ARISTOTLE

THE POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE

TRANSLATED WITH AN INTRODUCTION NOTES
AND APPENDIXES BY
ERNEST BARKER

CHINA SOCIAL SCIENCES PUBLISHING HOUSE
CHENGCHENG BOOKS LTD.

THE POLITICS OF ARISTOTLE

图书在版编目(CIP)数据

政治学:英文/(古希腊)亚里士多德著. -影印本.
-北京:中国社会科学出版社,1999.12
(西学基本经典·政治学类/西学基本经典工作委员会 编)
ISBN 7-5004-2651-8

Ⅰ.政… Ⅱ.亚… Ⅲ.政治学-古希腊-英文 Ⅳ.①D091.2②B502.233

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字(1999)第 68425 号

版权总代理:TAO MEDIA INTERNATIONAL
(2790 19th Avenue, Ste. 20, San Francisco, CA 94132 U.S.A)

西学基本经典·政治学类
西学基本经典工作委员会 编
中国社会科学出版社 出版发行
(北京鼓楼西大街甲 158 号 邮编 100720)
E-mail:5004@Peoplespace.net
诚成图书有限公司 制作
中国建筑工业出版社密云印刷厂印刷
新华书店经销
1999 年 12 月第 1 版 1999 年 12 月第 1 次印刷
开本 880×1230 1/32 印张 162.875
政治学类全 11 册 定价:550.00 元

总策划 严 平 野 夫
项目策划 张自文 任建成

西学基本经典工作委员会

※ ※ ※ ※ ※

西学基本经典专家委员会

PREFACE

THE original intention of the translator, when he began work in 1940—on the suggestion, and with the encouragement, of Sir Richard Livingstone—was to produce a simple and possibly shortened version of the *Politics* for the benefit of English readers who were not versed in the classics but were interested in the general history of social and political theory. The original intention has not been abandoned, but it has been partly modified and partly extended.

It has been modified in the sense that any idea of shortening the *Politics* has been dropped. Aristotle is too pithy to be made still pithier. It is expansion, rather than contraction, which the text of the *Politics* demands. Little could profitably have been omitted: a shortened version would have been but little shorter, and yet would have been incomplete; and the translator respected the original too much to sacrifice even its minor details. (Minor details, after all, go to make the character, and to determine the influence, of any great book.) The *Politics* is therefore presented to the reader ***in extenso***.

The original intention has also been extended, and that in more than one way. In the first place it seemed desirable to illustrate the argument of the *Politics* by adding a translation of the various passages concerned with matters of politics which are to be found in the other writings of Aristotle—especially the *Ethics*, the *Rhetoric*, and the *Constitution of Athens*. This was the origin of the five appendixes at the end of the book, which attempt to complete and round off the review of political philosophy contained in the *Politics* itself, and thus to present the reader with a general conspectus of the whole body of Aristotle's work in the field of political inquiry. In the second place the translator, who began his study of the *Politics* nearly half a century ago, and dealt with its argument in the first book which he published,[1] was naturally moved, when the translation had been completed and revised, to add an introduction dealing with the life of Aristotle, the place of the *Politics* in his system, the substance of its argument, and some problems of its vocabulary. The introduction runs to some length; but its length may perhaps be excused by the plea that it is the last contribution which the writer can hope to make to the interpretation of the *Politics*.

Was a new translation necessary? The translator asked himself that question before he began his work; and he could only answer

[1] *The Political Thought of Plato and Aristotle*, 1906.

