὐεργετῶν· τὸ γὰρ εὖ πεπονθὸς ἔργον ἐστὶν αὐτῶν· τοῦτο δὴ ἀγαπῶσι μᾶλλον ἢ τὸ ἔργον τὸν ποιήσαντα.

But the cause would seem to lie more in the nature of things, and the case of lenders is not even similar. With them there is no affection, only a wish that the debtors survive so as to be repaid; whereas those who have done good love and cherish those who have received it, even if they are of no use to them and never could be later on. This is what happens with craftsmen too: every craftsman loves his own work more than he would be loved by the work if it came to life. 1168a This happens most of all, perhaps, with poets, who love their own poems excessively, cherishing them like children. The benefactors' case seems to be like this: the person who has been treated well is their work, and so they love it more than the work loves the one who made it.

1168a τούτου δ' αἴτιον ὅτι τὸ εἶναι πᾶσιν αἱρετὸν καὶ φιλητόν, ἐσμὲν δ' ἐνεργείᾳ (τῷ ζῆν γὰρ καὶ πράττειν), ἐνεργείᾳ δὲ ὁ ποιήσας τὸ ἔργον ἔστι πως· στέργει δὴ τὸ ἔργον, διότι καὶ τὸ εἶναι. τοῦτο δὲ φυσικόν· ὃ γάρ ἐστι δυνάμει, τοῦτο ἐνεργείᾳ τὸ ἔργον μηνύει. ἅμα δὲ καὶ τῷ μὲν εὐεργέτῃ

The cause of this is that existence is choiceworthy and lovable to everyone, and we exist by activity (that is, by living and acting), and the maker of a work exists, in a way, by his activity. So he loves his work, because he loves existence too. And this

4 In Euripides' *Phoenician Women*, the brothers Eteocles and Polynices fight to the death over the throne of Thebes.
3 Pittacus was elected sole ruler of Mytilene, on Lesbos, in the early sixth century BC, and later laid down his power voluntarily.
5 Epicharmus was a Sicilian comic poet of the early fifth century BC.

GREEK

καλὸν τὸ κατὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν, ὥστε χαίρειν ἐν ᾧ τοῦτο, τῷ δὲ παθόντι οὐδὲν καλὸν ἐν τῷ δράσαντι, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, συμφέρον· τοῦτο δ' ἧττον ἡδὺ καὶ φιλητόν. ἡδεῖα δ' ἐστὶ τοῦ μὲν παρόντος ἡ ἐνέργεια, τοῦ δὲ μέλλοντος ἡ ἐλπίς, τοῦ δὲ γεγενημένου ἡ μνήμη· ἥδιστον δὲ τὸ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν, καὶ φιλητὸν ὁμοίως. τῷ μὲν οὖν πεποιηκότι μένει τὸ ἔργον (τὸ καλὸν γὰρ πολυχρόνιον), τῷ δὲ παθόντι τὸ χρήσιμον παροίχεται.

ENGLISH

is natural: what he is in capacity, the work displays in activity. At the same time, for the benefactor there is something fine in his action, so that he delights in the person in whom it lies; whereas for the one who has been treated well there is nothing fine in the one who acted, but at most something advantageous, and this is less pleasant and less lovable. What is pleasant is the activity of the present, the hope of the future, and the memory of the past; but most pleasant is what goes with activity, and it is likewise most lovable. For the one who has done good, his work remains (since what is fine is long-lasting), whereas for the one who received it, the usefulness passes away.

ἥ τε μνήμη τῶν μὲν καλῶν ἡδεῖα, τῶν δὲ χρησίμων οὐ πάνυ ἢ ἧττον· ἡ προσδοκία δ' ἀνάπαλιν ἔχειν ἔοικεν. καὶ ἡ μὲν φίλησις ποιήσει ἔοικεν, τὸ φιλεῖσθαι δὲ τῷ πάσχειν· τοῖς ὑπερέχουσι δὲ περὶ τὴν πρᾶξιν ἔπεται τὸ φιλεῖν καὶ τὰ φιλικά. ἔτι δὲ τὰ ἐπιπόνως γενόμενα πάντες μᾶλλον στέργουσιν, οἷον καὶ τὰ χρήματα οἱ κτησάμενοι τῶν παραλαβόντων· δοκεῖ δὲ τὸ μὲν εὖ πάσχειν ἄπονον εἶναι, τὸ δ' εὖ ποιεῖν ἐργῶδες. διὰ ταῦτα δὲ καὶ αἱ μητέρες φιλοτεκνότεραι· ἐπιπονωτέρα γὰρ ἡ γέννησις, καὶ μᾶλλον ἴσασιν ὅτι αὑτῶν. δόξειε δ' ἂν τοῦτο καὶ τοῖς εὐεργέταις οἰκεῖον εἶναι.

Again, the memory of fine things is pleasant, while that of useful things is not very pleasant, or less so; with expectation it seems to be the other way round. Also, loving is like acting, and being loved is like being acted upon; and loving and the features of friendship belong to those who take the leading part in the action. Again, everyone cherishes more what they have achieved with toil—as those who have made their money love it more than those who inherited it. And being treated well seems to involve no toil, while doing good is laborious. It is for these reasons, too, that mothers love their children more than fathers do: giving birth is more toilsome, and they know better that the children are their own. This would seem to be characteristic of benefactors as well.

SELF-LOVE

Aristotle distinguishes base self-love from the good person's love of what is fine.

GREEK

ἀπορεῖται δὲ καὶ πότερον δεῖ φιλεῖν ἑαυτὸν μάλιστα ἢ ἄλλον τινά. ἐπιτιμῶσι γὰρ τοῖς ἑαυτοὺς μάλιστ' ἀγαπῶσι, καὶ ὡς ἐν αἰσχρῷ φιλαύτους ἀποκαλοῦσι, δοκεῖ τε ὁ μὲν φαῦλος ἑαυτοῦ χάριν πάντα πράττειν, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν μοχθηρότερος ᾖ, τοσούτῳ μᾶλλον—ἐγκαλοῦσι δὴ αὐτῷ οἷον ὅτι οὐδὲν ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ πράττει—ὁ δ' ἐπιεικὴς διὰ τὸ καλόν, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν βελτίων ᾖ, μᾶλλον διὰ τὸ καλόν, καὶ φίλου ἕνεκα, τὸ δ' αὑτοῦ παρίησιν. τοῖς λόγοις δὲ τούτοις τὰ ἔργα διαφωνεῖ, οὐκ ἀλόγως.

ENGLISH

There is also a puzzle about whether one should love oneself most, or someone else. People criticize those who cherish themselves most, and call them "self-lovers" as a term of reproach. And the base person seems to do everything for his own sake, and the more so the worse he is—so people complain of him, for instance, that he does nothing except with himself in view—while the decent person acts because of the fine, and the better he is, the more he acts because of the fine, and for his friend's sake, setting his own interest aside. But the facts are at odds with these arguments, and not without reason.

1168b

GREEK

φασὶ γὰρ δεῖν φιλεῖν μάλιστα τὸν μάλιστα φίλον, φίλος δὲ μάλιστα ὁ βουλόμενος ᾧ βούλεται τἀγαθὰ ἐκείνου ἕνεκα, καὶ εἰ μηδεὶς εἴσεται· ταῦτα δ' ὑπάρχει μάλιστ' αὐτῷ πρὸς αὐτόν, καὶ τὰ λοιπὰ δὴ πάνθ' οἷς ὁ φίλος ὁρίζεται· εἴρηται γὰρ ὅτι ἀπ' αὐτοῦ πάντα τὰ φιλικὰ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους διήκει. καὶ αἱ παροιμίαι δὲ πᾶσαι ὁμογνωμονοῦσιν, οἷον τὸ μία ψυχή καὶ κοινὰ τὰ φίλων καὶ ἰσότης φιλότης καὶ γόνυ κνήμης ἔγγιον· πάντα γὰρ ταῦτα πρὸς αὐτὸν μάλιστ' ἂν ὑπάρχοι· μάλιστα γὰρ φίλος αὑτῷ· καὶ φιλητέον δὴ μάλισθ' ἑαυτόν. ἀπορεῖται δὴ εἰκότως ποτέροις χρεὼν ἕπεσθαι, ἀμφοῖν ἐχόντοιν τὸ πιστόν. ἴσως οὖν τοὺς τοιούτους δεῖ τῶν λόγων διαιρεῖν καὶ διορίζειν ἐφ' ὅσον ἑκάτεροι καὶ πῇ ἀληθεύουσιν.

εἰ δὴ λάβοιμεν τὸ φίλαυτον πῶς ἑκάτεροι λέγουσιν, τάχ' ἂν γένοιτο δῆλον. οἱ μὲν οὖν εἰς ὄνειδος ἄγοντες αὐτὸ φιλαύτους καλοῦσι τοὺς ἑαυτοῖς ἀπονέμοντας τὸ πλεῖον ἐν χρήμασι καὶ τιμαῖς καὶ ἡδοναῖς ταῖς σωματικαῖς· τούτων γὰρ οἱ πολλοὶ ὀρέγονται, καὶ ἐσπουδάκασι περὶ αὐτὰ ὡς ἄριστα ὄντα, διὸ καὶ περιμάχητά ἐστιν. οἱ δὴ περὶ ταῦτα πλεονέκται χαρίζονται ταῖς ἐπιθυμίαις καὶ ὅλως τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ τῷ ἀλόγῳ τῆς ψυχῆς· τοιοῦτοι δ' εἰσὶν οἱ πολλοί· διὸ καὶ ἡ προσηγορία γεγένηται ἀπὸ τοῦ πολλοῦ φαύλου ὄντος· δικαίως δὴ τοῖς οὕτω φιλαύτοις ὀνειδίζεται.

ὅτι δὲ τοὺς τὰ τοιαῦθ' αὑτοῖς ἀπονέμοντας εἰώθασι λέγειν οἱ πολλοὶ φιλαύτους, οὐκ ἄδηλον· εἰ γάρ τις ἀεὶ σπουδάζοι τὰ δίκαια πράττειν αὐτὸς μάλιστα πάντων ἢ τὰ σώφρονα ἢ ὁποιαοῦν ἄλλα τῶν κατὰ τὰς ἀρετάς, καὶ ὅλως ἀεὶ τὸ καλὸν ἑαυτῷ περιποιοῖτο, οὐδεὶς ἐρεῖ τοῦτον φίλαυτον οὐδὲ ψέξει. δόξειε δ' ἂν ὁ τοιοῦτος μᾶλλον εἶναι φίλαυτος· ἀπονέμει γοῦν ἑαυτῷ τὰ κάλλιστα καὶ μάλιστ' ἀγαθά, καὶ χαρίζεται ἑαυτοῦ τῷ κυριωτάτῳ, καὶ πάντα τούτῳ πείθεται· ὥσπερ δὲ καὶ πόλις τὸ κυριώτατον μάλιστ' εἶναι δοκεῖ καὶ πᾶν ἄλλο σύστημα, οὕτω καὶ ἄνθρωπος· καὶ φίλαυτος δὴ μάλιστα ὁ τοῦτο ἀγαπῶν καὶ τούτῳ χαριζόμενος.

ENGLISH

For people say one should love most the one who is most a friend, and the one most a friend is the person who wishes good things for someone for that person's sake, even if no one will know. But these features belong most of all to a person in relation to himself, and so do all the other features by which a friend is defined; for it has been said that all the features of friendship extend from oneself to others as well. All the proverbs agree too, such as "one soul," "friends' things are shared," "friendship is equality," and "the knee is closer than the shin." All these would apply most of all to a person in relation to himself, since he is most a friend to himself; and so he should love himself most. It is reasonable, then, to be puzzled about which side to follow, since both carry some conviction. Perhaps, then, we should separate such arguments and determine how far and in what way each side is right.

If we grasp how each side uses "self-love," it may perhaps become clear. Those who make it a term of reproach call "self-lovers" those who allot themselves the larger share of money, honors and bodily pleasures. These are what most people reach for, and they are keen about them as the best things, which is also why they are fought over. Those who grasp for more than their share of these things gratify their appetites and, in general, their feelings and the non-rational part of the soul. And most people are like this; that is why the term has come to be used as it is, from the prevailing kind, which is base. So those who are self-lovers in this way are justly reproached.

That it is those who allot such things to themselves whom most people usually call self-lovers is clear enough. For if someone were always keen that he himself, above all others, should do what is just, or moderate, or anything else in accordance with the excellences, and in general were always securing the fine for himself, no one would call him a self-lover or blame him. Yet such a person would seem to be more of a self-lover. At any rate, he allots himself the finest things and the greatest goods, and gratifies the most authoritative part of himself, and obeys it in everything. And just as a city, or any other organized whole, seems to be most of all its most authoritative part, so too does a human being; and so the person who cherishes this part and gratifies it is most of all a self-lover.

GREEK	ENGLISH
καὶ ἐγκρατὴς δὲ καὶ ἀκρατὴς λέγεται τῷ κρατεῖν τὸν νοῦν ἢ μή, ὡς τούτου ἑκάστου ὄντος· [1169a] καὶ πεπραγέναι δοκοῦσιν αὐτοὶ καὶ ἑκουσίως τὰ μετὰ λόγου μάλιστα. ὅτι μὲν οὖν τοῦθ' ἕκαστός ἐστιν ἢ μάλιστα, οὐκ ἄδηλον, καὶ ὅτι ὁ ἐπιεικὴς μάλιστα τοῦτ' ἀγαπᾷ. διὸ φίλαυτος μάλιστ' ἂν εἴη, καθ' ἕτερον εἶδος τοῦ ὀνειδιζομένου, καὶ διαφέρων τοσοῦτον ὅσον τὸ κατὰ λόγον ζῆν τοῦ κατὰ πάθος, καὶ ὀρέγεσθαι ἢ τοῦ καλοῦ ἢ τοῦ δοκοῦντος συμφέρειν. τοὺς μὲν οὖν περὶ τὰς καλὰς πράξεις διαφερόντως σπουδάζοντας πάντες ἀποδέχονται καὶ ἐπαινοῦσιν· πάντων δὲ ἁμιλλωμένων πρὸς τὸ καλὸν καὶ διατεινομένων τὰ κάλλιστα πράττειν κοινῇ τ' ἂν πάντ' εἴη τὰ δέοντα καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ τὰ μέγιστα τῶν ἀγαθῶν, εἴπερ ἡ ἀρετὴ τοιοῦτόν ἐστιν.	Again, people are called self-controlled or uncontrolled according to whether or not their intellect is in control, on the assumption that this is what each person is; [1169a] and it is the things done with reason that people seem most of all to have done themselves, and voluntarily. That this, then, is what each person is, or is most of all, is clear enough, and also that the decent person cherishes it most. That is why he would be a self-lover most of all—though of a different kind from the one reproached, and differing from it as much as living by reason differs from living by feeling, and as much as desiring the fine differs from desiring what seems advantageous. Now, everyone welcomes and praises those who are exceptionally keen on fine actions; and if everyone were competing for the fine and straining to do the finest things, the community would have everything it ought to have, and each individual would have the greatest of goods, since excellence is a good of this kind.
1169a ὥστε τὸν μὲν ἀγαθὸν δεῖ φίλαυτον εἶναι (καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ὀνήσεται τὰ καλὰ πράττων καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ὠφελήσει), τὸν δὲ μοχθηρὸν οὐ δεῖ· βλάψει γὰρ καὶ ἑαυτὸν καὶ τοὺς πέλας, φαύλοις πάθεσιν ἑπόμενος. τῷ μοχθηρῷ μὲν οὖν διαφωνεῖ ἃ δεῖ πράττειν καὶ ἃ πράττει· ὁ δ' ἐπιεικής, ἃ δεῖ, ταῦτα καὶ πράττει· πᾶς γὰρ νοῦς αἱρεῖται τὸ βέλτιστον ἑαυτῷ, ὁ δ' ἐπιεικὴς πειθαρχεῖ τῷ νῷ.	So the good person ought to be a self-lover, since he will both benefit himself by doing fine things and help others; but the wicked person ought not to be, since he will harm both himself and those around him by following base feelings. For the wicked person, what he ought to do and what he does are at odds; but the decent person does what he ought to do. For every intellect chooses what is best for itself, and the decent person obeys his intellect.
ἀληθὲς δὲ περὶ τοῦ σπουδαίου καὶ τὸ τῶν φίλων ἕνεκα πολλὰ πράττειν καὶ τῆς πατρίδος, κἂν δέῃ ὑπεραποθνήσκειν· προήσεται γὰρ καὶ χρήματα καὶ τιμὰς καὶ ὅλως τὰ περιμάχητα ἀγαθά, περιποιούμενος ἑαυτῷ τὸ καλόν· ὀλίγον γὰρ χρόνον ἡσθῆναι σφόδρα μᾶλλον ἕλοιτ' ἂν ἢ πολὺν ἠρέμα, καὶ βιῶσαι καλῶς ἐνιαυτὸν ἢ πόλλ' ἔτη τυχόντως, καὶ μίαν πρᾶξιν καλὴν καὶ μεγάλην ἢ πολλὰς καὶ μικράς. τοῖς δ' ὑπεραποθνήσκουσι τοῦτ' ἴσως συμβαίνει· αἱροῦνται δὴ μέγα καλὸν ἑαυτοῖς. καὶ χρήματα προοῖντ' ἂν ἐφ' ᾧ πλείονα λήψονται οἱ φίλοι· γίνεται γὰρ τῷ μὲν φίλῳ χρήματα, αὐτῷ δὲ τὸ καλόν· τὸ δὴ μεῖζον ἀγαθὸν ἑαυτῷ ἀπονέμει. καὶ περὶ τιμὰς δὲ καὶ ἀρχὰς ὁ αὐτὸς τρόπος· πάντα γὰρ τῷ φίλῳ ταῦτα προήσεται· καλὸν γὰρ αὐτῷ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπαινετόν.	It is also true of the excellent person that he does many things for the sake of his friends and his country, even dying for them if need be. He will give up money and honors and, in general, the goods people fight over, securing the fine for himself. He would choose intense pleasure for a short time over mild pleasure for a long time, a year of living finely over many years of living any old way, and one fine and great action over many small ones. This is presumably what happens with those who die for others: they choose a great and fine thing for themselves. He would also give up money so that his friends may get more; for his friend gets the money, but he gets the fine, and so he allots himself the greater good. It is the same with honors and offices: he will give all these up to his friend, since this is fine and praiseworthy for him.

GREEK

εἰκότως δὴ δοκεῖ σπουδαῖος εἶναι, ἀντὶ πάντων αἱρούμενος τὸ καλόν. ἐνδέχεται δὲ καὶ πράξεις τῷ φίλῳ προΐεσθαι, καὶ εἶναι κάλλιον τοῦ αὐτὸν πρᾶξαι τὸ αἴτιον τῷ φίλῳ γενέσθαι. ἐν πᾶσι δὴ τοῖς ἐπαινετοῖς ὁ σπουδαῖος φαίνεται ἑαυτῷ τοῦ καλοῦ πλέον νέμων. 1169b οὕτω μὲν οὖν φίλαυτον εἶναι δεῖ, καθάπερ εἴρηται· ὡς δ' οἱ πολλοί, οὐ χρή.

ENGLISH

It is reasonable, then, that he is thought excellent, since he chooses the fine above everything. It is even possible for him to give up actions to his friend, and it may be finer to be the cause of his friend's acting than to act himself. In everything praiseworthy, then, the excellent person evidently allots himself the greater share of the fine. 1169b In this way, then, one ought to be a self-lover, as has been said; but in the way most people are, one should not.

DOES THE HAPPY PERSON NEED FRIENDS?

Aristotle argues that even the happy, self-sufficient person needs good friends.

GREEK

1169b ἀμφισβητεῖται δὲ καὶ περὶ τὸν εὐδαίμονα, εἰ δεήσεται φίλων ἢ μή. οὐθὲν γάρ φασι δεῖν φίλων τοῖς μακαρίοις καὶ αὐτάρκεσιν· ὑπάρχειν γὰρ αὐτοῖς τἀγαθά· αὐτάρκεις οὖν ὄντας οὐδενὸς προσδεῖσθαι, τὸν δὲ φίλον, ἕτερον αὐτὸν ὄντα, πορίζειν ἃ δι' αὐτοῦ ἀδυνατεῖ· ὅθεν ὅταν ὁ δαίμων εὖ διδῷ, τί δεῖ φίλων; ἔοικε δ' ἀτόπῳ τὸ πάντ' ἀπονέμοντας τἀγαθὰ τῷ εὐδαίμονι φίλους μὴ ἀποδιδόναι, ὃ δοκεῖ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν μέγιστον εἶναι. εἴ τε φίλου μᾶλλόν ἐστι τὸ εὖ ποιεῖν ἢ πάσχειν, καὶ ἔστι τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ τῆς ἀρετῆς τὸ εὐεργετεῖν, κάλλιον δ' εὖ ποιεῖν φίλους ὀθνείων, τῶν εὖ πεισομένων δεήσεται ὁ σπουδαῖος. διὸ καὶ ἐπιζητεῖται πότερον ἐν εὐτυχίαις μᾶλλον δεῖ φίλων ἢ ἐν ἀτυχίαις, ὡς καὶ τοῦ ἀτυχοῦντος δεομένου τῶν εὐεργετησόντων καὶ τῶν εὐτυχούντων οὓς εὖ ποιήσουσιν.

