

Ancient
Commentators
on Aristotle

GENERAL EDITOR: RICHARD SORABJI

ASPASIUS,
ANONYMOUS,
MICHAEL OF
EPHESUS:
On Aristotle
Nicomachean
Ethics 8–9

Translated by
David Konstan

B L O O M S B U R Y



ASPASIUS

On Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 8

with

ANONYMOUS

Paraphrase of Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 8 and 9

and

MICHAEL OF EPHESUS

On Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 9

This page intentionally left blank

Commentators on Aristotle on Friendship

ASPASIUS
On Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics 8

with

ANONYMOUS
Paraphrase of Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics 8 and 9

and

MICHAEL OF EPHESUS
On Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics 9

Translated by David Konstan

Bloomsbury Academic

An imprint of Bloomsbury Publishing Plc

50 Bedford Square
London
WC1B 3DP
UK

1385 Broadway
New York
NY 10018
USA

www.bloomsbury.com

First published in 2001 by Gerald Duckworth & Co. Ltd.

Paperback edition first published 2014

© David Konstan, 2001

David Konstan asserts his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988,
to be identified as Author of this work.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted
in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying,
recording, or any information storage or retrieval system, without prior
permission in writing from the publishers.

No responsibility for loss caused to any individual or organization acting on or refraining from action as a
result of the material in this publication can be accepted by Bloomsbury Academic or the author.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library.

ISBN HB: 978-0-7156-3071-6

PB: 978-1-7809-3910-0

ePDF: 978-1-7809-3909-4

Acknowledgements

The present translations have been made possible by generous and imaginative funding from the
following sources: the National Endowment for the Humanities, Division of Research Programs, an
independent federal agency of the USA; the Leverhulme Trust; the British Academy; the Jowett Copyright
Trustees; the Royal Society (UK); Centro Internazionale A. Beltrame di Storia dello Spazio e del Tempo (Padua);

Mario Mignucci; Liverpool University; the Leventis Foundation; the Arts and Humanities
Research Board of the British Academy; the Esmée Fairbairn Charitable Trust; the Henry
Brown Trust; Mr and Mrs N. Egon; the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO/GW).

The editor wishes to thank Joseph G. DeFilippo, Hélène Longpré, Vasilis Politis, Michael Trapp,
Jan Szaif, Ruth Webb and Stephen White for their comments and Robbert M. van den
Berg and Han Baltussen for preparing the volume for press.

Typeset by Ray Davies
Printed and bound in Great Britain

Contents

| | |
|--------------|-----|
| Conventions | vii |
| Introduction | 1 |

Aspasius: On Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 8

| | |
|------------------------|----|
| Textual Emendations | 12 |
| Translation | 13 |
| Notes | 45 |
| English-Greek Glossary | 49 |
| Greek-English Index | 53 |
| Index of Names | 57 |

Anonymous: Paraphrase of Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 8 and 9

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Textual Emendations | 60 |
| Translation | 61 |
| Notes | 115 |
| English-Greek Glossary | 119 |
| Greek-English Index | 124 |
| Index of Names | 130 |

Michael of Ephesus: On Aristotle Nicomachean Ethics 9

| | |
|------------------------|-----|
| Textual Emendations | 133 |
| Translation | 135 |
| Notes | 215 |
| English-Greek Glossary | 221 |
| Greek-English Index | 226 |
| Index of Names | 232 |
| Subject Index | 233 |

This page intentionally left blank

Conventions

- [...] Square brackets enclose words or phrases that have been added to the translation or the lemmata for purposes of clarity.
- <...> Angle brackets enclose conjectures relating to the Greek text, i.e. additions to the transmitted text deriving from parallel sources and editorial conjecture, and transposition of words or phrases. Accompanying notes provide further details.
- (...) Round brackets, besides being used for ordinary parentheses, contain transliterated Greek words and Bekker page references to the Aristotelian text.
- * Lemmata are marked with an asterisk when they are not distinguished as such in Heylbut's text, but appear as part of the commentary.

To Khachig

Introduction

The eighth and ninth books of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* are devoted to an analysis of *philia*, a subject that Aristotle also treats in the *Eudemean Ethics* (Book 7) and the *Magna Moralia* (Book 2).¹ That Aristotle's is the most sustained and profound discussion of *philia* to survive from Greek antiquity is beyond question. It is equally clear that *philia* is one of the fundamental value terms in classical Greek. Given that this is so, it is the more remarkable that there is still no consensus on what *philia* means, or even how to render it in English.