(but his answer was inevitably partial) that it was. The *Politics* is a book which is needed—and needed in modern dress and a modern English idiom—by the 'general reader' of all the Anglo-Saxon world. It inspired the political thought of Aquinas: that in turn inspired Hooker: Hooker in turn helped to inspire Locke; and the thought of Locke, with all its ancestry, has largely inspired the general thought both of Britain and America in the realm of politics. More especially, the study of the *Politics* is a part of the curriculum in a hundred and more universities, not only in Britain and the United States, but also in the Dominions and India. Many—indeed, one may safely say, the great majority—of the students who attempt its study are students belonging to the faculties of modern history, or of modern philosophy, or of economics and politics, who have not been trained in the classics, and must therefore study the *Politics* in some sort of modern version. They need a version which is couched in a modern style (such as a writer would use to-day in treating of politics) and furnished with appropriate 'helps to study' which will bring its substance home to their minds. The translator, who was originally trained in the classics, but has spent most of his life in teaching students in the faculty of modern history, has accordingly drawn on his mixed experience in order to make a translation intended primarily to meet the needs of students of modern history, philosophy, and economics. This is not to say that he has not sought to translate the Greek text with as exact a scholarship as he could command, or that he has failed to remember the needs of the student of classical languages or the student of ancient history. But he has designed the translation more particularly for the service of the numerous students of social and political theory, in whatever faculty or department, who simply desire to study the *Politics* (along with Plato's *Republic*) as the fountain-head of that theory.

Some technical details should also be added for the guidance of the reader. (1) The text from which the translation has been made is that of Newman's edition,[1] but the translator has also used the Teubner edition of Immisch.[2] He would also add that he has checked his translation, again and again, with the revised version of Jowett's translation in vol. x of the *Oxford Translation of Aristotle*. (2) The reader will find in the text of the translation a number of passages, marked by square brackets, which have been added by the translator in order to elucidate the course of the argument. They may seem numerous, and the frequent recurrence of square brackets may confuse the eye of the reader. But

[1] Oxford, 1887–1902. [2] Leipzig, 1909.

no addition has been made to the text unless it seemed to be necessary for a full understanding of the argument; and scholarship demanded that any addition, however small, should be clearly marked. Every addition is simply, and only, designed to bring out clearly the ideas implied in the actual text; and there is no addition which is not based on the words of Aristotle himself or those of his commentators. (3) The titles given to each book (like the divisions and sub-titles within each book) are the work of the translator. But they are based on the authority of Aristotle; and in many cases they are simply translations of the phrases which he uses in the text of the *Politics*, e.g., in referring back to the contents of a previous book. (The analysis which precedes each chapter is entirely the work of the translator, and has no other authority.) (4) The explanatory footnotes are, of course, the work of the translator. The longer notes have been placed at the end of the relevant chapter, with a heading to indicate their contents, in order not to disturb the page with an excess of annotation. (5) At the top of each left-hand page the reader will find a statement of the book, chapter, and sections translated on the two pages facing him; and at the top of each right-hand page he will find a similar statement of the column (or columns) and the lines of the original Greek text of the same two pages, as that text is printed in the large two-column Berlin edition of the works of Aristotle by Bekker (vol. II, 1831). The beginning of each column of the Greek text of the Berlin edition is marked in thick type at the relevant point in the body of the translation itself. It is the habit of classical scholars to cite passages in Aristotle's works by the Berlin column and lines (as Plato's dialogues are cited by the page and the lettered divisions of the page in the Stephanus edition of 1578); and the translator hopes that the indications given, on the top of each right-hand page and in the body of the text, will form a sufficient guide for the tracing of such citations.

The translation has been a labour of love, and a permanent consolation of such leisure as was left to the writer, from the autumn of 1940 to the spring of 1945, among the anxieties and duties of war. It is a comfort, now that it is finished (*perfectum* in one sense, but in another *imperfectum . . . nec absoluto simile*), because it encourages a hope that something is here presented which may be of use to the students of the coming generation. For the wisdom of Aristotle grows on the mind as one ponders upon it; and the future will be all the better if it continues to digest his wisdom.