ἄτοπον δ' ἴσως καὶ τὸ μονώτην ποιεῖν τὸν μακάριον· οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἕλοιτ' ἂν καθ' αὑτὸν τὰ πάντ' ἔχειν ἀγαθά· πολιτικὸν γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος καὶ συζῆν πεφυκός. καὶ τῷ εὐδαίμονι δὴ τοῦθ' ὑπάρχει· τὰ γὰρ τῇ φύσει ἀγαθὰ ἔχει, δῆλον δ' ὡς μετὰ φίλων καὶ ἐπιεικῶν κρεῖττον ἢ μετ' ὀθνείων καὶ τῶν τυχόντων συνημερεύειν. δεῖ ἄρα τῷ εὐδαίμονι φίλων. τί οὖν λέγουσιν οἱ πρῶτοι, καὶ πῇ ἀληθεύουσιν; ἢ ὅτι οἱ πολλοὶ φίλους οἴονται τοὺς χρησίμους εἶναι; τῶν τοιούτων μὲν οὖν οὐδὲν δεήσεται ὁ μακάριος, ἐπειδὴ τἀγαθὰ ὑπάρχει αὐτῷ· οὐδὲ δὴ τῶν διὰ τὸ ἡδύ, ἢ ἐπὶ μικρόν (ἡδὺς γὰρ ὁ βίος ὢν οὐδὲν δεῖται ἐπεισάκτου ἡδονῆς)· οὐ δεόμενος δὲ τῶν τοιούτων φίλων οὐ δοκεῖ δεῖσθαι φίλων. τὸ δ' οὐκ ἔστιν ἴσως ἀληθές.

ENGLISH

There is also dispute about the happy person: will he need friends or not? People say that those who are blessed and self-sufficient have no need of friends, since they already have the good things. Being self-sufficient, then, they need nothing further, whereas a friend, being another self, provides what one cannot provide by oneself. Hence the line, "When heaven grants us good, what need of friends?" But it seems strange, when we assign all good things to the happy person, not to give him friends, which are thought to be the greatest of external goods. And if it belongs to a friend to do good rather than to receive it, and if doing good belongs to the good person and to excellence, and it is finer to do good to friends than to strangers, then the excellent person will need people to benefit. That is why people also ask whether friends are needed more in good fortune or in bad, on the grounds that the unfortunate person needs people to benefit him, and the fortunate need people they can benefit.

Perhaps it is also strange to make the blessed person solitary. No one would choose to have all good things on condition of having them all by himself, since a human being is a political creature, whose nature is to live with others. This holds of the happy person too, since he has the things that are good by nature; and clearly it is better to spend one's days with friends and decent people than with strangers and whoever happens along. So the happy person needs friends. What, then, do those who hold the first view mean, and in what way are they right? Is it that most people think friends are those who are useful? The blessed person will

GREEK

ENGLISH

have no need of friends like that, since he already has good things; nor of friends for pleasure, or only a little (for his life is pleasant and needs no imported pleasure). And because he does not need friends of these kinds, he is thought not to need friends at all. But this is perhaps not true.

ἐν ἀρχῇ γὰρ εἴρηται ὅτι ἡ εὐδαιμονία ἐνέργειά τις ἐστίν, ἡ δ' ἐνέργεια δῆλον ὅτι γίνεται καὶ οὐχ ὑπάρχει ὥσπερ κτῆμά τι. εἰ δὲ τὸ εὐδαιμονεῖν ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ζῆν καὶ ἐνεργεῖν, τοῦ δ' ἀγαθοῦ ἡ ἐνέργεια σπουδαία καὶ ἡδεῖα καθ' αὑτήν, καθάπερ ἐν ἀρχῇ εἴρηται, ἔστι δὲ καὶ τὸ οἰκεῖον τῶν ἡδέων, θεωρεῖν δὲ μᾶλλον τοὺς πέλας δυνάμεθα ἢ ἑαυτοὺς καὶ τὰς ἐκείνων πράξεις ἢ τὰς οἰκείας, αἱ τῶν σπουδαίων δὲ πράξεις φίλων ὄντος ἡδεῖαι τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς [1170a] ‘ἅμφω γὰρ ἔχουσι τὰ τῇ φύσει ἡδέα· ὁ μακάριος δὴ φίλων τοιούτων δεήσεται, εἴπερ θεωρεῖν προαιρεῖται πράξεις ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ οἰκείας, τοιαῦται δ' αἱ τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ φίλου ὄντος. οἴονταί τε δεῖν ἡδέως ζῆν τὸν εὐδαίμονα.

For it was said at the beginning that happiness is a kind of activity, and an activity clearly comes into being; it does not belong to one like a possession. Now suppose that being happy lies in living and being active; that the activity of the good person is excellent and pleasant in itself, as was said at the beginning; that what is one's own is also among pleasant things; that we are better able to contemplate our neighbors than ourselves, and their actions than our own; and that the actions of excellent people who are their friends are pleasant to good people [1170a] (since these actions have both of the features that are pleasant by nature). Then the blessed person will need friends of this kind, since he decides to contemplate actions that are decent and his own, and such are the actions of a good person who is his friend. People also think the happy person must live pleasantly.

1170a μονώτῃ μὲν οὖν χαλεπὸς ὁ βίος· οὐ γὰρ ῥᾴδιον καθ' αὑτὸν ἐνεργεῖν συνεχῶς, μεθ' ἑτέρων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἄλλους ῥᾷον. ἔσται οὖν ἡ ἐνέργεια συνεχεστέρα, ἡδεῖα οὖσα καθ' αὑτήν, ὃ δεῖ περὶ τὸν μακάριον εἶναι· ὁ γὰρ σπουδαῖος, ᾗ σπουδαῖος, ταῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεσι χαίρει, ταῖς δ' ἀπὸ κακίας δυσχεραίνει, καθάπερ ὁ μουσικὸς τοῖς καλοῖς μέλεσιν ἥδεται, ἐπὶ δὲ τοῖς φαύλοις λυπεῖται. γίνοιτο δ' ἂν καὶ ἄσκησίς τις τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐκ τοῦ συζῆν τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, καθάπερ καὶ Θέογνίς φησιν. φυσικώτερον δ' ἐπισκοποῦσιν ἔοικεν ὁ σπουδαῖος φίλος τῷ σπουδαίῳ τῇ φύσει αἱρετὸς εἶναι. τὸ γὰρ τῇ φύσει ἀγαθὸν εἴρηται ὅτι τῷ σπουδαίῳ ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡδύ ἐστι καθ' αὑτό.

Now for a solitary person life is hard, since it is not easy to be continuously active by oneself, but easier with others and in relation to others. So his activity, which is pleasant in itself, will be more continuous, as it should be for the blessed person. For the excellent person, insofar as he is excellent, delights in actions in accordance with excellence and is disgusted by those that come from vice, just as a musician takes pleasure in beautiful melodies and is pained by bad ones. Living with good people would also provide a kind of training in excellence, as Theognis says. And if we look at the matter more from the standpoint of nature, it seems that an excellent friend is by nature choiceworthy for an excellent person. For it has been said that what is good by nature is good and pleasant in itself for the excellent person.

τὸ δὲ ζῆν ὁρίζονται τοῖς ζῴοις δυνάμει αἰσθήσεως, ἀνθρώποις δ' αἰσθήσεως ἢ νοήσεως· ἡ δὲ δύναμις εἰς τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἀνάγεται, τὸ δὲ κύριον ἐν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ· ἔοικε δὴ τὸ ζῆν εἶναι κυρίως τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι ἢ νοεῖν. τὸ δὲ ζῆν τῶν καθ' αὑτὸ ἀγαθῶν καὶ ἡδέων· ὡρισμένον γάρ, τὸ δ' ὡρισμένον τῆς τἀγαθοῦ φύσεως· τὸ δὲ τῇ φύσει ἀγαθὸν καὶ τῷ ἐπιεικεῖ· διόπερ ἔοικε πᾶσιν ἡδὺ εἶναι· οὐ δεῖ δὲ λαμβάνειν μοχθηρὰν ζωὴν καὶ διεφθαρμένην, οὐδ' ἐν

People define life, for animals, by the capacity for perception, and for human beings by the capacity for perception or thought. But a capacity is referred to its activity, and what is decisive lies in the activity; so living seems to be, in the full sense, perceiving or thinking. And life is among the things that are good and pleasant in themselves, since it is determinate, and the determinate be-

GREEK

λύπαις· ἀόριστος γὰρ ἡ τοιαύτη, καθάπερ τὰ ὑπάρχοντα αὐτῇ. ἐν τοῖς ἐχομένοις δὲ περὶ τῆς λύπης ἔσται φανερώτερον.

εἰ δ' αὐτὸ τὸ ζῆν ἀγαθὸν καὶ ἡδύ (ἔοικε δὲ καὶ ἐκ τοῦ πάντας ὀρέγεσθαι αὐτοῦ, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς καὶ μακαρίους· τούτοις γὰρ ὁ βίος αἱρετώτατος, καὶ ἡ τούτων μακαριωτάτη ζωή), ὁ δ' ὁρῶν ὅτι ὁρᾷ αἰσθάνεται καὶ ὁ ἀκούων ὅτι ἀκούει καὶ ὁ βαδίζων ὅτι βαδίζει, καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὁμοίως ἔστι τι τὸ αἰσθανόμενον ὅτι ἐνεργοῦμεν, ὥστε ἂν αἰσθανώμεθ', ὅτι αἰσθανόμεθα, κἂν νοῶμεν, ὅτι νοοῦμεν, τὸ δ' ὅτι αἰσθανόμεθα ἢ νοοῦμεν, ὅτι ἐσμέν (τὸ γὰρ εἶναι ἦν αἰσθάνεσθαι ἢ νοεῖν), 1170b τὸ δ' αἰσθάνεσθαι ὅτι ζῇ, τῶν ἡδέων καθ' αὑτό (φύσει γὰρ ἀγαθὸν ζωή, τὸ δ' ἀγαθὸν ὑπάρχον ἐν ἑαυτῷ αἰσθάνεσθαι ἡδύ), αἱρετὸν δὲ τὸ ζῆν καὶ μάλιστα τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς, ὅτι τὸ εἶναι ἀγαθόν ἐστιν αὐτοῖς καὶ ἡδύ (συναισθανόμενοι γὰρ τοῦ καθ' αὑτὸ ἀγαθοῦ ἥδονται), ὡς δὲ πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔχει ὁ σπουδαῖος, καὶ πρὸς τὸν φίλον (ἕτερος γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ φίλος ἐστίν)· καθάπερ οὖν τὸ αὐτὸν εἶναι αἱρετόν ἐστιν ἑκάστῳ, οὕτω καὶ τὸ τὸν φίλον, ἢ παραπλησίως.

1170b τὸ δ' εἶναι ἦν αἱρετὸν διὰ τὸ αἰσθάνεσθαι αὑτοῦ ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος, ἡ δὲ τοιαύτη αἴσθησις ἡδεῖα καθ' ἑαυτήν. συναισθάνεσθαι ἄρα δεῖ καὶ τοῦ φίλου ὅτι ἔστιν, τοῦτο δὲ γίνοιτ' ἂν ἐν τῷ συζῆν καὶ κοινωνεῖν λόγων καὶ διανοίας· οὕτω γὰρ ἂν δόξειε τὸ συζῆν ἐπὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων λέγεσθαι, καὶ οὐχ ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῶν βοσκημάτων τὸ ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νέμεσθαι. εἰ δὴ τῷ μακαρίῳ τὸ εἶναι αἱρετόν ἐστι καθ' αὑτό, ἀγαθὸν τῇ φύσει ὂν καὶ ἡδύ, παραπλήσιον δὲ καὶ τὸ τοῦ φίλου ἐστίν, κἂν ὁ φίλος τῶν αἱρετῶν εἴη. ὃ δ' ἐστὶν αὐτῷ αἱρετόν, τοῦτο δεῖ ὑπάρχειν αὐτῷ, ἢ ταύτῃ ἐνδεὴς ἔσται. δεήσει ἄρα τῷ εὐδαιμονήσοντι φίλων σπουδαίων.

ENGLISH

longs to the nature of the good; and what is good by nature is good for the decent person too—which is why life seems to be pleasant for everyone. But we must not take a wicked and corrupted life, or one spent in pain; for such a life is indeterminate, as are its attributes. This will be clearer in what follows, when we discuss pain.

Suppose, then, that life itself is good and pleasant (and it seems to be, also from the fact that everyone desires it, and the decent and blessed most of all, since for them life is most choiceworthy and their existence most blessed). Suppose that one who sees perceives that he sees, one who hears that he hears, one who walks that he walks, and similarly in the other cases there is something that perceives that we are active, so that if we perceive, we perceive that we perceive, and if we think, we perceive that we think; and that perceiving that we perceive or think is perceiving that we exist (for existing, we said, is perceiving or thinking). 1170b Suppose that perceiving that one is alive is one of the things pleasant in themselves (for life is good by nature, and perceiving the good present in oneself is pleasant); that living is choiceworthy, and most of all for the good, because existing is good and pleasant for them (for they are pleased by their awareness of what is good in itself); and that the excellent person is related to his friend as he is to himself (for the friend is another self). Then just as one's own existence is choiceworthy for each person, so too is one's friend's existence, or nearly so.

Existence, we said, is choiceworthy because of one's perceiving that one is good, and such perception is pleasant in itself. So one must also share in perceiving that one's friend exists, and this would come about in living together and sharing talk and thought; for this is what living together would seem to mean in the case of human beings, and not, as with cattle, grazing in the same place. If, then, for the blessed person existence is choiceworthy in itself, being good and pleasant by nature, and his friend's existence is close to his own, then the friend too would be among the things choiceworthy. And what is choiceworthy for him he must have, or else he will be lacking in this respect. So whoever is to be happy will need excellent friends.

HOW MANY FRIENDS

Aristotle argues that one can have only a few friends of the best kind.

GREEK

ἆρ' οὖν ὡς πλείστους φίλους ποιητέον, ἢ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς ξενίας ἐμμελῶς εἰρῆσθαι δοκεῖ μήτε πολύξεινος μήτ' ἄξεινος, καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς φιλίας ἁρμόσει μήτ' ἄφιλον εἶναι μήτ' αὖ πολύφιλον καθ' ὑπερβολήν; τοῖς μὲν δὴ πρὸς χρῆσιν κἂν πάνυ δόξειεν ἁρμόζειν τὸ λεχθέν· πολλοῖς γὰρ ἀνθυπηρετεῖν ἐπίπονον, καὶ οὐχ ἱκανὸς ὁ βίος αὐτὸ τοῦτο πράττειν. οἱ πλείους δὴ τῶν πρὸς τὸν οἰκεῖον βίον ἱκανῶν περίεργοι καὶ ἐμπόδιοι πρὸς τὸ καλῶς ζῆν· οὐθὲν οὖν δεῖ αὐτῶν. καὶ οἱ πρὸς ἡδονὴν δὲ ἀρκοῦσιν ὀλίγοι, καθάπερ ἐν τῇ τροφῇ τὸ ἥδυσμα. τοὺς δὲ σπουδαίους πότερον πλείστους κατ' ἀριθμόν, ἢ ἔστι τι μέτρον καὶ φιλικοῦ πλήθους, ὥσπερ πόλεως; οὔτε γὰρ ἐκ δέκα ἀνθρώπων γένοιτ' ἂν πόλις, οὔτ' ἐκ δέκα μυριάδων ἔτι πόλις ἐστίν.

ENGLISH

Should we, then, make as many friends as possible? Or, just as with hospitality it seems aptly said, "neither a host to many guests nor a host to none," will it be fitting in friendship too to be neither friendless nor, again, to have an excessive number of friends? With friends for use, the saying would seem entirely fitting, since returning services to many people is laborious, and a life is not enough for doing it. So more of them than suffice for one's own life are superfluous and a hindrance to living finely; there is no need for them. And of friends for pleasure, too, a few are enough, like seasoning in food. But as for excellent friends, should one have as many as possible in number, or is there some measure for a number of friends too, as there is for a city? For ten people would not make a city, and with a hundred thousand it is no longer a city.

τὸ δὲ ποσὸν οὐκ ἔστιν ἴσως ἕν τι, ἀλλὰ πᾶν τὸ μεταξὺ τινῶν ὡρισμένων. [1171a] καὶ φίλων δή ἐστι πλῆθος ὡρισμένον, καὶ ἴσως οἱ πλεῖστοι μεθ' ὧν ἂν δύναιτό τις συζῆν (τοῦτο γὰρ ἐδόκει φιλικώτατον εἶναι)· ὅτι δ' οὐχ οἷόν τε πολλοῖς συζῆν καὶ διανέμειν ἑαυτόν, οὐκ ἄδηλον. ἔτι δὲ κἀκείνους δεῖ ἀλλήλοις φίλους εἶναι, εἰ μέλλουσι πάντες μετ' ἀλλήλων συνημερεύειν· τοῦτο δ' ἐργῶδες ἐν πολλοῖς ὑπάρχειν. χαλεπὸν δὲ γίνεται καὶ τὸ συγχαίρειν καὶ τὸ συναλγεῖν οἰκείως πολλοῖς· εἰκὸς γὰρ συμπίπτειν ἅμα τῷ μὲν συνήδεσθαι τῷ δὲ συνάχθεσθαι. ἴσως οὖν εὖ ἔχει μὴ ζητεῖν ὡς πολυφιλώτατον εἶναι, ἀλλὰ τοσούτους ὅσοι εἰς τὸ συζῆν ἱκανοί· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδέχεσθαι δόξειεν ἂν πολλοῖς εἶναι φίλον σφόδρα.

But the right quantity is perhaps not some single number, but anything between certain limits. [1171a] So for friends too there is a limited number, and it is perhaps the largest number with whom one could live together (for living together seemed to be most characteristic of friendship). That it is not possible to live with many people and divide oneself among them is clear enough. Moreover, they too must be friends with one another, if they are all to spend their days together; and this is hard to achieve among many. It also becomes difficult to share intimately in the joys and griefs of many, since one is likely to find oneself rejoicing with one person and grieving with another at the same time. Perhaps, then, it is good not to seek to have as many friends as possible, but as many as are enough for living together; for it would seem impossible even to be a close friend to many.

1171a διόπερ οὐδ' ἐρᾶν πλειόνων· ὑπερβολὴ γάρ τις εἶναι βούλεται φιλίας, τοῦτο δὲ πρὸς ἕνα· καὶ τὸ σφόδρα δὴ πρὸς ὀλίγους. οὕτω δ' ἔχειν ἔοικε καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων· οὐ γίνονται γὰρ φίλοι πολλοὶ κατὰ τὴν ἑταιρικὴν φιλίαν, αἱ δ' ὑμνούμεναι ἐν δυσὶ λέγονται. οἱ δὲ πολύφιλοι καὶ πᾶσιν οἰκείως ἐντυγχάνοντες οὐδενὶ δοκοῦσιν εἶναι φίλοι, πλὴν πολιτικῶς, οὓς καὶ καλοῦσιν ἀρέσκους. πολιτικῶς μὲν οὖν ἔστι πολλοῖς εἶναι φίλον καὶ μὴ ἄρεσκον ὄντα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀληθῶς ἐπιεικῆ· δι' ἀρετὴν δὲ καὶ

That is why one can't be in love with several people either: love tends to be a kind of excess of friendship, and that is felt toward one person; so intense friendship, too, is felt toward only a few. This seems to be borne out in practice as well. People don't have many friends in the way of comradely friendship, and the celebrated friendships are said to be between two people. Those who have many friends and are on intimate terms with

GREEK	ENGLISH
δι' αὐτοὺς οὐκ ἔστι πρὸς πολλούς, ἀγαπητὸν δὲ καὶ ὀλίγους εὑρεῖν τοιούτους.	everyone seem to be friends to no one, except in the way fellow citizens are—people call them people-pleasers. In the civic way, then, one can be a friend to many without being a people-pleaser, while being genuinely decent; but friendship on account of excellence, and for the friends' own sake, one can't have with many. One should be content to find even a few such people.

FRIENDS IN GOOD AND BAD FORTUNE

Aristotle asks whether friends are needed more in good fortune or bad, and praises living together.