The surviving ancient and medieval Greek commentaries on these books of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, translated in this volume, provide invaluable evidence as to how Aristotle's arguments were received in the philosophical schools that flourished in the centuries after Aristotle wrote. They also illuminate important aspects of Aristotle's treatment of *philia*, and shed light on what the concept might have meant to a writer of Greek in late antiquity. The commentaries do not, however, entirely resolve the perplexities attaching either to the term *philia* itself or to Aristotle's discussion of it; and they introduce some further interpretative problems of their own (consider, for example, Aspasius' effort (181,24-182,3) to turn Aristotle's words, 'a democracy is least wicked' (1160b19-20), into their opposite, 'democracy is worse than the others', in conformity with his own preference for monarchy). All of which is to the good, inasmuch as it encourages further thought on the nature of *philia*.

All English translations of Aristotle's *Ethics* with which I am familiar render the term *philia* as 'friendship' (translations into other modern languages typically employ *amicizia*, *amistad*, *amitié*, *Freundschaft*, and the like). On occasion, in the versions that follow, I do so as well. More often, however, I translate *philia* as 'love'. I believe that this is the core sense of the Greek word, and that even when it is applied, as it frequently is, to the relationship between friends (*philoi*), it primarily denotes the affection that obtains between them, and may properly be rendered as 'love' in these contexts as well. In some cases, the word 'friendship' is obviously absurd as an equivalent to *philia*, for example, when Aristotle speaks of a mother's *philia* for her infant child, and retaining 'friendship' makes Aristotle's arguments sound odd or nonsensical. In other cases, however, as in the affection that may arise between commercial partners, it sounds strange to speak of love, and I have bowed to the necessity of

using the term ‘friendship’. The ancient Greek commentators did not, of course, have to confront the question of how to translate *philia*. And yet, as we shall see, they worried about the different senses it apparently could bear in Aristotle’s own treatment of it. Aspasius in particular calls attention to one anomaly in this regard. Unfortunately, his efforts to clarify the matter only add to the general confusion.

Aristotle begins his treatise on *philia* in his typical fashion, by reviewing popular or received opinions (*endoxa*) concerning the topic. He then turns to an analysis of *philia* between friends, specifically identified as such, that is, as *philoï*. The definition he offers of *philia* here runs as follows (*EN* 8.2, 1155b31-56a5):

They say that one must wish good things for a friend (*philos*) for his sake, and they call those who wish good things in this way people who have good will (*eunous*), even if there is not the same [attitude] on the part of the other; for good will in those who feel it mutually is *philia*. We must add that it must not escape notice, for many have good will toward people they have not seen, but whom they believe to be decent and worthy, and one of these latter might feel the same way toward him. These then might be thought to have good will toward each other; but how could one call them friends if each escaped [the other’s] notice in regard to how he was disposed toward him? It is necessary, then, that they have good will toward one another, wish good things [for one another], and not escape [the other’s] notice [in being so disposed].

By affirming that ‘good will in those who feel it mutually is *philia*’, Aristotle would appear to be defining *philia* as a reciprocal relationship, which indeed it is – when it denotes the bond between friends or *philoï*. That this cannot be the meaning of *philia* as such in this treatise (or in Greek generally), however, appears shortly afterwards, when Aristotle offers as an example what he calls the most natural kind of *philia*, that between mother and child (8.8, 1159a28-33):

For some [mothers] give out their own children to be raised, and they love (*philousi*) and know them, but they do not seek to be loved in return (*antiphileisthai*), if both [loving them and being loved by them] are not possible; but it seems to them to suffice if they see them [their children] doing well, and they love them even if they [the children], as a result of their ignorance, provide in return none of the things that are due a mother.

It is obvious that this example of maternal love does not accord with the reciprocal character of *philia* as defined previously. Aspasius, accordingly, attempts to resolve the dilemma as follows (179,28-180,5):

Now, love (*philia*) is in loving (*philein*) and in being loved, but it seems to be more in loving than in being loved [Aristotle] adduces as a sign of this the fact that mothers delight in loving, even if they are not loved. For sometimes, if they are not recognized by [their children], who have been given to other

women to raise, they are not loved [in return]; but it is sufficient for them 'if they see that they are doing well'. But he has supposed [here] not love (*philia*) but the feeling of love (*philêsis*), for love is in those who love mutually (*antiphilein*). But, nevertheless, the [feeling] of parents toward their children is a trace of love (*philia*): I say 'trace', because sometimes their sons do not love them in return; and yet it strongly resembles love, because parents wish good things for their sons for their own sakes, and the chief function of love is in this.