Walter Burley, reputed a Fellow of Merton College, is said to

have dedicated a translation of the *Politics* (but was it, perhaps, a commentary?) to Richard de Bury, the Bishop of Durham and the author of *Philobiblon*, about the year 1330. History repeats itself in an old country; and six centuries later one who was some time a Fellow of Merton College presents again a work on the *Politics*, but presents it now to the Warden and Fellows of the College. It was Merton College which gave him the opportunity of a scholar's life, when it elected him to a Prize Fellowship in Classics in 1898. ('Surely that day', as Ascham wrote in his *Schoolmaster*, referring to his own election to a fellowship at another college, in another university, over 350 years earlier, 'was . . . *Dies natalis* to me for the whole foundation of the poor learning I have and of all the furtherance that hitherto elsewhere I have obtained.') It was in the College that he learned to know F. H. Bradley, Harold Joachim, John Burnet, and A. E. Taylor: it was during the years which he spent in the College that he was introduced by Harold Joachim to the Aristotelian circle which met round Professor Bywater. *Siquid huic libro insit boni, adscriptum sit*

CUSTODI ET SOCIIS
COLLEGII MERTONENSIS

E. B.

14 December 1945

NOTE

THE translator desires to record, with gratitude, the debt which he owes to Mr. A. E. Quene (sometime one of the principal regional medical officers of the Ministry of Health), who generously checked the references and cross-references in the original edition of 1946, and suggested a number of corrections and improvements which have been incorporated in the present printing.

E. B.

May 1948

INTRODUCTION

I

THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE *POLITICS*

The life of Aristotle in its relation to the Politics, *and the substance of the* Politics *in its relation to contemporary history*

ARISTOTLE was born in the year 384 and died in the year 322. The place of his birth was Stagira, a small Greek colonial town, a little to the east of the modern Salonica, on the borders of the kingdom of Macedonia. The place of his birth and the fact that his father was court physician to a previous king of Macedonia may partly help to explain how he came to be tutor, in his middle age (about 342), to the young prince Alexander. Two facts in his parentage may conceivably have also affected the method and direction of his future studies. In the first place both of his parents were of Ionian origin; and remembering that the tendency of the Ionians was towards the scientific investigation of nature and its physical elements and living types, we are perhaps entitled to fancy—but it is little more than a fancy—that the blood in his veins carried with it a scientific strain, and impelled him towards that preoccupation with nature, or *physis*, which marks so much of his thought. In the second place—and here we are on firmer ground—his father was a doctor, practised in the art of dissection (which Aristotle afterwards pursued), and probably versed in the writings of the school of Hippocrates,[1] with their close observation of the symptoms of diseases, their 'case records', and their suggestions of remedial treatment. This may have helped to turn Aristotle's attention to biological studies, which he certainly began to pursue (as we shall presently see) about 345, and on which he wrote and lectured after 335. It may also help to explain the biological and medical trend in Books IV–VI of the *Politics*, where he classifies constitutions, as a biologist would classify living types, by the structure and arrangement of their parts, and where again, in the spirit of a doctor, he suggests methods of remedial treatment for the infirmities of different constitutions as described in the light of political 'case records'.

The active life of Aristotle naturally falls into three periods. There is the 'apprentice' period, which was spent in Athens and

[1] It is perhaps not fanciful to detect some reference to the famous Hippocratean treatise 'On Airs, Waters, and Places' in Book VII of the *Politics*. Chapter VII of that book deals with the relation between climate (or 'places') and character in much the same sense as the treatise; and chapter XI seems clearly indebted to the treatise in its references to the proper siting of cities to suit the prevalent 'airs' and to secure a good supply of 'waters'. Aristotle himself, as well as his father, may well have been versed in the writings of the school of Hippocrates.

lasted for the twenty years from 367 to 347. There is the 'journeyman' period, which was partly spent in the north-western corner of Asia Minor (in the Troad and on the island of Lesbos) and partly in Macedonia, and which lasted for some twelve years, from 347 to 335. Finally there is the period of the 'master', which was spent, like the 'apprentice' period, in Athens, and lasted from 335 to his death in 322.