GREEK	ENGLISH
πότερον δ' ἐν εὐτυχίαις μᾶλλον φίλων δεῖ ἢ ἐν δυστυχίαις; ἐν ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ἐπιζητοῦνται· οἵ τε γὰρ ἀτυχοῦντες δέονται ἐπικουρίας, οἵ τ' εὐτυχοῦντες συμβίων καὶ οὓς εὖ ποιήσουσιν· βούλονται γὰρ εὖ δρᾶν. ἀναγκαιότερον μὲν δὴ ἐν ταῖς ἀτυχίαις, διὸ τῶν χρησίμων ἐνταῦθα δεῖ, κάλλιον δ' ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις, διὸ καὶ τοὺς ἐπιεικεῖς ζητοῦσιν· τούτους γὰρ αἱρετώτερον εὐεργετεῖν καὶ μετὰ τούτων διάγειν. ἔστι γὰρ καὶ ἡ παρουσία αὐτὴ τῶν φίλων ἡδεῖα καὶ ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς δυστυχίαις. κουφίζονται γὰρ οἱ λυπούμενοι συναλγούντων τῶν φίλων. διὸ κἂν ἀπορήσειέν τις πότερον ὥσπερ βάρους μεταλαμβάνουσιν, ἢ τοῦτο μὲν οὔ, ἡ παρουσία δ' αὐτῶν ἡδεῖα οὖσα καὶ ἡ ἔννοια τοῦ συναλγεῖν ἐλάττω τὴν λύπην ποιεῖ.	Do we need friends more in good fortune or in bad? They are sought in both. Those in misfortune need help, and the fortunate need people to share their lives with and to do good to, since they want to do good. Friends are more necessary in misfortune, which is why it's useful friends that are needed there; but it is finer to have them in good fortune, which is why people then look for decent friends, since it is more choiceworthy to do good to them and to spend time with them. For the very presence of friends is pleasant, in good fortune and in bad alike. People in pain are relieved when their friends share their pain. So one might even raise the puzzle whether friends take a share of it, as if it were a weight, or whether that isn't so, but rather their presence, being pleasant, and the thought that they share the pain make the pain less.
εἰ μὲν οὖν διὰ ταῦτα ἢ δι' ἄλλο τι κουφίζονται, ἀφείσθω· συμβαίνειν δ' οὖν φαίνεται τὸ λεχθέν. ἔοικε δ' ἡ παρουσία μικτή τις αὐτῶν εἶναι. αὐτὸ μὲν γὰρ τὸ ὁρᾶν τοὺς φίλους ἡδύ, 1171b ἄλλως τε καὶ ἀτυχοῦντι, καὶ γίνεταί τις ἐπικουρία πρὸς τὸ μὴ λυπεῖσθαι (παραμυθητικὸν γὰρ ὁ φίλος καὶ τῇ ὄψει καὶ τῷ λόγῳ, ἐὰν ᾖ ἐπιδέξιος· οἶδε γὰρ τὸ ἦθος καὶ ἐφ' οἷς ἥδεται καὶ λυπεῖται)· τὸ δὲ λυπούμενον αἰσθάνεσθαι ἐπὶ ταῖς αὑτοῦ ἀτυχίαις λυπηρόν· πᾶς γὰρ φεύγει λύπης αἴτιος εἶναι τοῖς φίλοις.	Whether it's for these reasons or some other that people are relieved, let's set aside; at any rate, what we described does seem to happen. But the presence of friends seems to be a mixed thing. The very sight of one's friends is pleasant, 1171b especially for someone in misfortune, and it gives some help against grief (for a friend is a comfort, both by being seen and by what he says, if he is tactful, since he knows one's character and what gives one pleasure and pain). Yet to perceive him pained at one's own misfortunes is painful, since everyone avoids being a cause of pain to his friends.
1171b διόπερ οἱ μὲν ἀνδρώδεις τὴν φύσιν εὐλαβοῦνται συλλυπεῖν τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῖς, κἂν μὴ ὑπερτείνῃ τῇ ἀλυπίᾳ, τὴν ἐκείνοις γινομένην λύπην οὐχ ὑπομένει, ὅλως τε συνθρήνους οὐ προσίεται διὰ τὸ μηδ' αὐτὸς εἶναι θρηνητικός· γύναια δὲ καὶ οἱ τοιοῦτοι ἄνδρες τοῖς	That is why those of a manly nature take care not to make their friends share their pain. Unless he is exceptionally insensitive to pain, such a man can't bear the pain it causes them, and in general he doesn't admit others to lament with him, since he

GREEK

συστένουσι χαίρουσι, καὶ φιλοῦσιν ὡς φίλους καὶ συναλγοῦντας. μιμεῖσθαι δ' ἐν ἅπασι δεῖ δῆλον ὅτι τὸν βελτίω. ἡ δ' ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις τῶν φίλων παρουσία τήν τε διαγωγὴν ἡδεῖαν ἔχει καὶ τὴν ἔννοιαν ὅτι ἥδονται ἐπὶ τοῖς αὑτοῦ ἀγαθοῖς. διὸ δόξειεν ἂν δεῖν εἰς μὲν τὰς εὐτυχίας καλεῖν τοὺς φίλους προθύμως (εὐεργετικὸν γὰρ εἶναι καλόν), εἰς δὲ τὰς ἀτυχίας ὀκνοῦντα· μεταδιδόναι γὰρ ὡς ἥκιστα δεῖ τῶν κακῶν, ὅθεν τὸ ἅλις ἐγὼ δυστυχῶν. μάλιστα δὲ παρακλητέον ὅταν μέλλωσιν ὀλίγα ὀχληθέντες μεγάλ' αὐτὸν ὠφελήσειν.

ἰέναι δ' ἀνάπαλιν ἴσως ἁρμόζει πρὸς μὲν τοὺς ἀτυχοῦντας ἄκλητον καὶ προθύμως (φίλου γὰρ εὖ ποιεῖν, καὶ μάλιστα τοὺς ἐν χρείᾳ καὶ τὸ μὴ ἀξιώσαντας· ἀμφοῖν γὰρ κάλλιον καὶ ἥδιον), εἰς δὲ τὰς εὐτυχίας συνεργοῦντα μὲν προθύμως (καὶ γὰρ εἰς ταῦτα χρεία φίλων), πρὸς εὐπάθειαν δὲ σχολαίως· οὐ γὰρ καλὸν τὸ προθυμεῖσθαι ὠφελεῖσθαι. δόξαν δ' ἀηδίας ἐν τῷ διωθεῖσθαι ἴσως εὐλαβητέον· ἐνίοτε γὰρ συμβαίνει. ἡ παρουσία δὴ τῶν φίλων ἐν ἅπασιν αἱρετὴ φαίνεται.

ἆρ' οὖν, ὥσπερ τοῖς ἐρῶσι τὸ ὁρᾶν ἀγαπητότατόν ἐστι καὶ μᾶλλον αἱροῦνται ταύτην τὴν αἴσθησιν ἢ τὰς λοιπὰς ὡς κατὰ ταύτην μάλιστα τοῦ ἔρωτος ὄντος καὶ γινομένου, οὕτω καὶ τοῖς φίλοις αἱρετώτατόν ἐστι τὸ συζῆν; κοινωνία γὰρ ἡ φιλία, καὶ ὡς πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἔχει, οὕτω καὶ πρὸς τὸν φίλον· περὶ αὐτὸν δ' ἡ αἴσθησις ὅτι ἔστιν αἱρετή, καὶ περὶ τὸν φίλον δή· ἡ δ' ἐνέργεια γίνεται αὐτῆς ἐν τῷ συζῆν, [1172a] ὥστ' εἰκότως τούτου ἐφίενται.

1172a καὶ ὅ ποτ' ἐστὶν ἑκάστοις τὸ εἶναι ἢ οὗ χάριν αἱροῦνται τὸ ζῆν, ἐν τούτῳ μετὰ τῶν φίλων βούλονται διάγειν· διόπερ οἱ μὲν συμπίνουσιν, οἱ δὲ συγκυβεύουσιν, ἄλλοι δὲ συγγυμνάζονται καὶ συγκυνηγοῦσιν ἢ συμφιλοσοφοῦσιν, ἕκαστοι ἐν τούτῳ συνημερεύοντες ὅ τι περ μάλιστ' ἀγαπῶσι τῶν ἐν τῷ βίῳ· συζῆν γὰρ βουλόμενοι μετὰ τῶν φίλων, ταῦτα ποιοῦσι καὶ τούτων κοινωνοῦσιν οἷς οἴονται συζῆν. γίνεται οὖν ἡ μὲν τῶν φαύλων φιλία μοχθηρά (κοινωνοῦσι γὰρ φαύλων ἀβέβαιοι ὄντες, καὶ

ENGLISH

isn't given to lamenting himself. Women, though, and men of that sort enjoy people who groan along with them, and love them as friends who share their pain. But clearly in everything one should imitate the better person. The presence of friends in good fortune, on the other hand, brings both pleasant time together and the thought that they are pleased at one's own goods. So it would seem that one should invite friends eagerly to share one's good fortune (for it is fine to be ready to do good), but hesitate to invite them to share one's misfortunes, since one should give others a share of one's troubles as little as possible—hence the line "It's enough that I am unfortunate." One should call on them above all when they will be of great help to one at little trouble to themselves.

Conversely, it is perhaps fitting to go to friends in misfortune uninvited and eagerly (for it belongs to a friend to do good, especially to those in need who haven't asked for it; this is finer and more pleasant for both), but when they are in good fortune, to go eagerly to help them (since friends are needed for this too), yet to be slow to go in order to be well treated oneself, since it isn't fine to be eager to receive benefits. Still, one should perhaps beware of seeming disagreeable by rebuffing them, since this sometimes happens. The presence of friends, then, appears choiceworthy in all circumstances.

Well then: just as for lovers seeing the beloved is what they cherish most, and they prefer this sense to the others because love exists and comes to be above all through it, isn't living together likewise the most choiceworthy thing for friends? For friendship is a partnership, and as one is toward oneself, so one is toward one's friend. In one's own case the perception that one exists is choiceworthy, and so it is in the case of one's friend; and this perception becomes active in living together, [1172a] so it's reasonable that friends aim at this.

And whatever existence means for each sort of person, or whatever it is for the sake of which they choose to live, that is what they want to spend their time doing with their friends. That is why some drink together, others play dice together, others exercise together and hunt together, or do philosophy together—each kind spending their days together in whatever they love most in life.

GREEK

μοχθηροὶ δὲ γίνονται ὁμοιούμενοι ἀλλήλοις), ἡ δὲ τῶν ἐπιεικῶν ἐπιεικής, συναυξανομένη ταῖς ὁμιλίαις· δοκοῦσι δὲ καὶ βελτίους γίνεσθαι ἐνεργοῦντες καὶ διορθοῦντες ἀλλήλους· ἀπομάττονται γὰρ παρ' ἀλλήλων οἷς ἀρέσκονται, ὅθεν ἐσθλῶν μὲν γὰρ ἄπ' ἐσθλά. περὶ μὲν οὖν φιλίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον εἰρήσθω· ἑπόμενον δ' ἂν εἴη διελθεῖν περὶ ἡδονῆς.

ENGLISH

Since they want to live together with their friends, they do and share in the things in which they think living together consists. So the friendship of base people turns out to be bad (for, being unstable, they share in base pursuits, and they become bad by growing like each other), while the friendship of decent people is decent, and grows with their association. They seem to become better, too, by being active together and correcting each other, since each takes the imprint of what he approves of in the other—hence "From the good, good things." So much for friendship. The next thing would be to discuss pleasure.

Book X

Pleasure, and the happiest life
Aristotle explains what pleasure is and argues that the happiest life is one of contemplation.

GREEK

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα περὶ ἡδονῆς ἴσως ἔπεται διελθεῖν. μάλιστα γὰρ δοκεῖ συνῳκειῶσθαι τῷ γένει ἡμῶν, διὸ παιδεύουσι τοὺς νέους οἰακίζοντες ἡδονῇ καὶ λύπῃ· δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ ἤθους ἀρετὴν μέγιστον εἶναι τὸ χαίρειν οἷς δεῖ καὶ μισεῖν ἃ δεῖ. διατείνει γὰρ ταῦτα διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου, ῥοπὴν ἔχοντα καὶ δύναμιν πρὸς ἀρετήν τε καὶ τὸν εὐδαίμονα βίον· τὰ μὲν γὰρ ἡδέα προαιροῦνται, τὰ δὲ λυπηρὰ φεύγουσιν· ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν τοιούτων ἥκιστ' ἂν δόξειε παρετέον εἶναι, ἄλλως τε καὶ πολλὴν ἐχόντων ἀμφισβήτησιν.

ENGLISH

After this, presumably, the next thing is to discuss pleasure. For pleasure seems to be more closely bound up with our kind than anything else, which is why people educate the young by steering them with pleasure and pain. For excellence of character, too, it seems to matter most to enjoy what one should and to hate what one should. These things extend through the whole of life, and carry weight and power for excellence and the happy life, since people decide on what is pleasant and avoid what is painful. And it would seem that such matters should least of all be passed over, especially since they are much disputed.

οἳ μὲν γὰρ τἀγαθὸν ἡδονὴν λέγουσιν, οἳ δ' ἐξ ἐναντίας κομιδῇ φαῦλον, οἳ μὲν ἴσως πεπεισμένοι οὕτω καὶ ἔχειν, οἳ δὲ οἰόμενοι βέλτιον εἶναι πρὸς τὸν βίον ἡμῶν ἀποφαίνειν τὴν ἡδονὴν τῶν φαύλων, καὶ εἰ μὴ ἐστίν· ῥέπειν γὰρ τοὺς πολλοὺς πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ δουλεύειν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, διὸ δεῖν εἰς τοὐναντίον ἄγειν· ἐλθεῖν γὰρ ἂν οὕτως ἐπὶ τὸ μέσον. μή ποτε δὲ οὐ καλῶς τοῦτο λέγεται. οἱ γὰρ περὶ τῶν ἐν τοῖς πάθεσι καὶ ταῖς πράξεσι λόγοι ἧττόν εἰσι πιστοὶ τῶν ἔργων· ὅταν οὖν διαφωνῶσι τοῖς κατὰ τὴν αἴσθησιν, καταφρονούμενοι καὶ τἀληθὲς προσαναιροῦσιν· [1172b] ὁ γὰρ ψέγων τὴν ἡδονήν, ὀφθείς ποτ' ἐφιέμενος, ἀποκλίνειν δοκεῖ πρὸς αὐτὴν ὡς τοιαύτην οὖσαν ἅπασαν· τὸ διορίζειν γὰρ οὐκ ἔστι τῶν πολλῶν.

Some say that pleasure is the good; others, on the contrary, that it is altogether bad. Some of the latter are perhaps convinced that this is really so; others think it better for our lives to present pleasure as a bad thing even if it isn't, since most people incline toward it and are slaves to their pleasures, so one must pull them in the opposite direction, and in that way they will arrive at the mean. But perhaps this isn't well said. Arguments about feelings and actions are less credible than facts; so when they clash with what is perceived, they are scorned and discredit the truth along with themselves. [1172b] If someone who condemns pleasure is once seen going after it, he seems to be leaning toward it because all pleasure is of that sort—for making distinctions is not something most people do.

1172b ἐοίκασιν οὖν οἱ ἀληθεῖς τῶν λόγων οὐ μόνον πρὸς τὸ εἰδέναι χρησιμώτατοι εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ πρὸς τὸν βίον· συνῳδοὶ γὰρ ὄντες τοῖς ἔργοις πιστεύονται, διὸ προτρέπονται τοὺς συνιέντας ζῆν κατ' αὐτούς. τῶν μὲν οὖν τοιούτων ἅλις· τὰ δ' εἰρημένα περὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐπέλθωμεν.

True arguments, then, seem to be most useful not only for knowledge but also for life. Since they harmonize with the facts, they are believed, and so they encourage those who understand them to live by them. But enough of such matters; let's go through what has been said about pleasure.

ARGUMENTS FOR AND AGAINST PLEASURE

Aristotle reviews Eudoxus' view that pleasure is the good and objections to it.

GREEK

εὔδοξος μὲν οὖν τὴν ἡδονὴν τἀγαθὸν ᾤετ' εἶναι διὰ τὸ πάνθ' ὁρᾶν ἐφιέμενα αὐτῆς, καὶ ἔλλογα καὶ ἄλογα, ἐν πᾶσι δ' εἶναι τὸ αἱρετὸν τὸ ἐπιεικές, καὶ τὸ μάλιστα κράτιστον· τὸ δὴ πάντ' ἐπὶ ταὐτὸ φέρεσθαι μηνύειν ὡς πᾶσι τοῦτο ἄριστον ὄν (ἕκαστον γὰρ τὸ αὑτῷ ἀγαθὸν εὑρίσκειν, ὥσπερ καὶ τροφήν), τὸ δὲ πᾶσιν ἀγαθόν, καὶ οὗ πάντ' ἐφίεται, τἀγαθὸν εἶναι. ἐπιστεύοντο δ' οἱ λόγοι διὰ τὴν τοῦ ἤθους ἀρετὴν μᾶλλον ἢ δι' αὑτούς· διαφερόντως γὰρ ἐδόκει σώφρων εἶναι· οὐ δὴ ὡς φίλος τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐδόκει ταῦτα λέγειν, ἀλλ' οὕτως ἔχειν κατ' ἀλήθειαν.

οὐχ ἧττον δ' ᾤετ' εἶναι φανερὸν ἐκ τοῦ ἐναντίου· τὴν γὰρ λύπην καθ' αὑτὸ πᾶσι φευκτὸν εἶναι, ὁμοίως δὴ τοὐναντίον αἱρετόν· μάλιστα δ' εἶναι αἱρετὸν ὃ μὴ δι' ἕτερον μηδ' ἑτέρου χάριν αἱρούμεθα· τοιοῦτο δ' ὁμολογουμένως εἶναι τὴν ἡδονήν· οὐδένα γὰρ ἐπερωτᾶν τίνος ἕνεκα ἥδεται, ὡς καθ' αὑτὴν οὖσαν αἱρετὴν τὴν ἡδονήν. προστιθεμένην τε ὁτῳοῦν τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἱρετώτερον ποιεῖν, οἷον τῷ δικαιοπραγεῖν καὶ σωφρονεῖν, αὔξεσθαι δὲ τὸ ἀγαθὸν αὑτῷ. ἔοικε δὴ οὗτός γε ὁ λόγος τῶν ἀγαθῶν αὐτὴν ἀποφαίνειν, καὶ οὐδὲν μᾶλλον ἑτέρου· πᾶν γὰρ μεθ' ἑτέρου ἀγαθοῦ αἱρετώτερον ἢ μονούμενον.

τοιούτῳ δὴ λόγῳ καὶ Πλάτων ἀναιρεῖ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἡδονὴ τἀγαθόν· αἱρετώτερον γὰρ εἶναι τὸν ἡδὺν βίον μετὰ φρονήσεως ἢ χωρίς, εἰ δὲ τὸ μικτὸν κρεῖττον, οὐκ εἶναι τὴν ἡδονὴν τἀγαθόν· οὐδενὸς γὰρ προστεθέντος αὐτῷ τἀγαθὸν αἱρετώτερον γίνεσθαι. δῆλον δ' ὡς οὐδ' ἄλλο οὐδὲν τἀγαθὸν ἂν εἴη, ὃ μετά τινος τῶν καθ' αὑτὸ ἀγαθῶν αἱρετώτερον γίνεται. τί οὖν ἐστὶ τοιοῦτον, οὗ καὶ ἡμεῖς κοινωνοῦμεν; τοιοῦτον γὰρ ἐπιζητεῖται. οἱ δ' ἐνιστάμενοι ὡς οὐκ ἀγαθὸν οὗ πάντ' ἐφίεται, μὴ οὐθὲν λέγουσιν. [1173a] ἃ γὰρ πᾶσι δοκεῖ, ταῦτ' εἶναί φαμεν· ὁ δ' ἀναιρῶν ταύτην τὴν πίστιν οὐ πάνυ πιστότερα ἐρεῖ. εἰ μὲν γὰρ τὰ ἀνόητα ὀρέγεται αὐτῶν, ἦν ἄν τι λεγόμενον, εἰ δὲ καὶ τὰ φρόνιμα, πῶς λέγοιεν ἄν τι;

ENGLISH

Eudoxus thought that pleasure is the good because he saw all creatures, rational and non-rational, aiming at it. In everything, he held, what is choiceworthy is what is good, and what is most choiceworthy is best; so the fact that all things are drawn to the same thing indicated that this is the best for all (since each thing finds what is good for itself, as it does its food), and what is good for all, and what all aim at, is the good. His arguments were believed more because of the excellence of his character than for their own sake. He seemed exceptionally moderate, so he seemed to be saying these things not as a lover of pleasure but because that was really how things were.

He thought it was no less evident from the opposite. Pain in itself is to be avoided by all, and so, similarly, its opposite is choiceworthy. And what is most choiceworthy is what we choose not because of something else or for the sake of something else; and pleasure is admittedly of this kind, since nobody asks anyone why he is enjoying himself, on the assumption that pleasure is choiceworthy in itself. Added to any good whatever—to acting justly or moderately, for instance—it makes it more choiceworthy, and good is increased by good. This argument, at any rate, seems to show that pleasure is one of the goods, and no more so than any other, since every good is more choiceworthy together with another good than on its own.

It is by just such an argument that Plato, too, refutes the claim that pleasure is the good: the pleasant life is more choiceworthy with practical wisdom than without it, and if the mixture is better, pleasure is not the good, since the good does not become more choiceworthy by having anything added to it. And clearly nothing else would be the good either if it becomes more choiceworthy when combined with any of the things good in themselves. What is there, then, of this kind, that we too can share in? For that is what we are looking for. Those who object that what all things aim at is not good may be talking nonsense. [1173a] What everyone believes, we say is so; and someone who does away with this conviction will hardly say

GREEK

ENGLISH

anything more convincing. If it were only mindless creatures that desired pleasures, there would be something in what they say; but if intelligent ones do too, how could it make sense?[1]

1173a ἴσως δὲ καὶ ἐν τοῖς φαύλοις ἔστι τι φυσικὸν ἀγαθὸν κρεῖττον ἢ καθ' αὑτά, ὃ ἐφίεται τοῦ οἰκείου ἀγαθοῦ. οὐκ ἔοικε δὲ οὐδὲ περὶ τοῦ ἐναντίου καλῶς λέγεσθαι. οὐ γάρ φασιν, εἰ ἡ λύπη κακόν ἐστι, τὴν ἡδονὴν ἀγαθὸν εἶναι· ἀντικεῖσθαι γὰρ καὶ κακὸν κακῷ καὶ ἄμφω τῷ μηδετέρῳ —λέγοντες ταῦτα οὐ κακῶς, οὐ μὴν ἐπί γε τῶν εἰρημένων ἀληθεύοντες. ἀμφοῖν γὰρ ὄντοιν τῶν κακῶν καὶ φευκτὰ ἔδει ἄμφω εἶναι, τῶν μηδετέρων δὲ μηδέτερον ἢ ὁμοίως· νῦν δὲ φαίνονται τὴν μὲν φεύγοντες ὡς κακόν, τὴν δ' αἱρούμενοι ὡς ἀγαθόν· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἀντίκειται.