In fact, however, no such contorted ingenuity as Aspasius' is required. For Aristotle, the noun *philos* normally carries the meaning of 'friend', as it commonly does in classical Greek. Friends, in Greek or in English, are characterized by mutual affection. So too, in the second book of the *Rhetoric*, where he discusses various emotions, Aristotle says that loving (*philia* or *to philein*) entails wishing good things (or what the other believes to be good things) for the other's sake and his only – not one's own, Aristotle insists parenthetically – and acting, to the best of one's ability, to secure good things for that person (2.4, 1380b35-1381a1). A friend (*philos*), Aristotle continues – he is clearly specifying a restriction on the more general definition of *philia* – is one who both loves and is loved in return,² and those who regard each other as mutually so disposed consider themselves to be friends (2.4, 1381a1-3).³

As it happens, the word *philos* as an adjective bears the sense of 'dear' (or, on occasion, 'loving'). The class of those who are dear *to one another* – as *philoî* or friends are by definition – clearly constitutes a subset of those who are dear *to someone*, irrespective of whether the feeling is reciprocated. It is perfectly possible for someone to be dear to me, without that person holding me dear in turn. To hold someone dear is to love (or like) that person; in Greek, the verb that corresponds to the adjective 'dear' or *philos* is *philein*, which I have rendered consistently as 'to love'. *Philia*, in turn, is the abstract noun that corresponds to the verb *philein*; to say that 'I love someone' (*philein*) means precisely that there obtains in me *philia* toward that person.

It is clear, then, that *philia* does not have to be mutual; in the case of a mother's love for an infant child, it manifestly is not, although this love is, on Aristotle's view, the most natural (innate or intense) type. Aspasius has applied to Aristotle's discussion of maternal love the conditions that obtain specifically in that type of *philia* that exists between friends, and which forms the subject of much, but by no means all, of Books 8 and 9 of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Hence, Aspasius' perplexity; and, I may add, that of some modern scholars as well.

Even when affection is reciprocal, it does not necessarily follow that the partners to the relationship are 'friends'. Consider the following account of parental affection that Aristotle offers in the *Eudemian Ethics* (7.4.1-2, 1239a1-7): 'it would be absurd for a father to be a friend (*philos*) to his child, but of course he loves (*philei*) him and is loved (*phileitai*) by him'.

Here, all the elements specified in Aristotle's definition of *philia* between friends seem to obtain; nevertheless, in Greek, as in English, it is not usual to speak of parents and young children as 'friends'. Hence Aristotle's proviso. The *philia*, then, that mothers and fathers bear for their children can be a one-way sentiment (as can other forms of love as well); requital is of course possible, but it is not part of the definition of such affection.

In his initial discussion of *philia* in the sense of 'friendship', Aristotle defines three kinds or species of the *philia* that obtains between *philoï*: one on account of utility, a second on account of pleasure, and the third on account of character or virtue. I have employed here, and in my translations of the commentators, the cumbersome phrase 'on account of' to render the concise Greek preposition *dia*, because alternative formulations, such as 'utilitarian friendship', 'pleasure friendship', or 'friendship of character', risk obscuring the sense of the Greek. At stake is whether Aristotle's formula means that friendship just is the bond, whatever its nature, between people who are useful or pleasing to one another, or who admire one another's virtues, or whether it indicates rather the affection that arises on the basis of these qualities (mutually apprehended), although it is not reducible to them. To make the distinction sharper: one view takes it that two people who are, say, useful to one another are *eo ipso* friends or *philoï*, in this case of the utilitarian kind. What each likes is just the other's usefulness. The other view allows that people may be mutually useful, but not necessarily friends simply as a result of this fact. If *philia*, that is, friendship or love, exists between them, it has emerged as a consequence, but not a necessary consequence, of their mutual utility. If there is *philia* (in the sense of friendship), according to Aristotle's definition, then it must be the case that each of the friends wishes good things for the other and solely for the other's sake. Utility, pleasure, and virtue specify the preconditions under which such affection may arise.

The commentators do not seem to be fully aware of the problem here. They recognize, as Aristotle does, that *philia* takes time to develop, and thus does not result immediately from the fact that people are useful or pleasing to one another. But they do not ask how *philia* differs from the reciprocal recognition that the other possesses one of the three qualities specified by Aristotle as conditions for friendship. One could have wished that they had addressed this issue explicitly.