§ 1. *The period down to 347.* The Athens to which Aristotle came in 367, at the age of seventeen, had begun to renew something of the life and vigour of the Periclean age of the previous century. Sparta, which had defeated and crushed Athens at the end of the Peloponnesian War (404), was already beginning to fail: she had been heavily defeated by Thebes at Leuctra in 371, and the Thebans under Epaminondas were already conducting a third invasion of the Peloponnese in the year in which Aristotle came to Athens. Meanwhile, as early as 377, the Athenians had already formed a second Athenian Confederacy, less wide-spread, indeed, than the old Confederacy of the fifth century, but with a much more generous concession to the autonomy of the confederates (as was shown in its double parliament, partly composed of the Athenian Council and Assembly, but partly also of a synod of representatives drawn from the allied states); and for the next fifty years—down to the battle of Amorgos which destroyed Athenian sea-power in the year of Aristotle's death—Athens was the mistress of the Aegaean. Mistress of the seas, she was also the trade-centre and the money-market of Greece, where Aristotle could study the problems of maritime trade, money, and interest;[1] but above all she was the general culture-centre of the Greek-speaking world—the home of Greek drama; the home of the standard speech which was becoming common to all educated Greeks; the home of the book trade for all Greece; and, above all, the home of a nascent university frequented by the Greek world. If, as the orator Isocrates said, 'Hellas had become a culture', Athens was the heart of Hellas.[2]

The nascent University of Athens was interested in many studies, and not least in the study of politics. Isocrates was the head of a school of political oratory which not only dealt with the

[1] The discussions of money and interest in Book I of the *Politics* (cc. IX–XI), and of maritime trade in Book VII (c.VI), have an Athenian background—if they have also, perhaps, the background of Aristotle's intercourse and talk with Hermias, the 'tyrant' and business magnate of Atarneus (see below, p. xv, n. 2).

[2] 'Our city', Isocrates said in his *Panegyricus* of 380, 'has left the rest of mankind so far behind, in thought and expression, that those who are her pupils have become the teachers of others. She has made the name of Greek no longer count as that of a stock, but as that of a type of mind: she has made it designate those who share with us in our culture, rather than those who share in a common physical type' (§ 50).

technique of oratory but also with the substance of statesmanship. But the great and cardinal school of Athens, which also handled politics, but handled it as a part of the general metaphysic of being and the general ethic of life, was the Academy of Plato. It was this Academy which Aristotle joined in 367; and for the next twenty years, from the age of seventeen to that of thirty-seven, he worked with the grey-haired but vigorous Plato (already a man of sixty in the year 367) during the last two decades of his long and active life. We may perhaps best conceive the position of Aristotle in Plato's school as that of a research student, who gradually grew into a research assistant. The researches of the Academy in which he would be concerned were wide and comprehensive. The study of the metaphysic of being involved research into 'ideas', in the Platonic sense of the word which meant the eternal realities or archetypes behind and beyond the world of sense; and here we may note that Plato, at this stage of his development, was tending to something in the nature of a mathematical mysticism, which identified 'ideas' with numbers. The study of the ethic of human life involved an inquiry into natural religion (and here again we may note that this inquiry was also tending to turn in the direction of mathematical astronomy); but it also involved, and it involved more particularly, an inquiry into politics.

That inquiry was twofold: it was practical as well as theoretical. (Politics was always, to the Greeks, an 'art' as well as a 'science'.) On the practical side of politics Plato was deeply concerned—and we may imagine that the members of the Academy would share his concern—in the current politics of Syracuse. Seeking, as he always sought, to make philosophy a pole-star of conduct and 'a way of life', and anxious to guide and instruct by its light the actual rulers of states, he had gone to Syracuse in 367—the very year of Aristotle's coming to the Academy—to advise its tyrant Dionysius II. Little result came of the journey, or of a later journey which he made in 361; but he still continued, as we know from the Platonic *Epistles*, to take a lively interest in the troubled affairs of Syracuse, and especially in the ill-starred fortunes of Dion, his friend and disciple, the would-be liberator who failed to liberate his native city from its factions. This interest lasted steadily down to the year 351; and though it is only a guess, it is a fair and legitimate guess that Aristotle must have watched with a close attention those sixteen years of preoccupation with Syracusan affairs,

> While the lunar beam
> Of Plato's genius, from its lofty sphere,
> Fell round him in the grove of Academe.[1]

[1] Wordsworth's poem on Dion.