Perhaps even in base creatures there is some natural good, stronger than they are in themselves, which aims at their proper good. Nor does the argument about the opposite seem to be correct. They say that if pain is bad, it doesn't follow that pleasure is good, since bad is opposed to bad as well, and both to what is neither. In saying this they aren't wrong, but it isn't true of the things in question. If both were bad, both would have to be avoided, and if both were neither, neither would have to be avoided, or both alike; but in fact people plainly avoid the one as bad and choose the other as good. It is in this way, then, that they are opposed.

οὐ μὴν οὐδ' εἰ μὴ τῶν ποιοτήτων ἐστὶν ἡ ἡδονή, διὰ τοῦτ' οὐδὲ τῶν ἀγαθῶν· οὐδὲ γὰρ αἱ τῆς ἀρετῆς ἐνέργειαι ποιότητές εἰσιν, οὐδ' ἡ εὐδαιμονία. λέγουσι δὲ τὸ μὲν ἀγαθὸν ὡρίσθαι, τὴν δ' ἡδονὴν ἀόριστον εἶναι, ὅτι δέχεται τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον. εἰ μὲν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ ἥδεσθαι τοῦτο κρίνουσι, καὶ περὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην καὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετάς, καθ' ἃς ἐναργῶς φασὶ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον τοὺς ποιοὺς ὑπάρχειν καὶ πράττειν κατὰ τὰς ἀρετάς, ἔσται ταὐτά· δίκαιοι γάρ εἰσι μᾶλλον καὶ ἀνδρεῖοι, ἔστι δὲ καὶ δικαιοπραγεῖν καὶ σωφρονεῖν μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον. εἰ δὲ ταῖς ἡδοναῖς, μή ποτ' οὐ λέγουσι τὸ αἴτιον, ἂν ὧσιν αἱ μὲν ἀμιγεῖς αἱ δὲ μικταί.

Nor, again, if pleasure is not a quality, does it follow that it is not a good either; for the activities of excellence aren't qualities either, nor is happiness. They also say that the good is determinate, while pleasure is indeterminate because it admits of more and less. Now if they judge this from being pleased, the same will hold of justice and the other excellences, with respect to which people are plainly said to be more or less of a given character, and to act more or less in accordance with the excellences: people are more just and more courageous, and it is possible to act justly and moderately more or less. But if they judge by the pleasures themselves, perhaps they aren't stating the cause, if some pleasures are unmixed and others mixed.

καὶ τί κωλύει, καθάπερ ὑγίεια ὡρισμένη οὖσα δέχεται τὸ μᾶλλον καὶ τὸ ἧττον, οὕτω καὶ τὴν ἡδονήν; οὐ γὰρ ἡ αὐτὴ συμμετρία ἐν πᾶσίν ἐστιν, οὐδ' ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ μία τις ἀεί, ἀλλ' ἀνιεμένη διαμένει ἕως τινός, καὶ διαφέρει τῷ μᾶλλον καὶ ἧττον. τοιοῦτον δὴ καὶ τὸ περὶ τὴν ἡδονὴν ἐνδέχεται εἶναι. τέλειόν τε τἀγαθὸν τιθέντες, τὰς δὲ κινήσεις καὶ τὰς γενέσεις ἀτελεῖς, τὴν ἡδονὴν κίνησιν καὶ γένεσιν ἀποφαίνειν πειρῶνται. οὐ καλῶς δ' ἐοίκασι λέγειν οὐδ' εἶναι κίνησιν. πάσῃ γὰρ οἰκεῖον εἶναι δοκεῖ τάχος καὶ βραδυτής, καὶ εἰ μὴ καθ' αὑτήν, οἷον τῇ τοῦ κόσμου, πρὸς ἄλλο· τῇ δ' ἡδονῇ τούτων οὐδέτερον ὑπάρχει. ἡσθῆναι μὲν γὰρ ἔστι ταχέως ὥσπερ ὀργισθῆναι,

And what prevents pleasure from being like health, which is determinate and yet admits of more and less? The same proportion is not present in everyone, nor is there always one and the same proportion in the same person; it can be loosened and still persist up to a point, and it differs by more and less. Pleasure too, then, can be of this kind. Again, they posit that the good is complete, while motions and comings-to-be are incomplete, and they try to show that pleasure is a motion and a coming-to-be. But they don't seem to be right; it doesn't even seem to be a motion. Speed and slow-

1 Plato argues this in his dialogue *Philebus*.

GREEK

ENGLISH

1173b ἥδεσθαι δ' οὔ, οὐδὲ πρὸς ἕτερον, βαδίζειν δὲ καὶ αὔξεσθαι καὶ πάντα τὰ τοιαῦτα.

ness seem proper to every motion—if not in itself, as with the motion of the cosmos, then relative to something else; but neither of these belongs to pleasure. One can become pleased quickly, as one can become angry quickly, 1173b but one can't be pleased quickly, not even relative to someone else, whereas one can walk, grow and do all such things quickly.

1173b μεταβάλλειν μὲν οὖν εἰς τὴν ἡδονὴν ταχέως καὶ βραδέως ἔστιν, ἐνεργεῖν δὲ κατ' αὐτὴν οὐκ ἔστι ταχέως, λέγω δ' ἥδεσθαι. γένεσίς τε πῶς ἂν εἴη; δοκεῖ γὰρ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ τυχόντος τὸ τυχὸν γίνεσθαι, ἀλλ' ἐξ οὗ γίνεται, εἰς τοῦτο διαλύεσθαι· καὶ οὗ γένεσις ἡ ἡδονή, τούτου ἡ λύπη φθορά. καὶ λέγουσι δὲ τὴν μὲν λύπην ἔνδειαν τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν εἶναι, τὴν δ' ἡδονὴν ἀναπλήρωσιν. ταῦτα δὲ σωματικά ἐστι τὰ πάθη. εἰ δή ἐστι τοῦ κατὰ φύσιν ἀναπλήρωσις ἡ ἡδονή, ἐν ᾧ ἡ ἀναπλήρωσις, τοῦτ' ἂν καὶ ἥδοιτο· τὸ σῶμα ἄρα· οὐ δοκεῖ δέ· οὐδ' ἔστιν ἄρα ἡ ἀναπλήρωσις ἡδονή, ἀλλὰ γινομένης μὲν ἀναπληρώσεως ἥδοιτ' ἄν τις, καὶ †τεμνόμενοσ† λυποῖτο.

One can change into pleasure quickly or slowly, then, but one can't be active in accordance with it—I mean, be pleased—quickly. And how could it be a coming-to-be? Not just anything, it seems, comes to be from just anything; rather, a thing dissolves into what it comes to be from; and pain would be the destruction of that of which pleasure is the coming-to-be. They also say that pain is a lack of the natural state, and pleasure a replenishment. But these are bodily feelings. If pleasure is a replenishment of the natural state, then what the replenishment occurs in would also be what feels the pleasure—the body, then; but that doesn't seem so. So replenishment is not pleasure, though someone might feel pleasure while a replenishment is taking place, and pain while being cut.

ἡ δόξα δ' αὕτη δοκεῖ γεγενῆσθαι ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὴν τροφὴν λυπῶν καὶ ἡδονῶν· ἐνδεεῖς γὰρ γενομένους καὶ προλυπηθέντας ἥδεσθαι τῇ ἀναπληρώσει. τοῦτο δ' οὐ περὶ πάσας συμβαίνει τὰς ἡδονάς· ἄλυποι γάρ εἰσιν αἵ τε μαθηματικαὶ καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις αἱ διὰ τῆς ὀσφρήσεως, καὶ ἀκροάματα δὲ καὶ ὁράματα πολλὰ καὶ μνῆμαι καὶ ἐλπίδες. τίνος οὖν αὗται γενέσεις ἔσονται; οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἔνδεια γεγένηται, οὗ γένοιτ' ἂν ἀναπλήρωσις.

This view seems to have arisen from the pains and pleasures connected with food: having been in want and felt pain beforehand, people are pleased by the replenishment. But this doesn't happen with all pleasures. The pleasures of mathematics involve no prior pain, nor, among the pleasures of the senses, do those of smell, nor many sounds and sights, nor memories and hopes. What, then, will these be comings-to-be of? There has been no lack of anything for there to be a replenishment of.

πρὸς δὲ τοὺς προφέροντας τὰς ἐπονειδίστους τῶν ἡδονῶν λέγοι τις ἂν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ταῦθ' ἡδέα (οὐ γὰρ εἰ τοῖς κακῶς διακειμένοις ἡδέα ἐστίν, οἰητέον αὐτὰ καὶ ἡδέα εἶναι πλὴν τούτοις, καθάπερ οὐδὲ τὰ τοῖς κάμνουσιν ὑγιεινὰ ἢ γλυκέα ἢ πικρά, οὐδ' αὖ λευκὰ τὰ φαινόμενα τοῖς ὀφθαλμιῶσιν)· ἢ οὕτω λέγοι τις ἄν, ὅτι αἱ μὲν ἡδοναὶ αἱρεταί εἰσιν, οὐ μὴν ἀπό γε τούτων, ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ πλουτεῖν, προδόντι δ' οὔ, καὶ τὸ ὑγιαίνειν, οὐ μὴν ὁτιοῦν φαγόντι· ἢ τῷ εἴδει διαφέρουσιν αἱ ἡδοναί· ἕτεραι γὰρ αἱ ἀπὸ τῶν καλῶν τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν αἰσχρῶν, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἡσθῆναι τὴν τοῦ δικαίου μὴ ὄντα δίκαιον οὐδὲ τὴν τοῦ μουσικοῦ μὴ ὄντα μουσικόν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων.

To those who cite the disgraceful pleasures, one might reply that these are not pleasant. If they are pleasant to people in a bad condition, we shouldn't think they are also pleasant, except to these people—just as we don't think that what is healthy or sweet or bitter to the sick is so, or that what appears white to people with eye disease is white. Or one might put it this way: pleasures are choiceworthy, but not from these sources—just as being rich is choiceworthy, but not for someone who gets it by betrayal, and being healthy, but not for someone who gets it by eating just anything. Or else pleasures differ in kind. Those from fine things are different from those from shameful

GREEK	ENGLISH
	ones, and one can't feel the pleasure of the just person without being just, or that of the musical person without being musical, and so on in other cases.
ἐμφανίζειν δὲ δοκεῖ καὶ ὁ φίλος ἕτερος ὢν τοῦ κόλακος οὐκ οὖσαν ἀγαθὸν τὴν ἡδονὴν ἢ διαφόρους εἴδει· ὃ μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τἀγαθὸν ὁμιλεῖν δοκεῖ, ὃ δὲ πρὸς ἡδονήν, καὶ τῷ μὲν ὀνειδίζεται, τὸν δ' ἐπαινοῦσιν ὡς πρὸς ἕτερα ὁμιλοῦντα. 1174a οὐδείς τ' ἂν ἕλοιτο ζῆν παιδίου διάνοιαν ἔχων διὰ βίου, ἡδόμενος ἐφ' οἷς τὰ παιδία ὡς οἷόν τε μάλιστα, οὐδὲ χαίρειν ποιῶν τι τῶν αἰσχίστων, μηδέποτε μέλλων λυπηθῆναι. περὶ πολλά τε σπουδὴν ποιησαίμεθ' ἂν καὶ εἰ μηδεμίαν ἐπιφέροι ἡδονήν, οἷον ὁρᾶν, μνημονεύειν, εἰδέναι, τὰς ἀρετὰς ἔχειν. εἰ δ' ἐξ ἀνάγκης ἕπονται τούτοις ἡδοναί, οὐδὲν διαφέρει· ἑλοίμεθα γὰρ ἂν ταῦτα καὶ εἰ μὴ γίνοιτ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἡδονή.	The fact that a friend is different from a flatterer also seems to make it plain that pleasure is not a good, or that pleasures differ in kind. The one seems to associate with us with a view to the good, the other with a view to pleasure; and the one is reproached, while people praise the other as associating with a view to other things. 1174a Again, no one would choose to live with a child's mind all his life, taking the greatest possible pleasure in the things children enjoy, or to enjoy doing something utterly shameful, even if he were never going to suffer pain for it. And there are many things we would care about even if they brought no pleasure, such as seeing, remembering, knowing, and having the excellences. If pleasures necessarily follow on these, it makes no difference, since we would choose them even if no pleasure came from them.
1174a ὅτι μὲν οὖν οὔτε τἀγαθὸν ἡ ἡδονὴ οὔτε πᾶσα αἱρετή, δῆλον ἔοικεν εἶναι, καὶ ὅτι εἰσί τινες αἱρεταὶ καθ' αὑτὰς διαφέρουσαι τῷ εἴδει ἢ ἀφ' ὧν. τὰ μὲν οὖν λεγόμενα περὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς καὶ λύπης ἱκανῶς εἰρήσθω.	That pleasure is not the good, then, and that not every pleasure is choiceworthy, seems to be clear; and also that some pleasures are choiceworthy in themselves, differing from the others in kind or in their sources. So much for what is said about pleasure and pain.

WHAT PLEASURE IS

Aristotle argues that pleasure is complete at every moment, like seeing, and is not a process.

GREEK	ENGLISH
τί δ' ἐστὶν ἢ ποῖόν τι, καταφανέστερον γένοιτ' ἂν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἀναλαβοῦσιν. δοκεῖ γὰρ ἡ μὲν ὅρασις καθ' ὁντινοῦν χρόνον τελεία εἶναι· οὐ γάρ ἐστιν ἐνδεὴς οὐδενὸς ὃ εἰς ὕστερον γινόμενον τελειώσει αὐτῆς τὸ εἶδος· τοιούτῳ δ' ἔοικε καὶ ἡ ἡδονή. ὅλον γάρ τι ἐστί, καὶ κατ' οὐδένα χρόνον λάβοι τις ἂν ἡδονὴν ἧς ἐπὶ πλείω χρόνον γινομένης τελειωθήσεται τὸ εἶδος. διόπερ οὐδὲ κίνησίς ἐστιν. ἐν χρόνῳ γὰρ πᾶσα κίνησις καὶ τέλους τινός, οἷον ἡ οἰκοδομική, καὶ τελεία ὅταν ποιήσῃ οὗ ἐφίεται. ἢ ἐν ἅπαντι δὴ τῷ χρόνῳ ἢ τούτῳ. ἐν δὲ τοῖς μέρεσι καὶ τῷ χρόνῳ πᾶσαι ἀτελεῖς, καὶ ἕτεραι τῷ εἴδει τῆς ὅλης καὶ ἀλλήλων.	What pleasure is, or what sort of thing it is, will become clearer if we take the matter up again from the beginning. Seeing seems to be complete at any moment, since it lacks nothing that, coming to be later, will complete its form. Pleasure too seems to be like this. It is a kind of whole, and at no moment could one find a pleasure whose form will be completed if it goes on for a longer time. That is why it isn't a motion either. Every motion takes time and is directed at some end—building, for instance—and is complete when it has made what it aims at: either in the whole time, then, or at that final moment. But in their parts and their stretches of time all motions are incomplete, and different in kind from the whole and from one another.

GREEK

ENGLISH

ἡ γὰρ τῶν λίθων σύνθεσις ἑτέρα τῆς τοῦ κίονος ῥαβδώσεως, καὶ αὗται τῆς τοῦ ναοῦ ποιήσεως· καὶ ἡ μὲν τοῦ ναοῦ τελεία (οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐνδεὴς πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον), ἡ δὲ τῆς κρηπῖδος καὶ τοῦ τριγλύφου ἀτελής· μέρους γὰρ ἑκατέρα. τῷ εἴδει οὖν διαφέρουσι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ὁτῳοῦν χρόνῳ λαβεῖν κίνησιν τελείαν τῷ εἴδει, ἀλλ' εἴπερ, ἐν τῷ ἅπαντι. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ βαδίσεως καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν. εἰ γάρ ἐστιν ἡ φορὰ κίνησις πόθεν ποῖ, καὶ ταύτης διαφοραὶ κατ' εἶδη, πτῆσις βάδισις ἅλσις καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα.

The fitting together of stones is different from the fluting of a column, and both from the making of the temple. The making of the temple is complete (it lacks nothing for what was proposed), whereas that of the foundation and of the triglyph is incomplete, since each is the making of a part. They differ in kind, then, and you can't find a motion complete in form at any given time, but, if at all, only in the whole time. It's the same with walking and the rest. For if locomotion is motion from somewhere to somewhere, it too has different kinds—flying, walking, jumping and the like.[2]

οὐ μόνον δ' οὕτως, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ βαδίσει· τὸ γὰρ πόθεν ποῖ οὐ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐν τῷ σταδίῳ καὶ ἐν τῷ μέρει, καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ μέρει καὶ ἐν ἑτέρῳ, οὐδὲ τὸ διεξιέναι τὴν γραμμὴν τήνδε κἀκείνην· 1174b οὐ μόνον γὰρ γραμμὴν διαπορεύεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν τόπῳ οὖσαν, ἐν ἑτέρῳ δ' αὕτη ἐκείνης. δι' ἀκριβείας μὲν οὖν περὶ κινήσεως ἐν ἄλλοις εἴρηται, ἔοικε δ' οὐκ ἐν ἅπαντι χρόνῳ τελεία εἶναι, ἀλλ' αἱ πολλαὶ ἀτελεῖς καὶ διαφέρουσαι τῷ εἴδει, εἴπερ τὸ πόθεν ποῖ εἰδοποιόν. τῆς ἡδονῆς δ' ἐν ὁτῳοῦν χρόνῳ τέλειον τὸ εἶδος. δῆλον οὖν ὡς ἕτεραί τ' ἂν εἶεν ἀλλήλων, καὶ τῶν ὅλων τι καὶ τελείων ἡ ἡδονή.

And not only in that way, but within walking itself. The from-where and to-where is not the same for the whole racecourse and for a part of it, or for one part and another; nor is traversing this line the same as traversing that one. 1174b For one traverses not only a line but a line in a place, and this one is in a different place from that one. Motion has been discussed precisely elsewhere; but it seems that it is not complete at every time, but that most motions are incomplete and differ in kind, if the from-where and to-where determines the kind. The form of pleasure, though, is complete at any time. Clearly, then, pleasure and motion would be different from each other, and pleasure is one of the things that are whole and complete.

1174b δόξειε δ' ἂν τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τοῦ μὴ ἐνδέχεσθαι κινεῖσθαι μὴ ἐν χρόνῳ, ἥδεσθαι δέ· τὸ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν ὅλον τι. ἐκ τούτων δὲ δῆλον καὶ ὅτι οὐ καλῶς λέγουσι κίνησιν ἢ γένεσιν εἶναι τὴν ἡδονήν. οὐ γὰρ πάντων ταῦτα λέγεται, ἀλλὰ τῶν μεριστῶν καὶ μὴ ὅλων· οὐδὲ γὰρ ὁράσεώς ἐστι γένεσις οὐδὲ στιγμῆς οὐδὲ μονάδος, οὐδὲ τούτων οὐθὲν κίνησις οὐδὲ γένεσις· οὐδὲ δὴ ἡδονῆς· ὅλον γάρ τι. αἰσθήσεως δὲ πάσης πρὸς τὸ αἰσθητὸν ἐνεργούσης, τελείως δὲ τῆς εὖ διακειμένης πρὸς τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὑπὸ τὴν αἴσθησιν (τοιοῦτον γὰρ μάλιστ' εἶναι δοκεῖ ἡ τελεία ἐνέργεια· αὐτὴν δὲ λέγειν ἐνεργεῖν, ἢ ἐν ᾧ ἐστί, μηθὲν διαφερέτω), καθ' ἑκάστην δὴ βελτίστη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια τοῦ ἄριστα διακειμένου πρὸς τὸ κράτιστον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτήν.

This would also seem to follow from the fact that one can't move except in a stretch of time, whereas one can be pleased without one; for what occurs in the now is a kind of whole. From this it is also clear that people are wrong to say that pleasure is a motion or a coming-to-be. These terms are not said of everything, but only of things that are divisible and not wholes. There is no coming-to-be of seeing, or of a point, or of a unit, and none of these is a motion or a coming-to-be; nor, then, is pleasure, since it is a kind of whole. Every sense is active in relation to its object, and a sense in good condition is completely active in relation to the finest of the objects that fall under it (for this more than anything seems to be what complete activity is—whether we say the sense itself is active, or that in which it resides, let it make no difference). In each case, then, the best activity is that of the sub-

2 A triglyph is a vertically grooved block in the frieze of a Doric temple.

GREEK	ENGLISH
	ject in the best condition in relation to the most excellent of its objects.

PLEASURE COMPLETES ACTIVITY

Aristotle argues that pleasure completes activity, and that pleasures differ as their activities do.