Even the theoretical work of the Academy, during the period of Aristotle's student days, had its practical side. The Academy was a school of political training, from which statesmen and legislators issued. It was largely concerned with legal studies; and Plato's great effort, in his last years, was the composition of the twelve books of the *Laws*, which were published in the year after his death (346). The *Laws* had a large inductive basis, alike in the general record of Greek history and in the body of current Greek law; and here again we may fairly guess that Aristotle, with his inductive mind and his natural bent for collecting and cataloguing records,[1] may well have joined in the preparation of this large basis. The influence of the *Laws* may certainly be traced in more than one passage of the *Politics*, and especially in the course of its seventh book. Nor shall we perhaps be wrong in ascribing to this period the development of those views of justice, of equity, and of law, which Aristotle was afterwards to enunciate in the *Ethics* and the *Rhetoric* as well as in the *Politics*.

'Such conversation under Attic shades' ended with Plato's death in 347. The death of Plato was bound, in any case, to mark a break in Aristotle's life; but two events conspired to make the break definite. One was the almost total destruction of Stagira, his birthplace, by the army of Philip of Macedon, which left him without a home; the other, and the more important, was the passing of Plato's mantle and the headship of the Academy to a successor who was not acceptable to Aristotle or to some of his friends. He therefore left Athens with one of these friends, Xenocrates (who was in later days to become the head of the Academy), and moved across the Aegaean to settle in the town of Assus. He carried with him memories of Plato: indeed he went to join friends of Plato. He took with him the spirit of the teaching of Plato's *Laws*; and however far he might depart in future years from the spirit of Plato's philosophy (and perhaps he departed less than critics are apt to think who construct an abstract Plato, and forget the actual Plato, whom Aristotle had actually known, immersed in Syracusan affairs and the practical study of Greek jurisprudence), he retained a deep and lasting veneration for the master, of whom he afterwards wrote, in some memorable elegiac verses, that 'he was a man whom the bad have not even the right to praise—the only man, or the first, to show clearly by his own life, and by the reasonings of his discourses, that to be happy is to be good'.

§ 2. *The period from 347 to 335.* The settlement in Assus in 347, which began the 'journeyman' period of Aristotle's life, was itself

[1] See Appendix V. III, and section II. 2 of this Introduction.

due to Platonic attraction.[1] When Aristotle and Xenocrates crossed the Aegaean to the Troad, they did not go at random. They went to join two other Platonists, Erastus and Coriscus, who had kept up for some time past a correspondence with the Academy, of which they had once been members. These two Platonists had come to the Academy from the little town of Scepsis, which lay inland, behind the Troad, to the north-east of Mount Ida; and it was to this little town that they had returned (some time before 350) with the lessons they had learned in the Academy, and with memories of their master's lively concern in the affairs of Syracuse and his steady effort to guide and instruct its tyrant Dionysius II. Almost in imitation of their master—or perhaps history simply repeated itself—they had formed a connexion with a neighbouring tyrant, Hermias of Atarneus, a city which lay to the south of Mount Ida and almost exactly opposite to Mytilene in the island of Lesbos. Hermias was a eunuch, who had risen from being a slave (and perhaps a banker's clerk) to become the owner of mining property on Mount Ida;[2] and with his wealth he had bought the title of prince from the Persian king and established his power in Atarneus and the neighbourhood. Erastus and Coriscus attracted him to Platonic studies, and especially to the study of the art of politics. They advised him as Plato had sought to advise Dionysius II: in particular they advised him to make his tyranny milder in order that it might last longer.[3] They were rewarded by him with the gift of Assus: they moved southward to Assus from their own native town of Scepsis; and it was thus to Assus that Aristotle and Xenocrates naturally came to join their fellow Platonists, in the course of the year 347, bringing with them the latest teaching of Plato, and especially the teaching of his latest work, the *Laws*.