GREEK	ENGLISH
αὕτη δ' ἂν τελειοτάτη εἴη καὶ ἡδίστη. κατὰ πᾶσαν γὰρ αἴσθησίν ἐστιν ἡδονή, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ διάνοιαν καὶ θεωρίαν, ἡδίστη δ' ἡ τελειοτάτη, τελειοτάτη δ' ἡ τοῦ εὖ ἔχοντος πρὸς τὸ σπουδαιότατον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτήν· τελειοῖ δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡ ἡδονή. οὐ τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον ἥ τε ἡδονὴ τελειοῖ καὶ τὸ αἰσθητόν τε καὶ ἡ αἴσθησις, σπουδαῖα ὄντα, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἡ ὑγίεια καὶ ὁ ἰατρὸς ὁμοίως αἰτία ἐστὶ τοῦ ὑγιαίνειν. καθ' ἑκάστην δ' αἴσθησιν ὅτι γίνεται ἡδονή, δῆλον (φαμὲν γὰρ ὁράματα καὶ ἀκούσματα εἶναι ἡδέα)· δῆλον δὲ καὶ ὅτι μάλιστα, ἐπειδὰν ἥ τε αἴσθησις ᾖ κρατίστη καὶ πρὸς τοιοῦτον ἐνεργῇ· τοιούτων δ' ὄντων τοῦ τε αἰσθητοῦ καὶ τοῦ αἰσθανομένου, ἀεὶ ἔσται ἡδονὴ ὑπάρχοντός γε τοῦ τε ποιήσοντος καὶ τοῦ πεισομένου.	And this activity would be the most complete and the most pleasant. For there is pleasure corresponding to every sense, and likewise to thought and contemplation; the most complete activity is the most pleasant, and the most complete is that of the subject in good condition in relation to the most excellent of its objects; and pleasure completes the activity. But pleasure doesn't complete it in the same way as the object perceived and the perception do when they are good—just as health and the doctor are not in the same way the cause of someone's being healthy. That there is pleasure corresponding to each sense is clear (we do say that sights and sounds are pleasant); and it's clear too that it is greatest when the sense is at its best and is active in relation to an object of that kind. When both the object and the perceiver are like this, there will always be pleasure, so long as there is both something to act and something to be acted on.
τελειοῖ δὲ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡ ἡδονὴ οὐχ ὡς ἡ ἕξις ἐνυπάρχουσα, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐπιγινόμενόν τι τέλος, οἷον τοῖς ἀκμαίοις ἡ ὥρα. ἕως ἂν οὖν τό τε νοητὸν ἢ αἰσθητὸν ᾖ οἷον δεῖ καὶ τὸ κρῖνον ἢ θεωροῦν, [1175a] ἔσται ἐν τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἡ ἡδονή· ὁμοίων γὰρ ὄντων καὶ πρὸς ἄλληλα τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἐχόντων τοῦ τε παθητικοῦ καὶ τοῦ ποιητικοῦ ταὐτὸ πέφυκε γίνεσθαι. πῶς οὖν οὐδεὶς συνεχῶς ἥδεται; ἢ κάμνει; πάντα γὰρ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια ἀδυνατεῖ συνεχῶς ἐνεργεῖν. οὐ γίνεται οὖν οὐδ' ἡδονή· ἕπεται γὰρ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ.	Pleasure completes the activity not in the way the state present within it does, but as a sort of end that supervenes, like the bloom of youth on those in their prime. So long, then, as the object of thought or perception is as it should be, and so is what judges or contemplates it, [1175a] there will be pleasure in the activity; for when what is acted on and what acts are alike and related to each other in the same way, the same result naturally comes about. How is it, then, that no one is pleased continuously? Is it that we grow tired? Nothing human is capable of continuous activity, so pleasure doesn't occur continuously either, since it follows on activity.
1175a ἔνια δὲ τέρπει καινὰ ὄντα, ὕστερον δὲ οὐχ ὁμοίως διὰ ταὐτό· τὸ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτον παρακέκληται ἡ διάνοια καὶ διατεταμένως περὶ αὐτὰ ἐνεργεῖ, ὥσπερ κατὰ τὴν ὄψιν οἱ ἐμβλέποντες, μετέπειτα δ' οὐ τοιαύτη ἡ ἐνέργεια ἀλλὰ παρημελημένη· διὸ καὶ ἡ ἡδονὴ ἀμαυροῦται. ὀρέγεσθαι δὲ τῆς ἡδονῆς οἰηθείη τις ἂν ἅπαντας, ὅτι καὶ τοῦ ζῆν ἅπαντες ἐφίενται· ἡ δὲ ζωὴ ἐνέργειά τις ἐστί, καὶ ἕκαστος περὶ ταῦτα καὶ τούτοις ἐνεργεῖ ἃ καὶ μάλιστ' ἀγαπᾷ, οἷον	Some things delight us when they are new, but later not as much, for the same reason. At first our thought is stimulated and intensely active about them, as with people's sight when they look hard at something; but afterward the activity is not like that but slackens, and so the pleasure fades too. One might think that everyone desires pleasure because everyone also aims at living. Life is a kind

GREEK

ENGLISH

ὁ μὲν μουσικὸς τῇ ἀκοῇ περὶ τὰ μέλη, ὁ δὲ φιλομαθὴς τῇ διανοίᾳ περὶ τὰ θεωρήματα, οὕτω δὲ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἕκαστος· ἡ δ' ἡδονὴ τελειοῖ τὰς ἐνεργείας, καὶ τὸ ζῆν δή, οὗ ὀρέγονται. εὐλόγως οὖν καὶ τῆς ἡδονῆς ἐφίενται· τελειοῖ γὰρ ἑκάστῳ τὸ ζῆν, αἱρετὸν ὄν.

of activity, and each person is active about the things, and with the faculties, that he loves most—the musical person, for instance, with his hearing about melodies, the lover of learning with his thought about objects of study, and likewise each of the rest. And pleasure completes the activities, and so it completes living, which they desire. It is reasonable, then, that they aim at pleasure too, since it completes life for each of them, and life is choiceworthy.

πότερον δὲ διὰ τὴν ἡδονὴν τὸ ζῆν αἱρούμεθα ἢ διὰ τὸ ζῆν τὴν ἡδονήν, ἀφείσθω ἐν τῷ παρόντι. συνεζεῦχθαι μὲν γὰρ ταῦτα φαίνεται καὶ χωρισμὸν οὐ δέχεσθαι· ἄνευ τε γὰρ ἐνεργείας οὐ γίνεται ἡδονή, πᾶσάν τε ἐνέργειαν τελειοῖ ἡ ἡδονή.

Whether we choose life for the sake of pleasure or pleasure for the sake of life, let's leave aside for now. The two appear to be yoked together and not to admit of separation, since without activity there is no pleasure, and pleasure completes every activity.

ὅθεν δοκοῦσι καὶ τῷ εἴδει διαφέρειν. τὰ γὰρ ἕτερα τῷ εἴδει ὑφ' ἑτέρων οἰόμεθα τελειοῦσθαι (οὕτω γὰρ φαίνεται καὶ τὰ φυσικὰ καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τέχνης, οἷον ζῷα καὶ δένδρα καὶ γραφὴ καὶ ἄγαλμα καὶ οἰκία καὶ σκεῦος)· ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τὰς ἐνεργείας τὰς διαφερούσας τῷ εἴδει ὑπὸ διαφερόντων εἴδει τελειοῦσθαι. διαφέρουσι δ' αἱ τῆς διανοίας τῶν κατὰ τὰς αἰσθήσεις καὶ αὐταὶ ἀλλήλων κατ' εἶδος· καὶ αἱ τελειοῦσαι δὴ ἡδοναί. φανείη δ' ἂν τοῦτο καὶ ἐκ τοῦ συνῳκειῶσθαι τῶν ἡδονῶν ἑκάστην τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ ἣν τελειοῖ. συναύξει γὰρ τὴν ἐνέργειαν ἡ οἰκεία ἡδονή.

That is why pleasures seem to differ in kind too. We think that things different in kind are completed by different things (this is how it appears with both natural things and products of craft, such as animals and trees, a painting, a statue, a house, a utensil); and similarly, that activities differing in kind are completed by things differing in kind. The activities of thought differ in kind from those of the senses, and these differ in kind among themselves; so too, then, do the pleasures that complete them. This would appear also from the fact that each pleasure is closely bound up with the activity it completes. For an activity's proper pleasure increases it.

μᾶλλον γὰρ ἕκαστα κρίνουσι καὶ ἐξακριβοῦσιν οἱ μεθ' ἡδονῆς ἐνεργοῦντες, οἷον γεωμετρικοὶ γίνονται οἱ χαίροντες τῷ γεωμετρεῖν, καὶ κατανοοῦσιν ἕκαστα μᾶλλον, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ οἱ φιλόμουσοι καὶ φιλοικοδόμοι καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστοι ἐπιδιδόασιν εἰς τὸ οἰκεῖον ἔργον χαίροντες αὐτῷ· συναύξουσι δὲ αἱ ἡδοναί, τὰ δὲ συναύξοντα οἰκεῖα· [1175b] τοῖς ἑτέροις δὲ τῷ εἴδει καὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα ἕτερα τῷ εἴδει. ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦτ' ἂν φανείη ἐκ τοῦ τὰς ἀφ' ἑτέρων ἡδονὰς ἐμποδίους ταῖς ἐνεργείαις εἶναι. οἱ γὰρ φίλαυλοι ἀδυνατοῦσι τοῖς λόγοις προσέχειν, ἐὰν κατακούσωσιν αὐλοῦντος, μᾶλλον χαίροντες αὐλητικῇ τῆς παρούσης ἐνεργείας· ἡ κατὰ τὴν αὐλητικὴν οὖν ἡδονὴ τὴν περὶ τὸν λόγον ἐνέργειαν φθείρει.

People who are active with pleasure judge each thing better and are more precise. Those who enjoy doing geometry, for instance, become geometers and grasp each point better; similarly, lovers of music, lovers of building and all the rest make progress in their own proper work by enjoying it. So the pleasures increase the activities, and what increases a thing is proper to it; [1175b] and for things different in kind, what is proper to them is also different in kind. This would appear still more clearly from the fact that pleasures from other sources get in the way of activities. Lovers of pipe music can't pay attention to arguments if they overhear someone playing the pipes, since they enjoy piping more than their present activity; so the pleasure of piping destroys the activity of argument.

1175b

GREEK

ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμβαίνει, ὅταν ἅμα περὶ δύο ἐνεργῇ· ἡ γὰρ ἡδίων τὴν ἑτέραν ἐκκρούει, κἂν πολὺ διαφέρῃ κατὰ τὴν ἡδονήν, μᾶλλον, ὥστε μηδ' ἐνεργεῖν κατὰ τὴν ἑτέραν. διὸ χαίροντες ὁτῳοῦν σφόδρα οὐ πάνυ δρῶμεν ἕτερον, καὶ ἄλλα ποιοῦμεν ἄλλοις ἡρέμα ἀρεσκόμενοι, οἷον καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεάτροις οἱ τραγηματίζοντες, ὅταν φαῦλοι οἱ ἀγωνιζόμενοι ὦσι, τότε μάλιστ' αὐτὸ δρῶσιν. ἐπεὶ δ' ἡ μὲν οἰκεία ἡδονὴ ἐξακριβοῖ τὰς ἐνεργείας καὶ χρονιωτέρας καὶ βελτίους ποιεῖ, αἱ δ' ἀλλότριαι λυμαίνονται, δῆλον ὡς πολὺ διεστᾶσιν. σχεδὸν γὰρ αἱ ἀλλότριαι ἡδοναὶ ποιοῦσιν ὅπερ αἱ οἰκεῖαι λῦπαι· φθείρουσι γὰρ τὰς ἐνεργείας αἱ οἰκεῖαι λῦπαι, οἷον εἴ τῳ τὸ γράφειν ἀηδὲς καὶ ἐπίλυπον ἢ τὸ λογίζεσθαι· ὃ μὲν γὰρ οὐ γράφει, ὃ δ' οὐ λογίζεται, λυπηρᾶς οὔσης τῆς ἐνεργείας.

ENGLISH

The same thing happens in other cases when someone is active about two things at once. The more pleasant activity crowds out the other—all the more if it differs greatly in pleasantness—so that one stops engaging in the other altogether. That's why, when we are enjoying anything intensely, we hardly do anything else, and we do other things when we are only mildly pleased with something; people who munch snacks in the theater, for instance, do it most when the performers are bad. Since an activity's proper pleasure makes it more precise, more lasting and better, while alien pleasures spoil it, clearly the two are far apart. Alien pleasures do pretty much what an activity's proper pains do. For proper pains destroy activities—if, for instance, someone finds writing or calculating unpleasant and painful: the one doesn't write, the other doesn't calculate, because the activity is painful.

συμβαίνει δὴ περὶ τῆς ἐνεργείας τοὐναντίον ἀπὸ τῶν οἰκείων ἡδονῶν τε καὶ λυπῶν· οἰκεῖαι δ' εἰσὶν αἱ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ καθ' αὐτὴν γινόμεναι. αἱ δ' ἀλλότριαι ἡδοναὶ εἴρηται ὅτι παραπλήσιόν τι τῇ λύπῃ ποιοῦσιν· φθείρουσι γάρ, πλὴν οὐχ ὁμοίως. διαφερουσῶν δὲ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν ἐπιεικείᾳ καὶ φαυλότητι, καὶ τῶν μὲν αἱρετῶν οὐσῶν τῶν δὲ φευκτῶν τῶν δ' οὐδετέρων, ὁμοίως ἔχουσι καὶ αἱ ἡδοναί· καθ' ἑκάστην γὰρ ἐνέργειαν οἰκεία ἡδονὴ ἔστιν. ἡ μὲν οὖν τῇ σπουδαίᾳ οἰκεία ἐπιεικής, ἡ δὲ τῇ φαύλῃ μοχθηρά· καὶ γὰρ αἱ ἐπιθυμίαι τῶν μὲν καλῶν ἐπαινεταί, τῶν δ' αἰσχρῶν ψεκταί.

So opposite effects on an activity come from its proper pleasures and pains; and the proper ones are those that arise from the activity in itself. Alien pleasures, as has been said, do something similar to pain: they destroy the activity, though not in the same way. Since activities differ in goodness and badness, and some are choiceworthy, some to be avoided and some neither, the same holds for pleasures, since each activity has its own proper pleasure. The pleasure proper to an excellent activity is decent, and that proper to a base one is bad; for appetites, too, are praiseworthy when they are for fine things and blameworthy when they are for shameful ones.

οἰκειότεραι δὲ ταῖς ἐνεργείαις αἱ ἐν αὐταῖς ἡδοναὶ τῶν ὀρέξεων· αἳ μὲν γὰρ διωρισμέναι εἰσὶ καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις καὶ τῇ φύσει, αἳ δὲ σύνεγγυς ταῖς ἐνεργείαις, καὶ ἀδιόριστοι οὕτως ὥστ' ἔχειν ἀμφισβήτησιν εἰ ταὐτόν ἐστιν ἡ ἐνέργεια τῇ ἡδονῇ. οὐ μὴν ἔοικέ γε ἡ ἡδονὴ διάνοια εἶναι οὐδ' αἴσθησις (ἄτοπον γάρ), ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ μὴ χωρίζεσθαι φαίνεταί τισι ταὐτόν. ὥσπερ οὖν αἱ ἐνέργειαι ἕτεραι, καὶ αἱ ἡδοναί. [1176a] διαφέρει δὲ ἡ ὄψις ἁφῆς καθαρειότητι, καὶ ἀκοὴ καὶ ὄσφρησις γεύσεως· ὁμοίως δὴ διαφέρουσι καὶ αἱ ἡδοναί, καὶ τούτων αἱ περὶ τὴν διάνοιαν, καὶ ἑκάτεραι ἀλλήλων. δοκεῖ δ' εἶναι ἑκάστῳ ζῴῳ καὶ ἡδονὴ οἰκεία, ὥσπερ καὶ ἔργον· ἡ γὰρ κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν.

But the pleasures in activities are more proper to them than the desires are. The desires are distinct from the activities both in time and in nature, while the pleasures are close to the activities and so hard to distinguish from them that there is dispute whether the activity is the same thing as the pleasure. Still, pleasure doesn't seem to be thought or perception (that would be absurd); but because it isn't separated from them, it appears to some to be the same. As activities are different, then, so are the pleasures. [1176a] Sight differs from touch in purity, and hearing and smell from taste; so the pleasures differ similarly, and the pleasures of thought differ from these, and each group among themselves. Each animal also seems to have its own proper pleasure, as it has its own function—

GREEK

ENGLISH

namely, the pleasure that corresponds to its activity.

1176a καὶ ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ δὲ θεωροῦντι τοῦτ' ἂν φανείη· ἑτέρα γὰρ ἵππου ἡδονὴ καὶ κυνὸς καὶ ἀνθρώπου, καθάπερ Ἡράκλειτός φησιν ὄνους σύρματ' ἂν ἐλέσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ χρυσόν· ἥδιον γὰρ χρυσοῦ τροφὴ ὄνοις. αἱ μὲν οὖν τῶν ἑτέρων τῷ εἴδει διαφέρουσιν εἴδει, τὰς δὲ τῶν αὐτῶν ἀδιαφόρους εὔλογον εἶναι. διαλλάττουσι δ' οὐ σμικρὸν ἐπί γε τῶν ἀνθρώπων· τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ τοὺς μὲν τέρπει τοὺς δὲ λυπεῖ, καὶ τοῖς μὲν λυπηρὰ καὶ μισητά ἐστι τοῖς δὲ ἡδέα καὶ φιλητά. καὶ ἐπὶ γλυκέων δὲ τοῦτο συμβαίνει· οὐ γὰρ τὰ αὐτὰ δοκεῖ τῷ πυρέττοντι καὶ τῷ ὑγιαίνοντι, οὐδὲ θερμὸν εἶναι τῷ ἀσθενεῖ καὶ τῷ εὐεκτικῷ. ὁμοίως δὲ τοῦτο καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρων συμβαίνει. δοκεῖ δ' ἐν ἅπασι τοῖς τοιούτοις εἶναι τὸ φαινόμενον τῷ σπουδαίῳ.

This would appear, too, if one looks at them one by one: the pleasure of a horse is different from that of a dog or a human being—as Heraclitus says, donkeys would choose rubbish rather than gold, since food is more pleasant to donkeys than gold. So the pleasures of creatures different in kind differ in kind, and it is reasonable that those of the same kind do not differ. Yet among human beings, at least, they vary quite a lot: the same things delight some and pain others, and are painful and hateful to some, pleasant and lovable to others. This happens with sweet things too. The same things don't seem sweet to someone with a fever and to someone healthy, nor does the same thing seem warm to a sick person and to one in good condition. The same happens in other cases. But in all such cases, what is really so seems to be what appears so to the excellent person.

εἰ δὲ τοῦτο καλῶς λέγεται, καθάπερ δοκεῖ, καὶ ἔστιν ἑκάστου μέτρον ἡ ἀρετὴ καὶ ἀγαθός, ᾗ τοιοῦτος, καὶ ἡδοναὶ εἶεν ἂν αἱ τούτῳ φαινόμεναι καὶ ἡδέα οἷς οὗτος χαίρει. τὰ δὲ τούτῳ δυσχερῆ εἴ τῳ φαίνεται ἡδέα, οὐδὲν θαυμαστόν· πολλαὶ γὰρ φθοραὶ καὶ λῦμαι ἀνθρώπων γίνονται· ἡδέα δ' οὐκ ἔστιν, ἀλλὰ τούτοις καὶ οὕτω διακειμένοις. τὰς μὲν οὖν ὁμολογουμένως αἰσχρὰς δῆλον ὡς οὐ φατέον ἡδονὰς εἶναι, πλὴν τοῖς διεφθαρμένοις· τῶν δ' ἐπιεικῶν εἶναι δοκουσῶν ποίαν ἢ τίνα φατέον τοῦ ἀνθρώπου εἶναι; ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἐνεργειῶν δῆλον; ταύταις γὰρ ἕπονται αἱ ἡδοναί. εἴτ' οὖν μία ἐστὶν εἴτε πλείους αἱ τοῦ τελείου καὶ μακαρίου ἀνδρός, αἱ ταύτας τελειοῦσαι ἡδοναὶ κυρίως λέγοιντ' ἂν ἀνθρώπου ἡδοναὶ εἶναι, αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ δευτέρως καὶ πολλοστῶς, ὥσπερ αἱ ἐνέργειαι.

If this is right, as it seems to be, and excellence—the good person, as such—is the measure of each thing, then pleasures too would be what appear to be pleasures to him, and pleasant things what he enjoys. If what he finds distasteful appears pleasant to someone, that's no wonder, since human beings suffer many kinds of corruption and damage; but these things are not pleasant, except to these people and to those in this condition. Clearly, then, we should not say that the admittedly shameful pleasures are pleasures, except to the corrupt. But among those that seem decent, what kind of pleasure, or which one, should we say is the pleasure of a human being? Or is it clear from the activities, since pleasures follow on these? Whether, then, there is one activity or several belonging to the complete and blessed man, the pleasures that complete them would be called human pleasures in the strict sense, and the rest in a secondary sense and at many removes, as are the activities.

HAPPINESS IS NOT AMUSEMENT

Aristotle argues that happiness lies in excellent activity, not in amusement.

GREEK

ENGLISH

εἰρημένων δὲ τῶν περὶ τὰς ἀρετάς τε καὶ φιλίας καὶ ἡδονάς, λοιπὸν περὶ εὐδαιμονίας τύπῳ διελθεῖν, ἐπειδὴ τέλος αὐτὴν τίθεμεν τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων. ἀναλαβοῦσι δὴ τὰ

Now that we have discussed the excellences, friendships and pleasures, it remains to go through happiness in outline, since we posit it as

GREEK

προειρημένα συντομώτερος ἂν εἴη ὁ λόγος. εἴπομεν δὴ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἕξις· καὶ γὰρ τῷ καθεύδοντι διὰ βίου ὑπάρχοι ἄν, φυτῶν ζῶντι βίον, καὶ τῷ δυστυχοῦντι τὰ μέγιστα. [1176b] εἰ δὴ ταῦτα μὴ ἀρέσκει, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον εἰς ἐνέργειάν τινα θετέον, καθάπερ ἐν τοῖς πρότερον εἴρηται, τῶν δ' ἐνεργειῶν αἳ μέν εἰσιν ἀναγκαῖαι καὶ δι' ἕτερα αἱρεταὶ αἳ δὲ καθ' αὑτάς, δῆλον ὅτι τὴν εὐδαιμονίαν τῶν καθ' αὑτὰς αἱρετῶν τινὰ θετέον καὶ οὐ τῶν δι' ἄλλο· οὐδενὸς γὰρ ἐνδεὴς ἡ εὐδαιμονία ἀλλ' αὐτάρκης. καθ' αὑτὰς δ' εἰσὶν αἱρεταὶ ἀφ' ὧν μηδὲν ἐπιζητεῖται παρὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν.

ENGLISH

the end of human affairs. Our account will be more concise if we take up again what was said before. We said, then, that it is not a state; for then it could belong to someone who slept through his whole life, living the life of a plant, or to someone suffering the greatest misfortunes. [1176b] If these consequences are unacceptable, and we should rather place it in some activity, as was said earlier; and if some activities are necessary and choiceworthy for the sake of other things, while others are choiceworthy in themselves, then clearly happiness should be placed among those choiceworthy in themselves and not among those choiceworthy for the sake of something else; for happiness lacks nothing but is self-sufficient. Activities are choiceworthy in themselves when nothing is sought from them beyond the activity.

1176b τοιαῦται δ' εἶναι δοκοῦσιν αἱ κατ' ἀρετὴν πράξεις· τὰ γὰρ καλὰ καὶ σπουδαῖα πράττειν τῶν δι' αὐτὰ αἱρετῶν. καὶ τῶν παιδιῶν δὲ αἱ ἡδεῖαι· οὐ γὰρ δι' ἕτερα αὐτὰς αἱροῦνται· βλάπτονται γὰρ ἀπ' αὐτῶν μᾶλλον ἢ ὠφελοῦνται, ἀμελοῦντες τῶν σωμάτων καὶ τῆς κτήσεως. καταφεύγουσι δ' ἐπὶ τὰς τοιαύτας διαγωγὰς τῶν εὐδαιμονιζομένων οἱ πολλοί, διὸ παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις εὐδοκιμοῦσιν οἱ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις διαγωγαῖς εὐτράπελοι· ὧν γὰρ ἐφίενται, ἐν τούτοις παρέχουσι σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ἡδεῖς, δέονται δὲ τοιούτων.

Actions in accordance with excellence seem to be of this kind, since doing fine and excellent things is among what is choiceworthy for its own sake. So do pleasant amusements, since people don't choose them for the sake of other things; in fact, they are harmed by them more than benefited, neglecting their bodies and their property. Most of those who are considered happy take refuge in such pastimes, which is why people who are witty in such pastimes are well regarded at the courts of tyrants: they make themselves pleasant in the things the tyrants aim at, and such people are what the tyrants need.

δοκεῖ μὲν οὖν εὐδαιμονικὰ ταῦτα εἶναι διὰ τὸ τοὺς ἐν δυναστείαις ἐν τούτοις ἀποσχολάζειν, οὐδὲν δ' ἴσως σημεῖον οἱ τοιοῦτοί εἰσιν· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῷ δυναστεύειν ἡ ἀρετὴ οὐδ' ὁ νοῦς, ἀφ' ὧν αἱ σπουδαῖαι ἐνέργειαι· οὐδ' εἰ ἄγευστοι οὗτοι ὄντες ἡδονῆς εἰλικρινοῦς καὶ ἐλευθερίου ἐπὶ τὰς σωματικὰς καταφεύγουσιν, διὰ τοῦτο ταύτας οἰητέον αἱρετωτέρας εἶναι· καὶ γὰρ οἱ παῖδες τὰ παρ' αὑτοῖς τιμώμενα κράτιστα οἴονται εἶναι. εὔλογον δή, ὥσπερ παισὶ καὶ ἀνδράσιν ἕτερα φαίνεται τίμια, οὕτω καὶ φαύλοις καὶ ἐπιεικέσιν. καθάπερ οὖν πολλάκις εἴρηται, καὶ τίμια καὶ ἡδέα ἐστὶ τὰ τῷ σπουδαίῳ τοιαῦτα ὄντα· ἑκάστῳ δ' ἡ κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἕξιν αἱρετωτάτη ἐνέργεια, καὶ τῷ σπουδαίῳ δὴ ἡ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετήν.

These things are thought to belong to happiness because those in positions of power spend their leisure in them; but perhaps such people are no evidence. For excellence and intellect, from which excellent activities come, don't consist in holding power; and if these people, having never tasted pure pleasure, worthy of a free person, take refuge in bodily pleasures, we shouldn't on that account think these more choiceworthy. Children, too, think that what is valued among them is best. It is reasonable, then, that just as different things appear valuable to children and to men, so different things appear valuable to bad and to decent people. As has often been said, then, what is valuable and pleasant is what is so to the excellent person; and to each person the most choiceworthy activity is the one in accordance with his own state, and so to the excellent person it is the activity in accordance with excellence.

GREEK

οὐκ ἐν παιδιᾷ ἄρα ἡ εὐδαιμονία· καὶ γὰρ ἄτοπον τὸ τέλος εἶναι παιδιάν, καὶ πραγματεύεσθαι καὶ κακοπαθεῖν τὸν βίον ἅπαντα τοῦ παίζειν χάριν. ἅπαντα γὰρ ὡς εἰπεῖν ἑτέρου ἕνεκα αἱρούμεθα πλὴν τῆς εὐδαιμονίας· τέλος γὰρ αὕτη. σπουδάζειν δὲ καὶ πονεῖν παιδιᾶς χάριν ἠλίθιον φαίνεται καὶ λίαν παιδικόν. παίζειν δ' ὅπως σπουδάζῃ, κατ' Ἀνάχαρσιν, ὀρθῶς ἔχειν δοκεῖ· ἀναπαύσει γὰρ ἔοικεν ἡ παιδιά, ἀδυνατοῦντες δὲ συνεχῶς πονεῖν ἀναπαύσεως δέονται. οὐ δὴ τέλος ἡ ἀνάπαυσις· 1177a γίνεται γὰρ ἕνεκα τῆς ἐνεργείας. δοκεῖ δ' ὁ εὐδαίμων βίος κατ' ἀρετὴν εἶναι· οὗτος δὲ μετὰ σπουδῆς, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐν παιδιᾷ. βελτίω τε λέγομεν τὰ σπουδαῖα τῶν γελοίων καὶ μετὰ παιδιᾶς, καὶ τοῦ βελτίονος ἀεὶ καὶ μορίου καὶ ἀνθρώπου σπουδαιοτέραν τὴν ἐνέργειαν· ἡ δὲ τοῦ βελτίονος κρείττων καὶ εὐδαιμονικωτέρα ἤδη.

ENGLISH

Happiness, then, does not lie in amusement. It would be absurd if the end were amusement, and if we toiled and suffered hardship our whole life long for the sake of amusing ourselves. For practically everything we choose, we choose for the sake of something else—except happiness, since that is the end. To be serious and to labor for the sake of amusement seems foolish and altogether childish; but to amuse oneself so as to be serious, as Anacharsis put it, seems right. For amusement is like relaxation, and we need relaxation because we can't labor continuously. Relaxation, then, is not an end, 1177a since it happens for the sake of activity. The happy life seems to be a life in accordance with excellence, and such a life involves seriousness; it does not consist in amusement. We also say that serious things are better than funny things and things done in fun, and that the activity of the better thing—whether the better part of a person or the better person—is always the more serious; and the activity of what is better is superior, and so already happier.[3]

1177a ἀπολαύσειέ τ' ἂν τῶν σωματικῶν ἡδονῶν ὁ τυχὼν καὶ ἀνδράποδον οὐχ ἧττον τοῦ ἀρίστου· εὐδαιμονίας δ' οὐδεὶς ἀνδραπόδῳ μεταδίδωσιν, εἰ μὴ καὶ βίου. οὐ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς τοιαύταις διαγωγαῖς ἡ εὐδαιμονία, ἀλλ' ἐν ταῖς κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνεργείαις, καθάπερ καὶ πρότερον εἴρηται.

Besides, anyone at all, even a slave, could enjoy bodily pleasures no less than the best of people; but no one grants a slave a share in happiness—unless he also grants him a life of his own. For happiness does not lie in pastimes of this kind, but in activities in accordance with excellence, as we have said before.

THE LIFE OF CONTEMPLATION

Aristotle argues that the happiest life is the activity of intellect in contemplation.

GREEK

εἰ δ' ἐστὶν ἡ εὐδαιμονία κατ' ἀρετὴν ἐνέργεια, εὔλογον κατὰ τὴν κρατίστην· αὕτη δ' ἂν εἴη τοῦ ἀρίστου. εἴτε δὴ νοῦς τοῦτο εἴτε ἄλλο τι, ὃ δὴ κατὰ φύσιν δοκεῖ ἄρχειν καὶ ἡγεῖσθαι καὶ ἔννοιαν ἔχειν περὶ καλῶν καὶ θείων, εἴτε θεῖον ὂν καὶ αὐτὸ εἴτε τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν τὸ θειότατον, ἡ τούτου ἐνέργεια κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν ἀρετὴν εἴη ἂν ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία. ὅτι δ' ἐστὶ θεωρητική, εἴρηται. ὁμολογούμενον δὲ τοῦτ' ἂν δόξειεν εἶναι καὶ τοῖς πρότερον καὶ τῷ ἀληθεῖ. κρατίστη τε γὰρ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ἐνέργεια (καὶ γὰρ ὁ νοῦς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν, καὶ τῶν γνωστῶν, περὶ ἃ ὁ νοῦς)· ἔτι δὲ συνεχεστάτη· θεωρεῖν τε γὰρ δυνάμεθα συνεχῶς μᾶλλον ἢ πράττειν ὁτιοῦν.

ENGLISH

If happiness is activity in accordance with excellence, it is reasonable that it should be in accordance with the highest excellence, and this will be the excellence of the best thing in us. Whether this is intellect or something else that is thought by nature to rule and lead us and to have a conception of what is fine and divine—whether it is itself divine or only the most divine thing in us—the activity of this in accordance with its proper excellence will be complete happiness. That this activity is contemplative, we have already said. And this would seem to agree both with what we said earlier and with the truth. For this activity is the

3 Anacharsis was a Scythian prince of the sixth century BC, later counted among the proverbial wise men.

GREEK

ENGLISH

highest (since intellect is the highest thing in us, and the objects of intellect are the highest of the things that can be known); and it is also the most continuous, since we are able to contemplate continuously more than we can do anything else at all.

οἰόμεθά τε δεῖν ἡδονὴν παραμεμῖχθαι τῇ εὐδαιμονίᾳ, ἡδίστη δὲ τῶν κατ᾽ ἀρετὴν ἐνεργειῶν ἡ κατὰ τὴν σοφίαν ὁμολογουμένως ἐστίν· δοκεῖ γοῦν ἡ φιλοσοφία θαυμαστὰς ἡδονὰς ἔχειν καθαρειότητι καὶ τῷ βεβαίῳ, εὔλογον δὲ τοῖς εἰδόσι τῶν ζητούντων ἡδίω τὴν διαγωγὴν εἶναι. ἥ τε λεγομένη αὐτάρκεια περὶ τὴν θεωρητικὴν μάλιστ᾽ ἂν εἴη· τῶν μὲν γὰρ πρὸς τὸ ζῆν ἀναγκαίων καὶ σοφὸς καὶ δίκαιος καὶ οἱ λοιποὶ δέονται, τοῖς δὲ τοιούτοις ἱκανῶς κεχορηγημένων ὁ μὲν δίκαιος δεῖται πρὸς οὓς δικαιοπραγήσει καὶ μεθ᾽ ὧν, ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ σώφρων καὶ ὁ ἀνδρεῖος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἕκαστος, ὁ δὲ σοφὸς καὶ καθ᾽ αὑτὸν ὢν δύναται θεωρεῖν, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν σοφώτερος ᾖ, μᾶλλον· βέλτιον δ᾽ ἴσως συνεργοὺς ἔχων, ἀλλ᾽ ὅμως αὐταρκέστατος.

We think, too, that pleasure must be mixed in with happiness; and the activity in accordance with wisdom is, by common agreement, the most pleasant of the activities in accordance with excellence. At any rate, philosophy seems to hold pleasures that are marvelous for their purity and their stability, and it is reasonable that those who know should pass their time more pleasantly than those who are still inquiring. Again, what is called self-sufficiency will belong most of all to contemplative activity. The wise person, the just person and the rest all need the necessities of life; but once they are adequately supplied with these, the just person still needs people toward whom and with whom to act justly, and so do the moderate person, the courageous person and each of the others. The wise person, by contrast, can contemplate even on his own, and the wiser he is, the more he can do so. He does better, perhaps, if he has fellow workers; but all the same he is the most self-sufficient.

1177b δόξαι τ᾽ ἂν αὐτὴ μόνη δι᾽ αὑτὴν ἀγαπᾶσθαι· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀπ᾽ αὐτῆς γίνεται παρὰ τὸ θεωρῆσαι, ἀπὸ δὲ τῶν πρακτικῶν ἢ πλεῖον ἢ ἔλαττον περιποιούμεθα παρὰ τὴν πρᾶξιν. δοκεῖ τε ἡ εὐδαιμονία ἐν τῇ σχολῇ εἶναι· ἀσχολούμεθα γὰρ ἵνα σχολάζωμεν, καὶ πολεμοῦμεν ἵν᾽ εἰρήνην ἄγωμεν.

And this activity alone would seem to be loved for its own sake, since nothing comes from it beyond the contemplating, whereas from practical activities we gain something, more or less, beyond the action itself. Happiness also seems to lie in leisure: we are busy so that we may have leisure, and we make war so that we may live in peace.

τῶν μὲν οὖν πρακτικῶν ἀρετῶν ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς ἢ ἐν τοῖς πολεμικοῖς ἡ ἐνέργεια, αἱ δὲ περὶ ταῦτα πράξεις δοκοῦσιν ἄσχολοι εἶναι, αἱ μὲν πολεμικαὶ καὶ παντελῶς (οὐδεὶς γὰρ αἱρεῖται τὸ πολεμεῖν τοῦ πολεμεῖν ἕνεκα, οὐδὲ παρασκευάζει πόλεμον· δόξαι γὰρ ἂν παντελῶς μιαιφόνος τις εἶναι, εἰ τοὺς φίλους πολεμίους ποιοῖτο, ἵνα μάχαι καὶ φόνοι γίνοιντο)· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ τοῦ πολιτικοῦ ἄσχολος, καὶ παρ᾽ αὐτὸ τὸ πολιτεύεσθαι περιποιουμένη δυναστείας καὶ τιμὰς ἢ τήν γε εὐδαιμονίαν αὐτῷ καὶ τοῖς πολίταις, ἑτέραν οὖσαν τῆς πολιτικῆς, ἣν καὶ ζητοῦμεν δῆλον ὡς ἑτέραν οὖσαν.

Now the activity of the practical excellences lies in politics or in war, and actions concerned with these seem to be unleisured—those of war entirely so. For no one chooses to make war, or stirs up a war, for the sake of making war; a person would seem utterly bloodthirsty if he turned his friends into enemies so that there might be battles and slaughter. But the politician's activity is unleisured too: beyond political activity itself, it seeks to secure positions of power and honors—or at any rate happiness for the politician himself and his fellow citizens, a happiness distinct from political activity, and which we are plainly seeking as something distinct.

GREEK

εἰ δὴ τῶν μὲν κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς πράξεων αἱ πολιτικαὶ καὶ πολεμικαὶ κάλλει καὶ μεγέθει προέχουσιν, αὗται δ' ἄσχολοι καὶ τέλους τινὸς ἐφίενται καὶ οὐ δι' αὑτὰς αἱρεταί εἰσιν, ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ ἐνέργεια σπουδῇ τε διαφέρειν δοκεῖ θεωρητικὴ οὖσα, καὶ παρ' αὐτὴν οὐδενὸς ἐφίεσθαι τέλους, καὶ ἔχειν τὴν ἡδονὴν οἰκείαν (αὕτη δὲ συναύξει τὴν ἐνέργειαν), καὶ τὸ αὔταρκες δὴ καὶ σχολαστικὸν καὶ ἄτρυτον ὡς ἀνθρώπῳ, καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα τῷ μακαρίῳ ἀπονέμεται, τὰ κατὰ ταύτην τὴν ἐνέργειαν φαίνεται ὄντα· ἡ τελεία δὴ εὐδαιμονία αὕτη ἂν εἴη ἀνθρώπου, λαβοῦσα μῆκος βίου τέλειον· οὐδὲν γὰρ ἀτελές ἐστι τῶν τῆς εὐδαιμονίας.

ὁ δὲ τοιοῦτος ἂν εἴη βίος κρείττων ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον· οὐ γὰρ ᾗ ἄνθρωπός ἐστιν οὕτω βιώσεται, ἀλλ' ᾗ θεῖόν τι ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχει· ὅσον δὲ διαφέρει τοῦτο τοῦ συνθέτου, τοσοῦτον καὶ ἡ ἐνέργεια τῆς κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετήν. εἰ δὴ θεῖον ὁ νοῦς πρὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ ὁ κατὰ τοῦτον βίος θεῖος πρὸς τὸν ἀνθρώπινον βίον. οὐ χρὴ δὲ κατὰ τοὺς παραινοῦντας ἀνθρώπινα φρονεῖν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα οὐδὲ θνητὰ τὸν θνητόν, ἀλλ' ἐφ' ὅσον ἐνδέχεται ἀθανατίζειν καὶ πάντα ποιεῖν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν κατὰ τὸ κράτιστον τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ· εἰ γὰρ καὶ τῷ ὄγκῳ μικρόν ἐστι, 1178a δυνάμει καὶ τιμιότητι πολὺ μᾶλλον πάντων ὑπερέχει. δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ εἶναι ἕκαστος τοῦτο, εἴπερ τὸ κύριον καὶ ἄμεινον.

1178a ἄτοπον οὖν γίνοιτ' ἄν, εἰ μὴ τὸν αὑτοῦ βίον αἱροῖτο ἀλλά τινος ἄλλου. τὸ λεχθέν τε πρότερον ἁρμόσει καὶ νῦν· τὸ γὰρ οἰκεῖον ἑκάστῳ τῇ φύσει κράτιστον καὶ ἥδιστόν ἐστιν ἑκάστῳ· καὶ τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ δὴ ὁ κατὰ τὸν νοῦν βίος, εἴπερ τοῦτο μάλιστα ἄνθρωπος. οὗτος ἄρα καὶ εὐδαιμονέστατος.

ENGLISH

Suppose, then, that among actions in accordance with the excellences, political and military actions stand out in fineness and greatness, but are unleisured, aim at some further end and are not chosen for their own sake; whereas the activity of intellect, being contemplative, seems to excel in seriousness, to aim at no end beyond itself, and to have its own proper pleasure (which in turn increases the activity); and suppose that self-sufficiency, leisure, freedom from weariness (so far as that is possible for a human being), and all the other things ascribed to the blessed person are evidently features of this activity. Then this will be the complete happiness of a human being—provided it takes up a complete span of life, for nothing that belongs to happiness is incomplete.

But such a life would be higher than the human level. For a person will live like this not insofar as he is human, but insofar as there is something divine in him; and as far as this divine element differs from the composite, so far does its activity differ from activity in accordance with the other kind of excellence. If, then, intellect is divine in comparison with a human being, the life in accordance with intellect is divine in comparison with human life. We should not follow those who advise us to think human thoughts because we are human, or mortal thoughts because we are mortal. Rather, we should make ourselves immortal as far as we can, and do everything to live in accordance with the highest thing in us. For even if it is small in bulk, 1178a in power and worth it far surpasses everything. It would seem, too, that each of us actually is this thing, since it is the authoritative and better part of us.[4]

It would be odd, then, if a person chose not his own life but someone else's. And what we said before will apply now too: what properly belongs to each thing by nature is best and most pleasant for it. So for a human being the life in accordance with intellect is best and most pleasant, since intellect, more than anything else, is what a human being is. This life, then, will also be the happiest.

4 The "composite" is the human being as a compound of soul and body.

THE LIFE OF THE OTHER EXCELLENCES

Aristotle calls the life of practical excellence happy in a secondary way and ranks it below contemplation.