The four Platonists made Assus something of a new 'colonial' Academy, which attracted students from the neighbourhood. Aristotle himself entered into close relations of personal friendship with Hermias; he married his niece and adopted daughter;

[1] In this section the writer is largely indebted to Professor Jaeger's *Aristoteles* Part II, c. I.

[2] Perhaps the career of Hermias, and the close connexion formed by Aristotle with this ex-slave who afterwards became a man of business and affairs, may help to explain the chapters on slavery and the economics of 'acquisition' in Book I of the *Politics*. There is a specific reference to mining in I. c. XI, § 5.

[3] Aristotle was later to give similar advice to tyrants in a notable passage of the *Politics* (Book V, c. XI, §§ 17–34). It may be added that the sixth of the Platonic *Epistles* (if we regard it as authentic)—an epistle sent to Hermias and Erastus and Coriscus, perhaps between 350 and 347—suggests to Hermias that 'neither abundance of cavalry or of other military resources, nor the acquisition of gold, could add more to his strength in all directions than would the gaining of steadfast friends of uncorrupted character' (*Thirteen Epistles of Plato*, translated by L. A. Post, p. 128).

and down to the end of his life he cherished his memory. During the three years in which he stayed at Assus (347–344) we may well imagine him discussing politics with a little circle of students (he was already a man of forty, who must have had many memories of political discussions in Plato's Academy): we may even imagine him lecturing on politics; and it is possible that there may be strata in the *Politics*, or at any rate views and ideas, which go back as far as this period. In any case it is a legitimate conjecture that Aristotle added to the knowledge of politics which he brought from the Academy a new body of more empirical knowledge which was due to his intercourse with Hermias. He could not only learn something of business and general 'economics' from Hermias' experience of banking and of the management of mining property: he could also study, at first hand, the nature of personal one-man rule (or 'monarchy'); and as Hermias had foreign connexions as far afield as Macedonia, he would naturally be led to appreciate the importance of foreign relations and foreign policy—a matter to which we find him devoting attention (and criticizing Plato for having omitted to notice) in several passages of the *Politics*.[1]

It is possible that the circle at Assus included Callisthenes, the nephew of Aristotle, who was afterwards to accompany Alexander of Macedon on his Asiatic campaigns: it is possible also that it included Theophrastus, from the neighbouring island of Lesbos—the author of the famous *Characters* which formed a model for a number of English writers in the seventeenth century, but also a natural historian and a botanist, and the successor afterwards of Aristotle as the head of the Lyceum in Athens. It may have been on the suggestion of Theophrastus that Aristotle moved, about 344, to the island of Lesbos and settled at Mytilene: it may also have been under his influence—but the influence was also in Aristotle's own blood—that he now turned for two years to the study of biology, and specially marine biology. The Greek philosophers of the fourth century B.C. took all knowledge to be their province; and the philosopher of politics was equally (at this period of Aristotle's life perhaps even more) the philosopher of nature and 'the things of the sea'.[2]

These two years in the island of Lesbos (344–342) were followed

[1] Book II, c. VI, §§ 7–8: ibid. c. VII, § 14 (see also the note): Book IV, c. IV, §§ 10–11; and especially Book VII, c. VI and c. XI.