GREEK	ENGLISH
δευτέρως δ' ὁ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην ἀρετήν· αἱ γὰρ κατὰ ταύτην ἐνέργειαι ἀνθρωπικαί. δίκαια γὰρ καὶ ἀνδρεῖα καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ κατὰ τὰς ἀρετὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους πράττομεν ἐν συναλλάγμασι καὶ χρείαις καὶ πράξεσι παντοίαις ἔν τε τοῖς πάθεσι διατηροῦντες τὸ πρέπον ἑκάστῳ· ταῦτα δ' εἶναι φαίνεται πάντα ἀνθρωπικά. ἔνια δὲ καὶ συμβαίνειν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος δοκεῖ, καὶ πολλὰ συνῳκειῶσθαι τοῖς πάθεσιν ἡ τοῦ ἤθους ἀρετή. συνέζευκται δὲ καὶ ἡ φρόνησις τῇ τοῦ ἤθους ἀρετῇ, καὶ αὕτη τῇ φρονήσει, εἴπερ αἱ μὲν τῆς φρονήσεως ἀρχαὶ κατὰ τὰς ἠθικάς εἰσιν ἀρετάς, τὸ δ' ὀρθὸν τῶν ἠθικῶν κατὰ τὴν φρόνησιν. συνηρτημέναι δ' αὖται καὶ τοῖς πάθεσι περὶ τὸ σύνθετον ἂν εἶεν· αἱ δὲ τοῦ συνθέτου ἀρεταὶ ἀνθρωπικαί· καὶ ὁ βίος δὴ ὁ κατὰ ταύτας καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία.	The life in accordance with the other kind of excellence is happiest in a secondary way, since the activities in accordance with it are human. For we do just and courageous acts, and the others that accord with the excellences, toward one another—in contracts, services and actions of every kind, and in our feelings—observing what is fitting for each person; and all these are evidently human. Some of them even seem to arise from the body, and excellence of character seems in many ways bound up with the feelings. Practical wisdom, too, is yoked to excellence of character, and excellence of character to practical wisdom, since the starting points of practical wisdom accord with the excellences of character, and what is right in the excellences of character accords with practical wisdom. And since these are also linked with the feelings, they will belong to the composite; and the excellences of the composite are human. So, then, are the life and the happiness that accord with them.
ἡ δὲ τοῦ νοῦ κεχωρισμένη· τοσοῦτον γὰρ περὶ αὐτῆς εἰρήσθω· διακριβῶσαι γὰρ μεῖζον τοῦ προκειμένου ἐστίν. δόξειε δ' ἂν καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς χορηγίας ἐπὶ μικρὸν ἢ ἐπ' ἔλαττον δεῖσθαι τῆς ἠθικῆς. τῶν μὲν γὰρ ἀναγκαίων ἀμφοῖν χρεία καὶ ἐξ ἴσου ἔστω, εἰ καὶ μᾶλλον διαπονεῖ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ὁ πολιτικός, καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα· μικρὸν γὰρ ἄν τι διαφέροι· πρὸς δὲ τὰς ἐνεργείας πολὺ διοίσει. τῷ μὲν γὰρ ἐλευθερίῳ δεήσει χρημάτων πρὸς τὸ πράττειν τὰ ἐλευθέρια, καὶ τῷ δικαίῳ δὴ εἰς τὰς ἀνταποδόσεις (αἱ γὰρ βουλήσεις ἄδηλοι, προσποιοῦνται δὲ καὶ οἱ μὴ δίκαιοι βούλεσθαι δικαιοπραγεῖν), τῷ ἀνδρείῳ δὲ δυνάμεως, εἴπερ ἐπιτελεῖ τι τῶν κατὰ τὴν ἀρετήν, καὶ τῷ σώφρονι ἐξουσίας· πῶς γὰρ δῆλος ἔσται ἢ οὗτος ἢ τῶν ἄλλων τις;	The happiness of intellect, by contrast, is separate. Let that much be said about it, since to work it out precisely is a larger task than the one before us. It would seem, too, to need external resources only a little, or at least less than the happiness of character. Let us grant that both need the necessities, and to an equal degree—even if the politician takes more trouble over the body and things of that sort—for the difference here would be small. But where their activities are concerned there will be a great difference. The generous person will need money to do generous deeds; so will the just person, for paying back what he owes (since wishes can't be seen, and even people who are not just pretend to wish to act justly); the courageous person will need power, if he is to accomplish any of the deeds that accord with his excellence; and the moderate person will need the opportunity. Otherwise how will he, or any of the others, be recognized for what he is?
ἀμφισβητεῖταί τε πότερον κυριώτερον τῆς ἀρετῆς ἡ προαίρεσις ἢ αἱ πράξεις, ὡς ἐν ἀμφοῖν οὔσης· 1178b τὸ δὴ τέλειον δῆλον ὡς ἐν ἀμφοῖν ἂν εἴη· πρὸς δὲ τὰς πράξεις πολλῶν δεῖται, καὶ ὅσῳ ἂν μείζους ὦσι καὶ καλλίους,	People also dispute whether decision or actions matter more for excellence, on the grounds that it involves both. 1178b Clearly its completeness would lie in both; but actions need many things, and the

GREEK

πλειόνων. τῷ δὲ θεωροῦντι οὐδενὸς τῶν τοιούτων πρός γε τὴν ἐνέργειαν χρεία, ἀλλ' ὡς εἰπεῖν καὶ ἐμπόδιά ἐστι πρός γε τὴν θεωρίαν· ᾗ δ' ἄνθρωπός ἐστι καὶ πλείοσι συζῇ, αἱρεῖται τὰ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν πράττειν· δεήσεται οὖν τῶν τοιούτων πρὸς τὸ ἀνθρωπεύεσθαι. ἡ δὲ τελεία εὐδαιμονία ὅτι θεωρητική τις ἐστὶν ἐνέργεια, καὶ ἐντεῦθεν ἂν φανείη. τοὺς θεοὺς γὰρ μάλιστα ὑπειλήφαμεν μακαρίους καὶ εὐδαίμονας εἶναι· πράξεις δὲ ποίας ἀπονεῖμαι χρεὼν αὐτοῖς; πότερα τὰς δικαίας; ἢ γελοῖοι φανοῦνται συναλλάττοντες καὶ παρακαταθήκας ἀποδιδόντες καὶ ὅσα τοιαῦτα;

ENGLISH

greater and finer they are, the more they need. The person who contemplates, on the other hand, needs none of these things, at least for the activity itself; in fact they are, so to speak, even hindrances, at least to contemplation. But insofar as he is a human being and lives with others, he chooses to do what accords with excellence, and so he will need such things for living a human life. That complete happiness is a kind of contemplative activity will also be clear from the following. We suppose the gods above all to be blessed and happy; but what sort of actions ought we to ascribe to them? Just ones? Won't they look ridiculous making contracts, returning deposits and so on?

1178b ἀλλὰ τὰς ἀνδρείους ὑπομένοντας τὰ φοβερὰ καὶ κινδυνεύοντας ὅτι καλόν; ἢ τὰς ἐλευθερίους; τίνι δὲ δώσουσιν; ἄτοπον δ' εἰ καὶ ἔσται αὐτοῖς νόμισμα ἤ τι τοιοῦτον. αἱ δὲ σώφρονες τί ἂν εἶεν; ἢ φορτικὸς ὁ ἔπαινος, ὅτι οὐκ ἔχουσι φαύλας ἐπιθυμίας; διεξιοῦσι δὲ πάντα φαίνοιτ' ἂν τὰ περὶ τὰς πράξεις μικρὰ καὶ ἀνάξια θεῶν. ἀλλὰ μὴν ζῆν γε πάντες ὑπειλήφασιν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐνεργεῖν ἄρα· οὐ γὰρ δὴ καθεύδειν ὥσπερ τὸν Ἐνδυμίωνα. τῷ δὴ ζῶντι τοῦ πράττειν ἀφαιρουμένου, ἔτι δὲ μᾶλλον τοῦ ποιεῖν, τί λείπεται πλὴν θεωρία; ὥστε ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐνέργεια, μακαριότητι διαφέρουσα, θεωρητικὴ ἂν εἴη· καὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων δὴ ἡ ταύτῃ συγγενεστάτη εὐδαιμονικωτάτη. σημεῖον δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ μετέχειν τὰ λοιπὰ ζῷα εὐδαιμονίας, τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ἐστερημένα τελείως.

Courageous ones, then—facing terrors and running risks because it is fine? Or generous ones? But to whom will they give? And it would be absurd if they actually had money or anything like it. And what would their moderate actions be? Isn't that a vulgar thing to praise them for, since they don't have base appetites? If we went through them all, everything to do with action would appear petty and unworthy of gods. Yet everyone supposes that the gods are alive, and so active; surely they don't sleep, like Endymion. Now if a living being is deprived of acting, and still more of producing, what is left but contemplation? So the activity of the god, which surpasses all others in blessedness, will be contemplative; and so, among human activities, the one most akin to this will be the happiest. A sign of this is that the other animals have no share in happiness, being completely deprived of such activity.[5]

τοῖς μὲν γὰρ θεοῖς ἅπας ὁ βίος μακάριος, τοῖς δ' ἀνθρώποις, ἐφ' ὅσον ὁμοίωμά τι τῆς τοιαύτης ἐνεργείας ὑπάρχει· τῶν δ' ἄλλων ζώων οὐδὲν εὐδαιμονεῖ, ἐπειδὴ οὐδαμῇ κοινωνεῖ θεωρίας. ἐφ' ὅσον δὴ διατείνει ἡ θεωρία, καὶ ἡ εὐδαιμονία, καὶ οἷς μᾶλλον ὑπάρχει τὸ θεωρεῖν, καὶ εὐδαιμονεῖν, οὐ κατὰ συμβεβηκὸς ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὴν θεωρίαν· αὕτη γὰρ καθ' αὑτὴν τιμία. ὥστ' εἴη ἂν ἡ εὐδαιμονία θεωρία τις.

For the whole life of the gods is blessed, while human life is blessed insofar as it has some likeness of such activity; but none of the other animals is happy, since they have no share at all in contemplation. Happiness, then, extends just as far as contemplation does, and those who contemplate more are happier—not incidentally, but by virtue of the contemplation, since it is valuable in itself. So happiness would be a kind of contemplation.

δεήσει δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐκτὸς εὐημερίας ἀνθρώπῳ ὄντι· οὐ γὰρ αὐτάρκης ἡ φύσις πρὸς τὸ θεωρεῖν, ἀλλὰ δεῖ καὶ τὸ σῶμα ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τροφὴν καὶ τὴν λοιπὴν θεραπείαν ὑπάρχειν. 1179a οὐ μὴν οἰητέον γε πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων δεήσεσθαι

But since he is human, the happy person will also need external prosperity. For our nature is not self-sufficient for contemplating: the body must be

5 Endymion, in myth, was a beautiful youth granted endless sleep.

GREEK

τὸν εὐδαιμονήσοντα, εἰ μὴ ἐνδέχεται ἄνευ τῶν ἐκτὸς ἀγαθῶν μακάριον εἶναι· οὐ γὰρ ἐν τῇ ὑπερβολῇ τὸ αὔταρκες οὐδ' ἡ πρᾶξις, δυνατὸν δὲ καὶ μὴ ἄρχοντα γῆς καὶ θαλάττης πράττειν τὰ καλά· καὶ γὰρ ἀπὸ μετρίων δύναιτ' ἄν τις πράττειν κατὰ τὴν ἀρετήν (τοῦτο δ' ἔστιν ἰδεῖν ἐναργῶς· οἱ γὰρ ἰδιῶται τῶν δυναστῶν οὐχ ἧττον δοκοῦσι τὰ ἐπιεικῆ πράττειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ μᾶλλον)· ἱκανὸν δὲ τοσαῦθ' ὑπάρχειν· ἔσται γὰρ ὁ βίος εὐδαίμων τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ἐνεργοῦντος.

ENGLISH

healthy, and there must be food and other care as well. [1179a] Still, we should not think that someone who is to be happy will need many great things, even if it is not possible to be blessed without external goods. For self-sufficiency and action do not depend on excess, and one can do fine things without ruling land and sea; a person can act in accordance with excellence even from moderate means. (This can be seen clearly: private individuals seem to do decent things no less than those in power—even more, in fact.) It is enough to have that much, since the life of someone who is active in accordance with excellence will be happy.

1179a καὶ Σόλων δὲ τοὺς εὐδαίμονας ἴσως ἀπεφαίνετο καλῶς, εἰπὼν μετρίως τοῖς ἐκτὸς κεχορηγημένους, πεπραγότας δὲ τὰ κάλλισθ', ὡς ᾤετο, καὶ βεβιωκότας σωφρόνως· ἐνδέχεται γὰρ μέτρια κεκτημένους πράττειν ἃ δεῖ. ἔοικε δὲ καὶ Ἀναξαγόρας οὐ πλούσιον οὐδὲ δυνάστην ὑπολαβεῖν τὸν εὐδαίμονα, εἰπὼν ὅτι οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειεν εἴ τις ἄτοπος φανείη τοῖς πολλοῖς· οὗτοι γὰρ κρίνουσι τοῖς ἐκτός, τούτων αἰσθανόμενοι μόνον. συμφωνεῖν δὴ τοῖς λόγοις ἐοίκασιν αἱ τῶν σοφῶν δόξαι. πίστιν μὲν οὖν καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα ἔχει τινά, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς ἐκ τῶν ἔργων καὶ τοῦ βίου κρίνεται· ἐν τούτοις γὰρ τὸ κύριον. σκοπεῖν δὴ τὰ προειρημένα χρὴ ἐπὶ τὰ ἔργα καὶ τὸν βίον φέροντας, καὶ συνᾳδόντων μὲν τοῖς ἔργοις ἀποδεκτέον, διαφωνούντων δὲ λόγους ὑποληπτέον.

Solon, too, was perhaps right in his description of the happy when he said they were people moderately supplied with external goods, who had done what he thought were the finest deeds, and had lived moderately; for it is possible for people with moderate possessions to do what they should. Anaxagoras also seems to have supposed that the happy person was neither rich nor powerful, when he said he wouldn't be surprised if the happy person struck most people as odd; for they judge by externals, since externals are all they perceive. So the opinions of the wise seem to agree with our arguments. Such things carry some conviction, then; but in practical matters the truth is judged from deeds and from life, since these are what is decisive. We must therefore examine what we have said by bringing it to bear on deeds and life: if it harmonizes with the deeds, we should accept it, and if it clashes, we should suppose it to be mere words.

ὁ δὲ κατὰ νοῦν ἐνεργῶν καὶ τοῦτον θεραπεύων καὶ διακείμενος ἄριστα καὶ θεοφιλέστατος ἔοικεν. εἰ γάρ τις ἐπιμέλεια τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων ὑπὸ θεῶν γίνεται, ὥσπερ δοκεῖ, καὶ εἴη ἂν εὔλογον χαίρειν τε αὐτοὺς τῷ ἀρίστῳ καὶ συγγενεστάτῳ (τοῦτο δ' ἂν εἴη ὁ νοῦς) καὶ τοὺς ἀγαπῶντας μάλιστα τοῦτο καὶ τιμῶντας ἀντευποιεῖν ὡς τῶν φίλων αὐτοῖς ἐπιμελουμένους καὶ ὀρθῶς τε καὶ καλῶς πράττοντας. ὅτι δὲ πάντα ταῦτα τῷ σοφῷ μάλισθ' ὑπάρχει, οὐκ ἄδηλον. θεοφιλέστατος ἄρα. τὸν αὐτὸν δ' εἰκὸς καὶ εὐδαιμονέστατον· ὥστε κἂν οὕτως εἴη ὁ σοφὸς μάλιστ' εὐδαίμων.

The person who is active in accordance with intellect, who cultivates it and is in the best condition, also seems to be the one most loved by the gods. For if the gods have some care for human affairs, as they are thought to, it would be reasonable for them to delight in what is best and most akin to them (and that would be intellect), and to reward those who most love and honor it, on the grounds that these people care for what the gods hold dear and act rightly and finely. And it is plain enough that all this belongs most of all to the wise person. He, then, is the most loved by the gods; and the same person is likely to be the happiest too. So in this way as well the wise person will be happiest of all.

FROM ETHICS TO LAWGIVING

Aristotle argues that becoming good requires good laws and habits, and turns to the study of legislation.

GREEK	ENGLISH
ἆρ' οὖν εἰ περί τε τούτων καὶ τῶν ἀρετῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φιλίας καὶ ἡδονῆς, ἱκανῶς εἴρηται τοῖς τύποις, τέλος ἔχειν οἰητέον τὴν προαίρεσιν; ἢ καθάπερ λέγεται, [1179b] οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τοῖς πρακτοῖς τέλος τὸ θεωρῆσαι ἕκαστα καὶ γνῶναι, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον τὸ πράττειν αὐτά· οὐδὲ δὴ περὶ ἀρετῆς ἱκανὸν τὸ εἰδέναι, ἀλλ' ἔχειν καὶ χρῆσθαι πειρατέον, ἢ εἴ πως ἄλλως ἀγαθοὶ γινόμεθα;	If, then, we have said enough in outline about these matters and about the excellences, and also about friendship and pleasure, should we think that our project has reached its end? Or is it, as they say, [1179b] that in matters of action the end is not to study and know each thing but rather to do it? In that case, knowing about excellence is not enough either; we must try to possess it and use it —or become good in whatever other way we can.
1179b εἰ μὲν οὖν ἦσαν οἱ λόγοι αὐτάρκεις πρὸς τὸ ποιῆσαι ἐπιεικεῖς, πολλοὺς ἂν μισθοὺς καὶ μεγάλους δικαίως ἔφερον κατὰ τὸν Θέογνιν, καὶ ἔδει ἂν τούτους πορίσασθαι· νῦν δὲ φαίνονται προτρέψασθαι μὲν καὶ παρορμῆσαι τῶν νέων τοὺς ἐλευθερίους ἰσχύειν, ἦθός τ' εὐγενὲς καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς φιλόκαλον ποιῆσαι ἂν κατοκώχιμον ἐκ τῆς ἀρετῆς, τοὺς δὲ πολλοὺς ἀδυνατεῖν πρὸς καλοκαγαθίαν προτρέψασθαι· οὐ γὰρ πεφύκασιν αἰδοῖ πειθαρχεῖν ἀλλὰ φόβῳ, οὐδ' ἀπέχεσθαι τῶν φαύλων διὰ τὸ αἰσχρὸν ἀλλὰ διὰ τὰς τιμωρίας· πάθει γὰρ ζῶντες τὰς οἰκείας ἡδονὰς διώκουσι καὶ δι' ὧν αὗται ἔσονται, φεύγουσι δὲ τὰς ἀντικειμένας λύπας, τοῦ δὲ καλοῦ καὶ ὡς ἀληθῶς ἡδέος οὐδ' ἔννοιαν ἔχουσιν, ἄγευστοι ὄντες. τοὺς δὴ τοιούτους τίς ἂν λόγος μεταρρυθμίσαι;	Now if arguments were enough by themselves to make people decent, they would rightly have earned many large fees, as Theognis says, and we would have had to get hold of them. As it is, arguments evidently have the power to encourage and spur on the generous-minded among the young, and to make a well-born character, one that truly loves what is fine, open to being possessed by excellence; but they are evidently unable to spur the many on toward being fine and good. For the many are not naturally inclined to obey a sense of shame, but fear, or to keep away from base things because they are shameful, but because of the penalties. Living by feeling, they pursue their own pleasures and whatever will bring them about, and avoid the opposing pains; but they have not even a notion of what is fine and truly pleasant, since they have never tasted it. What argument could reshape people like that?
οὐ γὰρ οἷόν τε ἢ οὐ ῥᾴδιον τὰ ἐκ παλαιοῦ τοῖς ἤθεσι κατειλημμένα λόγῳ μεταστῆσαι· ἀγαπητὸν δ' ἴσως ἐστὶν εἰ πάντων ὑπαρχόντων δι' ὧν ἐπιεικεῖς δοκοῦμεν γίνεσθαι, μεταλάβοιμεν τῆς ἀρετῆς. γίνεσθαι δ' ἀγαθοὺς οἴονται οἱ μὲν φύσει οἱ δ' ἔθει οἱ δὲ διδαχῇ. τὸ μὲν οὖν τῆς φύσεως δῆλον ὡς οὐκ ἐφ' ἡμῖν ὑπάρχει, ἀλλὰ διά τινας θείας αἰτίας τοῖς ὡς ἀληθῶς εὐτυχέσιν ὑπάρχει· ὁ δὲ λόγος καὶ ἡ διδαχὴ μή ποτ' οὐκ ἐν ἅπασιν ἰσχύει, ἀλλὰ δεῖ προδιειργάσθαι τοῖς ἔθεσι τὴν τοῦ ἀκροατοῦ ψυχὴν πρὸς τὸ καλῶς χαίρειν καὶ μισεῖν, ὥσπερ γῆν τὴν θρέψουσαν τὸ σπέρμα. οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἀκούσειε λόγου ἀποτρέποντος οὐδ' αὖ συνείη ὁ κατὰ πάθος ζῶν· τὸν δ' οὕτως ἔχοντα πῶς οἷόν τε μεταπεῖσαι;	For it is impossible, or at least not easy, to dislodge by argument what has long been ingrained in people's characters. We should perhaps be content if, when we have everything by which people seem to become decent, we get some share of excellence. Some think people become good by nature, others by habit, others by teaching. What comes from nature is plainly not up to us, but belongs, through some divine causes, to those who are truly fortunate. Argument and teaching may well not have force with everyone; the listener's soul must first have been cultivated by habits to enjoy and to hate in the right way, like soil that is to nourish the seed. For someone who lives by feeling would not listen to an argument turning him away, or even understand it; and how can you persuade someone in that state to change?

	GREEK	ENGLISH
	ὅλως τ’ οὐ δοκεῖ λόγῳ ὑπείκειν τὸ πάθος ἀλλὰ βίᾳ. δεῖ δὴ τὸ ἦθος προϋπάρχειν πως οἰκεῖον τῆς ἀρετῆς, στέργον τὸ καλὸν καὶ δυσχεραῖνον τὸ αἰσχρόν. ἐκ νέου δ’ ἀγωγῆς ὀρθῆς τυχεῖν πρὸς ἀρετὴν χαλεπὸν μὴ ὑπὸ τοιούτοις τραφέντα νόμοις· τὸ γὰρ σωφρόνως καὶ καρτερικῶς ζῆν οὐχ ἡδὺ τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἄλλως τε καὶ νέοις. διὸ νόμοις δεῖ τετάχθαι τὴν τροφὴν καὶ τὰ ἐπιτηδεύματα· οὐκ ἔσται γὰρ λυπηρὰ συνήθη γενόμενα.	In general, feeling seems to yield not to argument but to force. So there must already be a character somehow akin to excellence, one that loves what is fine and is repelled by what is shameful. But it is hard to get the right upbringing for excellence from youth if one has not been raised under the right laws; for living moderately and with endurance is not pleasant to most people, especially the young. That is why their upbringing and pursuits must be ordered by laws, since these will not be painful once they have become habitual.
1180a	οὐχ ἱκανὸν δ’ ἴσως νέους ὄντας τροφῆς καὶ ἐπιμελείας τυχεῖν ὀρθῆς, ἀλλ’ ἐπιεδὴ καὶ ἀνδρωθέντας δεῖ ἐπιτηδεύειν αὐτὰ καὶ ἐθίζεσθαι, καὶ περὶ ταῦτα δεοίμεθ’ ἂν νόμων, καὶ ὅλως δὴ περὶ πάντα τὸν βίον· οἱ γὰρ πολλοὶ ἀνάγκῃ μᾶλλον ἢ λόγῳ πειθαρχοῦσι καὶ ζημίαις ἢ τῷ καλῷ.	1180a But it is perhaps not enough to get the right upbringing and care when young; since people must keep up these pursuits and be habituated to them when they are grown men as well, we would need laws about this too, and in general about the whole of life. For most people obey necessity rather than argument, and penalties rather than what is fine.
1180a	διόπερ οἴονταί τινες τοὺς νομοθετοῦντας δεῖν μὲν παρακαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν ἀρετὴν καὶ προτρέπεσθαι τοῦ καλοῦ χάριν, ὡς ἐπακουσομένων τῶν ἐπιεικῶς τοῖς ἔθεσι προηγμένων, ἀπειθοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἀφυεστέροις οὖσι κολάσεις τε καὶ τιμωρίας ἐπιτιθέναι, τοὺς δ’ ἀνιάτους ὅλως ἐξορίζειν· τὸν μὲν γὰρ ἐπιεικῆ πρὸς τὸ καλὸν ζῶντα τῷ λόγῳ πειθαρχήσειν, τὸν δὲ φαῦλον ἡδονῆς ὀρεγόμενον λύπῃ κολάζεσθαι ὥσπερ ὑποζύγιον. διὸ καί φασι δεῖν τοιαύτας γίνεσθαι τὰς λύπας αἳ μάλιστ’ ἐναντιοῦνται ταῖς ἀγαπωμέναις ἡδοναῖς.	That is why some think that lawgivers should urge people toward excellence and exhort them for the sake of the fine, expecting that those who have been decently prepared by their habits will listen; but should impose punishments and penalties on those who disobey or are of poorer nature, and banish the incurable altogether. For the decent person, who lives with a view to the fine, will obey reason, while the base person, who craves pleasure, must be corrected by pain, like a beast of burden. That is also why they say the pains should be those most opposed to the pleasures such people love.
	εἰ δ’ οὖν, καθάπερ εἴρηται, τὸν ἐσόμενον ἀγαθὸν τραφῆναι καλῶς δεῖ καὶ ἐθισθῆναι, εἶθ’ οὕτως ἐν ἐπιτηδεύμασιν ἐπιεικέσι ζῆν καὶ μήτ’ ἄκοντα μήθ’ ἑκόντα πράττειν τὰ φαῦλα, ταῦτα δὲ γίνοιτ’ ἂν βιουμένοις κατά τινα νοῦν καὶ τάξιν ὀρθήν, ἔχουσαν ἰσχύν· ἡ μὲν οὖν πατρικὴ πρόσταξις οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἰσχυρὸν οὐδὲ δὴ τὸ ἀναγκαῖον, οὐδὲ δὴ ὅλως ἡ ἑνὸς ἀνδρός, μὴ βασιλέως ὄντος ἤ τινος τοιούτου· ὁ δὲ νόμος ἀναγκαστικὴν ἔχει δύναμιν, λόγος ὢν ἀπό τινος φρονήσεως καὶ νοῦ. καὶ τῶν μὲν ἀνθρώπων ἐχθαίρουσι τοὺς ἐναντιουμένους ταῖς ὁρμαῖς, κἂν ὀρθῶς αὐτὸ δρῶσιν· ὁ δὲ νόμος οὐκ ἔστιν ἐπαχθὴς τάττων τὸ ἐπιεικές.	If, then, as we have said, the person who is to be good must be raised well and habituated well, and then live in decent pursuits and do nothing base either involuntarily or voluntarily, and if this would come about for people who live according to some kind of intellect and right order that has force behind it—well, a father’s command does not have force or compulsion, nor in general does the command of any one man, unless he is a king or something of the sort; but law does have compelling power, being a rule that proceeds from a kind of practical wisdom and intellect. Besides, people hate individuals who oppose their impulses, even if they do so rightly; but law is not resented when it prescribes what is decent.
	ἐν μόνῃ δὲ τῇ Λακεδαιμονίων πόλει ἢ μετ’ ὀλίγων ὁ νομοθέτης ἐπιμέλειαν δοκεῖ πεποιῆσθαι τροφῆς τε καὶ ἐπιτηδευμάτων· ἐν δὲ ταῖς πλείσταις τῶν πόλεων	Yet it is only in the city of the Spartans, or there and in a few others, that the lawgiver seems to have taken care over upbringing and pursuits. In

GREEK

ἐξημέληται περὶ τῶν τοιούτων, καὶ ζῇ ἕκαστος ὡς βούλεται, κυκλωπικῶς θεμιστεύων παίδων ἠδ' ἀλόχου. κράτιστον μὲν οὖν τὸ γίνεσθαι κοινὴν ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ ὀρθὴν καὶ δρᾶν αὐτὸ δύνασθαι· κοινῇ δ' ἐξαμελουμένων ἑκάστῳ δόξειεν ἂν προσήκειν τοῖς σφετέροις τέκνοις καὶ φίλοις εἰς ἀρετὴν συμβάλλεσθαι, ἢ προαιρεῖσθαί γε. μᾶλλον δ' ἂν τοῦτο δύνασθαι δόξειεν ἐκ τῶν εἰρημένων νομοθετικὸς γενόμενος. αἱ μὲν γὰρ κοιναὶ ἐπιμέλειαι δῆλον ὅτι διὰ νόμων γίνονται, ἐπιεικεῖς δ' αἱ διὰ τῶν σπουδαίων· 1180b γεγραμμένων δ' ἢ ἀγράφων, οὐδὲν ἂν δόξειε διαφέρειν, οὐδὲ δι' ὧν εἷς ἢ πολλοὶ παιδευθήσονται, ὥσπερ οὐδ' ἐπὶ μουσικῆς ἢ γυμναστικῆς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐπιτηδευμάτων.

ENGLISH

most cities such matters are neglected, and each person lives as he wishes, "laying down the law for children and wife," like the Cyclopes. The best thing, then, is for there to be public care, and of the right kind, and for the city to be able to carry it out. But when the community neglects it, it would seem to be up to each person to help his own children and friends toward excellence—or at least to decide to do so. And from what we have said, it would seem that he would be better able to do this if he became a lawgiver. For public care evidently comes about through laws, and decent care through excellent laws. 1180b Whether they are written or unwritten would seem to make no difference, nor whether they are laws by which one person or many will be educated—any more than it does in music or athletics and the other pursuits.[6]

1180b ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν ἐνισχύει τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὰ ἤθη, οὕτω καὶ ἐν οἰκίαις οἱ πατρικοὶ λόγοι καὶ τὰ ἔθη, καὶ ἔτι μᾶλλον διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν καὶ τὰς εὐεργεσίας· προϋπάρχουσι γὰρ στέργοντες καὶ εὐπειθεῖς τῇ φύσει. ἔτι δὲ καὶ διαφέρουσιν αἱ καθ' ἕκαστον παιδεῖαι τῶν κοινῶν, ὥσπερ ἐπ' ἰατρικῆς· καθόλου μὲν γὰρ τῷ πυρέττοντι συμφέρει ἡσυχία καὶ ἀσιτία, τινὶ δ' ἴσως οὔ, ὅ τε πυκτικὸς ἴσως οὐ πᾶσι τὴν αὐτὴν μάχην περιτίθησιν. ἐξακριβοῦσθαι δὴ δόξειεν ἂν μᾶλλον τὸ καθ' ἕκαστον ἰδίας τῆς ἐπιμελείας γινομένης· μᾶλλον γὰρ τοῦ προσφόρου τυγχάνει ἕκαστος.

For just as laws and customs have force in cities, so a father's words and habits have force in households—and even more so, because of kinship and the benefits he confers; for his children start out with affection for him and are naturally ready to obey. Further, individual education differs from public education, just as in medicine: in general rest and fasting are good for someone with a fever, but perhaps not for a particular person; and a boxer perhaps doesn't teach everyone the same style of fighting. So it would seem that the particular case is worked out more precisely when the care is private, since each person is more likely to get what suits him.

ἀλλ' ἐπιμεληθείη μὲν ἂν ἄριστα καθ' ἓν καὶ ἰατρὸς καὶ γυμναστὴς καὶ πᾶς ἄλλος ὁ καθόλου εἰδώς, τί πᾶσιν ἢ τοῖς τοιοισδί (τοῦ κοινοῦ γὰρ αἱ ἐπιστῆμαι λέγονταί τε καὶ εἰσίν)· οὐ μὴν ἀλλ' ἑνός τινος οὐδὲν ἴσως κωλύει καλῶς ἐπιμεληθῆναι καὶ ἀνεπιστήμονα ὄντα, τεθεαμένον δ' ἀκριβῶς τὰ συμβαίνοντα ἐφ' ἑκάστῳ δι' ἐμπειρίαν, καθάπερ καὶ ἰατροὶ ἔνιοι δοκοῦσιν ἑαυτῶν ἄριστοι εἶναι, ἑτέρῳ οὐδὲν ἂν δυνάμενοι ἐπαρκέσαι. οὐδὲν δ' ἧττον ἴσως τῷ γε βουλομένῳ τεχνικῷ γενέσθαι καὶ θεωρητικῷ ἐπὶ τὸ καθόλου βαδιστέον εἶναι δόξειεν ἄν, κἀκεῖνο γνωριστέον ὡς ἐνδέχεται· εἴρηται γὰρ ὅτι περὶ τοῦθ' αἱ ἐπιστῆμαι. τάχα δὲ καὶ τῷ βουλομένῳ δι' ἐπιμελείας βελτίους ποιεῖν, εἴτε πολλοὺς εἴτ' ὀλίγους, νομοθετικῷ πειρατέον γενέσθαι, εἰ διὰ νόμων ἀγαθοὶ γενοίμεθ' ἄν.

But a doctor, a trainer or anyone else will give the best care to an individual if he knows the universal—what is good for everyone, or for people of a certain kind (for the sciences are said to be about what is common, and they are). Still, perhaps nothing prevents even someone without scientific knowledge from caring well for a single individual, if through experience he has observed precisely what happens in each case—just as some people seem to be their own best doctors, though they couldn't help anyone else at all. Nonetheless, someone who wants to master a craft and to understand it theoretically would seem to have to proceed to the universal and come to know it as far as possible; for we have said that this is what

6 The Cyclopes, the one-eyed giants of the *Odyssey*, live without assemblies or laws, each ruling his own wife and children.

GREEK

ENGLISH

the sciences are about. And perhaps someone who wants to make people better through his care, whether many or few, should try to become a lawgiver, if it is through laws that we can become good.

ὄντινα γὰρ οὖν καὶ τὸν προτεθέντα διαθεῖναι καλῶς οὐκ ἔστι τοῦ τυχόντος, ἀλλ' εἴπερ τινός, τοῦ εἰδότος, ὥσπερ ἐπ' ἰατρικῆς καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ὧν ἔστιν ἐπιμέλειά τις καὶ φρόνησις. ἆρ' οὖν μετὰ τοῦτο ἐπισκεπτέον πόθεν ἢ πῶς νομοθετικὸς γένοιτ' ἄν τις; ἢ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων, παρὰ τῶν πολιτικῶν; μόριον γὰρ ἐδόκει τῆς πολιτικῆς εἶναι. ἢ οὐχ ὅμοιον φαίνεται ἐπὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐπιστημῶν τε καὶ δυνάμεων;

For putting anyone at all—whoever is set before you—into a good condition is not a job for just anybody; if it is for anyone, it is for the person who knows, as in medicine and the other fields that involve care and practical wisdom. Should we next examine, then, where or how one might become a lawgiver? Is it, as in other fields, from the practitioners—the politicians? For lawgiving seemed to be a part of political science. Or does political science appear to be unlike the other sciences and capacities?

ἐν μὲν γὰρ ταῖς ἄλλαις οἱ αὐτοὶ φαίνονται τάς τε δυνάμεις παραδιδόντες καὶ ἐνεργοῦντες ἀπ' αὐτῶν, οἷον ἰατροὶ γραφεῖς· τὰ δὲ πολιτικὰ ἐπαγγέλλονται μὲν διδάσκειν οἱ σοφισταί, 1181a πράττει δ' αὐτῶν οὐδείς, ἀλλ' οἱ πολιτευόμενοι, οἳ δόξαιεν ἂν δυνάμει τινὶ τοῦτο πράττειν καὶ ἐμπειρίᾳ μᾶλλον ἢ διανοίᾳ· οὔτε γὰρ γράφοντες οὔτε λέγοντες περὶ τῶν τοιούτων φαίνονται (καίτοι κάλλιον ἦν ἴσως ἢ λόγους δικανικούς τε καὶ δημηγορικούς), οὐδ' αὖ πολιτικοὺς πεποιηκότες τοὺς σφετέρους υἱεῖς ἤ τινας ἄλλους τῶν φίλων. εὔλογον δ' ἦν, εἴπερ ἐδύναντο· οὔτε γὰρ ταῖς πόλεσιν ἄμεινον οὐδὲν κατέλιπον ἄν, οὔθ' αὑτοῖς ὑπάρξαι προέλοιντ' ἂν μᾶλλον τῆς τοιαύτης δυνάμεως, οὐδὲ δὴ τοῖς φιλτάτοις.

For in the others, evidently, the same people both pass on the capacities and exercise them—doctors and painters, for instance. But when it comes to politics, it is the sophists who profess to teach it, 1181a yet none of them practises it; the practitioners are the politicians, who would seem to do this through a kind of capacity and experience rather than through thought. For they evidently neither write nor speak about such matters (though that would perhaps be finer than composing speeches for the law courts and the assembly), nor have they made politicians of their own sons or of any of their friends. Yet it would be reasonable for them to have done so, if they could; for there is nothing better they could leave to their cities, and nothing they would rather choose to have for themselves, or indeed for those dearest to them, than such a capacity.

1181a οὐ μὴν μικρόν γε ἔοικεν ἡ ἐμπειρία συμβάλλεσθαι· οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγίνοντ' ἂν διὰ τῆς πολιτικῆς συνηθείας πολιτικοί· διὸ τοῖς ἐφιεμένοις περὶ πολιτικῆς εἰδέναι προσδεῖν ἔοικεν ἐμπειρίας. τῶν δὲ σοφιστῶν οἱ ἐπαγγελλόμενοι λίαν φαίνονται πόρρω εἶναι τοῦ διδάξαι. ὅλως γὰρ οὐδὲ ποιόν τι ἐστὶν ἢ περὶ ποῖα ἴσασιν· οὐ γὰρ ἂν τὴν αὐτὴν τῇ ῥητορικῇ οὐδὲ χείρω ἐτίθεσαν, οὐδ' ἂν ᾤοντο ῥᾴδιον εἶναι τὸ νομοθετῆσαι συναγαγόντι τοὺς εὐδοκιμοῦντας τῶν νόμων· ἐκλέξασθαι γὰρ εἶναι τοὺς ἀρίστους, ὥσπερ οὐδὲ τὴν ἐκλογὴν οὖσαν συνέσεως καὶ τὸ κρῖναι ὀρθῶς μέγιστον, ὥσπερ ἐν τοῖς κατὰ μουσικήν.

Still, experience seems to contribute no small amount; otherwise people would not have become politicians through familiarity with politics. That is why those who want to know about political science seem to need experience as well. But those sophists who profess to teach it are evidently very far from doing so. For in general they don't even know what sort of thing it is or what it is about; otherwise they would not have classed it as the same as rhetoric, or even as inferior to it, nor would they have thought it easy to legislate by collecting the laws that are well thought of. You can select the best ones, they say—as if the selection itself did not call for comprehension, and as if

GREEK	ENGLISH
	judging correctly were not the most important thing, just as in music.
οἱ γὰρ ἔμπειροι περὶ ἕκαστα κρίνουσιν ὀρθῶς τὰ ἔργα, καὶ δι' ὧν ἢ πῶς ἐπιτελεῖται συνιᾶσιν, καὶ ποῖα ποίοις συνᾴδει· τοῖς δ' ἀπείροις ἀγαπητὸν τὸ μὴ διαλανθάνειν εἰ εὖ ἢ κακῶς πεποίηται τὸ ἔργον, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ γραφικῆς. οἱ δὲ νόμοι τῆς πολιτικῆς ἔργοις ἐοίκασιν· [1181b] πῶς οὖν ἐκ τούτων νομοθετικὸς γένοιτ' ἄν τις, ἢ τοὺς ἀρίστους κρίναι; οὐ γὰρ φαίνονται οὐδ' ἰατρικοὶ ἐκ τῶν συγγραμμάτων γίνεσθαι. καίτοι πειρῶνταί γε λέγειν οὐ μόνον τὰ θεραπεύματα, ἀλλὰ καὶ ὡς ἰαθεῖεν ἄν καὶ ὡς δεῖ θεραπεύειν ἑκάστους, διελόμενοι τὰς ἕξεις· ταῦτα δὲ τοῖς μὲν ἐμπείροις ὠφέλιμα εἶναι δοκεῖ, τοῖς δ' ἀνεπιστήμοσιν ἀχρεῖα.	For people experienced in a given field judge its works correctly and understand by what means or how they are accomplished, and what fits with what; whereas the inexperienced must be content if they can tell whether the work has been done well or badly, as with painting. Laws are like the works of political science; [1181b] how, then, could someone become a lawgiver from them, or judge which are best? For people evidently don't become doctors from medical handbooks either. And yet these try to state not only the treatments but also how particular kinds of patient might be cured and how each should be treated, distinguishing the various bodily states; but while these seem useful to the experienced, they are useless to those without knowledge.
1181b ἴσως οὖν καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῶν πολιτειῶν αἱ συναγωγαὶ τοῖς μὲν δυναμένοις θεωρῆσαι καὶ κρῖναι τί καλῶς ἢ τοὐναντίον καὶ ποῖα ποίοις ἁρμόττει εὔχρηστ' ἂν εἴη· τοῖς δ' ἄνευ ἕξεως τὰ τοιαῦτα διεξιοῦσι τὸ μὲν κρίνειν καλῶς οὐκ ἂν ὑπάρχοι, εἰ μὴ ἄρα αὐτόματον, εὐσυνετώτεροι δ' εἰς ταῦτα τάχ' ἂν γένοιντο. παραλιπόντων οὖν τῶν προτέρων ἀνερεύνητον τὸ περὶ τῆς νομοθεσίας, αὐτοὺς ἐπισκέψασθαι μᾶλλον βέλτιον ἴσως, καὶ ὅλως δὴ περὶ πολιτείας, ὅπως εἰς δύναμιν ἡ περὶ τὰ ἀνθρώπεια φιλοσοφία τελειωθῇ. πρῶτον μὲν οὖν εἴ τι κατὰ μέρος εἴρηται καλῶς ὑπὸ τῶν προγενεστέρων πειραθῶμεν ἐπελθεῖν, εἶτα ἐκ τῶν συνηγμένων πολιτειῶν θεωρῆσαι τὰ ποῖα σῴζει καὶ φθείρει τὰς πόλεις καὶ τὰ ποῖα ἑκάστας τῶν πολιτειῶν, καὶ διὰ τίνας αἰτίας αἱ μὲν καλῶς αἱ δὲ τοὐναντίον πολιτεύονται.	Perhaps, then, collections of laws and constitutions would also be very useful to those who are able to study them and judge what is well done or the opposite, and what sorts of things suit what; but those who go through such material without the trained state would not be able to judge well, except by chance, though they might become more discerning about these matters. Since our predecessors have left the subject of lawgiving unexamined, it is perhaps better that we examine it ourselves, and indeed the whole subject of the constitution, so that our philosophy of human affairs may be completed as far as possible. First, then, let us try to review whatever has been said well on particular points by those before us; then, on the basis of the constitutions we have collected, let us study what sorts of things preserve and destroy cities, and what sorts preserve and destroy each kind of constitution, and for what reasons some cities are well governed and others the opposite.[7]
θεωρηθέντων γὰρ τούτων τάχ' ἂν μᾶλλον συνίδοιμεν καὶ ποία πολιτεία ἀρίστη, καὶ πῶς ἑκάστη ταχθεῖσα, καὶ τίσι νόμοις καὶ ἔθεσι χρωμένη. λέγωμεν οὖν ἀρξάμενοι.	For once these have been studied, we will perhaps have a better view of which constitution is best, how each is arranged, and what laws and customs it uses. Let us begin, then, and discuss it.

7 Aristotle's school compiled accounts of 158 constitutions, of which only the *Constitution of the Athenians* survives.