[2] On Aristotle the biologist see Sir D'Arcy Thompson's chapter on Natural Science in *The Legacy of Greece*. He notes, p. 144, that 'Aristotle spent two years, the happiest perhaps of all his life, . . . by the sea-side in the island . . .: here it was that he learned the great bulk of his natural history, in which, wide and general as it is, the things of the sea have from first to last a notable predominance'.

by a great and sudden change, which carried Aristotle into that association with Alexander the Great on which the imagination of posterity (and especially of the Middle Ages) has more particularly dwelt. He was summoned to Pella, the capital of Macedonia, by Philip of Macedon, and here for some six years (342–336) he acted as the tutor of Philip's son—a boy of 13 when he came; a young man of nineteen when he left. We need not concern ourselves with the cause which led to his summons to Pella—whether it was the old Macedonian connexions of his family, or whether it was the influence of Hermias, who had entered into some sort of connexion with Philip of Macedon, and who may conceivably, in the course of the connexion, have commended Aristotle to his notice.[1] The more serious question—if only there were sufficient material for an answer—is what Aristotle did at Pella, and in what way he taught, and how far he influenced, his pupil. But before we approach that question there is still one fact to be recorded about Hermias which undoubtedly affected Aristotle deeply, and may even have had some effect on his teaching of Alexander. In 341 Hermias was treacherously captured by a Persian general, taken to Susa, and executed. Aristotle celebrated his memory in a lyric poem (as he had celebrated the memory of Plato in elegiac verse), in which he coupled his name with those of Hercules and the great twin brethren as an example of toiling and suffering *Aretē*;[2] and he also testified his affection in an inscription which he wrote for the cenotaph of Hermias at Delphi, recording the treachery of his execution by the Persian king. The effect of the fate of Hermias on his ideas and his teaching may perhaps be traced in passages of the *Politics* which suggest that the 'barbarians' are the natural subjects of the Greeks,[3] and in a fragment of an epistle or exhortation addressed to Alexander, in which he advised him to act as 'leader' of the Greeks but as 'master' of the barbarians.[4] These are lessons which the fortunes of Hermias may have inspired him to teach Alexander (already naturally inclined

[1] Professor Jaeger, in the work previously cited, suggests that Philip, already projecting the Eastern expedition which Alexander afterwards achieved, was anxious for a bridge-head on the other side of the Dardanelles; that Hermias, with his territory convenient for this purpose, was thus brought into touch with him; and that Aristotle, as an associate of Hermias and connected with him by marriage, went to Pella to make the touch closer and to forward the Eastern project. The suggestion may have some basis; but it is highly speculative, and it presupposes a Balkan style of diplomacy which belongs more to the twentieth century A.D. than to the fourth century B.C. On the actual facts of the connexion between Hermias and Philip see W. W. Tarn in the *Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. vi, p. 23.

[2] Rose, *Fragmenta*, 675; see Book VII, c. I, § 11, note.

[3] Book I, c. II, § 4, and c. VI, § 6; Book VII, c. VII, §§ 1–3.

[4] See Appendix V. II and IV.

to receive them); but they are also (it must be confessed) lessons which any Greek of the period might have taught him in any case.

We have little evidence about the actual teaching which Aristotle gave to Alexander in the years which he spent at Pella. He was curiously conjoined in his influence on his pupil with Alexander's fierce and stormy mother, the queen Olympias. It was a conjunction of 'a philosopher who taught that moderation alone could hold a state together and . . . a woman to whom any sort of moderation was unknown'.[1] Did the master and his pupil, when they were at work, do more than read the *Iliad* together (in a revised text which Aristotle had prepared, and Alexander kept under his pillow); and was the master's instruction confined to teaching his pupil the example of Achilles and the lesson of ambitious heroism,

> Always to be the best and eminent over all others?[2]

Or was Aristotle perhaps carrying on his own studies, and conducting something of a school, in which Alexander may have been an associate, and where he may have been introduced to ethics, some politics, and even some metaphysics? It is difficult to return any certain answer. It is still more difficult to say whether any parts of the *Politics* were influenced by the association of Aristotle with Alexander: whether, for example, the discussion of absolute kingship, at the end of Book III of the *Politics*, and the figure of the king who is so transcendent in *Aretē* that he is like a god among men, are merely theoretical reminiscences of Platonic discussions in the Academy or actual memories of Alexander at Pella.[3]

Some facts, however, are certain, or at any rate tolerably certain. One is that Aristotle wrote for Alexander two treatises or political pamphlets now lost—a treatise 'on kingship', which may have been sent to Alexander at his accession, and possibly at his request, as something in the nature of a programme for his reign; and a treatise 'concerning colonies', which is also said to have been written at Alexander's request, and which may belong to the period of his foundation of Greek colonial cities in the East.[4] Another fact, which suggests that Aristotle had interested his pupil in scientific investigation as well as in Homer and also, perhaps, in Greek philosophy, is that Alexander assigned a sum of 800 talents from his Eastern spoils for Aristotle's researches. Indeed he had already from the very beginning of his conquests (like Napoleon in Egypt two thousand years afterwards) associated the

[1] W. W. Tarn, *C.A.H.*, vol. vi, p. 353.
[2] *Iliad*, vi. 208.
[3] See Book III, c. xv, § 3 and note.
[4] Appendix V. 11. On the Greek colonial cities of Alexander's foundation see Tarn, *C.A.H.*, vol. vi, pp. 429–31.

scientist with the soldier; and geography, anthropology, zoology, and botany were all made to profit by the progress of his army. If Aristotle did not himself accompany Alexander to the East, as he is made to do in the medieval French romances of Alexander, he sent his nephew Callisthenes in his stead; and Callisthenes was followed by other philosophers, and by scientists who 'among other things collected information and specimens for Aristotle'.[1]

In the later years of his stay in Macedonia Aristotle can have seen but little of his pupil. In 340, at the age of sixteen, he was governing the kingdom in his father's absence; in 338, at the age of eighteen, he was commanding one of the wings of the Macedonian army at the battle of Chaeronea. It is possible that Aristotle may have been living and working, during some of these later years, near Stagira, where we know that his associate Theophrastus possessed a property; and it is recorded that Alexander, on his accession, had Stagira restored and reconstructed at his desire. But there was no reason which could impel him to make any permanent stay in Macedonia, or at Stagira. Athens was his magnet, and he found Macedonia cold (at any rate a jest attributed to him makes 'the great cold' the cause of his going, as 'the great king' had been the cause of his coming); and to Athens he accordingly returned, somewhere about 335, to begin the third and last period of his life, as the master of a school.

§ 3. *The period after 335.* He came to Athens to found a school of his own, the Lyceum, by the side of the Platonic Academy, now under the headship of his old associate, Xenocrates, with whom he had gone to Assus a dozen years before. The Athens to which he returned was still, in form, a free city; but it was not the old free city which he had left in 347. The battle of Chaeronea, 'fatal to liberty', had made Greece a Macedonian protectorate, with its city-states associated under the protecting power in the League of Corinth. The dominant figure in Greece, for the rest of Aristotle's life, was the Macedonian Antipater, who had been left by Alexander to govern Macedonia and supervise Greek affairs. Antipater has been described as a narrow and unimaginative man,

[1] Tarn, *C.A.H.*, vol. vi, pp. 359–60; cf. also p. 353. The medieval romances of Alexander, with their curious pictures of the relations between Alexander and Aristotle, are based on a remarkable flowering of legend which has been examined by M. Paul Meyer and Sir E. Wallis Budge. One of the most curious flowers is the medieval *fabliau* called *Le Lai d'Aristote*, which tells the charming story of Aristotle and the Hindu princess from whom he sought to wean Alexander's affections, and recounts how

Aristotes, qui tout 'savoit
Quanques droite clergie avoit,

was defeated by her wiles. (The story is carved on the cap of one of the piers of the nave of the church of St. Pierre at Caen.)