While *philia* between friends occurs, according to Aristotle, on account of one (or more) of the three features indicated above – utility, pleasure, and virtue – these are not the only things on account of which love or *philia* arises. Aristotle mentions other kinds or species of love (sometimes he speaks of 'loves', employing the word *philia* in the plural), for example that among kin, and these loves are said to have other bases, or additional bases, than the canonical trio that constitute the conditions for friendship. For example, when speaking of *philia* between fellow citizens (*politikê philia*), or the affection between host and guest (*xenikê philia*), Aristotle

says these loves are based on association (*koinônia*), and involve agreement (*homologia*) between the parties. Furthermore, Aristotle distinguishes love for kin (*sunegenikê philia*) and love for comrades (*hetairikê philia*) from the loves arising from association (8.12, 1161b11-16). *Philia* among kin, moreover, has various grounds, although all derive ultimately from paternal love. Aristotle specifies that parents love their children because the children are a piece of themselves, while children love their parents because they themselves are a piece taken from their parents (8.12, 1161b17-19).⁴ Familial *philia* is thus a consequence of the identity of substance (or stuff) that obtains among biological kin. This does not mean that affection between blood relatives is reducible to this identity, any more than friendship based on utility is reducible to the mutual exchange of services: not all those who are related to one another *eo ipso* love each other.

Identity of substance, however, does not account for the love between husband and wife, nor does it completely describe the basis of *philia* even among blood relatives. Thus, Aristotle holds that parents love their children more than children do their parents. He explains this lack of parity by elaborating on the asymmetry inherent in the relation of producer to product: parents recognize their children as coming from themselves more than children recognize that they come from their parents; and the product belongs to the maker rather than vice versa. Aristotle notes also that the love of parents for children is of longer duration than that of children for parents, since it begins at birth, when the infant is still incapable of consciousness and perception. Time, as Aristotle notes elsewhere (cf. 9.5, 1166b43; *EE* 7.2, 1237b12-38a16), is one of the elements that contribute to *philia*.

Interestingly enough, Aspasius is aware that children should, on one line of reasoning, love parents more than parents love children. For, as he points out (in his comments on 1158b11-1159b23), 'in loves according to superiority, being loved must be distributed in accord with worth', i.e., the better or more beneficial person should be loved more than the worse. Aspasius remarks (177,31-3): 'This argument shows that parents should be loved more by their sons than they love them, even if it does not happen thus: for they [i.e., the parents] are more beneficial and better.' The qualification that 'it does not happen thus' shows that Aspasius knows perfectly well that this conclusion contradicts other statements in Aristotle, but he does not bestir himself to work the problem out. In general, the commentators stop short of pressing Aristotle very hard, even where they are alert to a difficulty in the argument. But their perplexities are in themselves often illuminating, as are their attempts to resolve them.

Aristotle offers an abundance of motives too for love between brothers (or, perhaps, siblings). Like that between parents and children, it rests on consubstantiality, since siblings are products of the same parents; though they are separate, they are in a sense the same thing. In addition, the fact

that they are brought up together and are of the same age contributes to the *philia* between them. In these respects, Aristotle says, love between siblings resembles that between comrades or *hetairoi* (1161b30-5). However, fraternal love is even more intimate, since common rearing and education produce a similarity in character as well (1162a9-14). Brotherly love, accordingly, best stands the test of time. Here again, one notes that *philia* within the family is not reducible to the bond of kinship as such; love may endure a longer or shorter time, whereas the tie of blood is permanent.

I have been speaking so far about the things on account of which love may arise, but have not yet addressed the question of what kind of affect love is. Aristotle himself seems to have been unsure of how to classify *philia*. In the *Nicomachean Ethics*, he states that *philia* resembles a settled state of character or *hexis*, since it is accompanied by deliberate choice (*proairesis*); accordingly, he coins the term *philêsis* – a ‘loving feeling’, perhaps – to denote that aspect of love that corresponds to a *pathos* (8.5, 1157b28-32). In the *Rhetoric*, however, Aristotle unhesitatingly includes *philia* among the emotions or passions (*pathê*). Friendship is clearly more than passing feeling between two individuals; yet it was as natural in Greek as it is in English to label love as an emotion. Here too, the commentators note the difficulty without, so far as I can see, offering a clear or convincing solution.

Although Aristotle insists that *philia* entails that one wish good things for the sake of the other, and not one’s own sake, there remains some controversy over whether this proviso amounts to an altruistic conception of love. The issue hangs in part on Aristotle’s discussion of self-love (*EN* 9.4, 9.8). On one interpretation, love for others is an extension of love for oneself, or is at all events modelled on it; if this is so, one might argue that love inevitably has, for Aristotle, a self-interested or egoistic dimension. Aristotle may, however, be arguing the reverse, namely, that self-love (or at least the idea of self-love) is derivative from love for others, which is the unproblematic category. There is a further question of how, and indeed whether, Aristotle distinguishes the two parties in a perfectly loving relationship. Aristotle famously describes a friend as ‘another self’; if one takes this formula in its most literal, or radical, sense, then desire for the well-being of the other simply is desire for one’s own well-being.

Still in the chapter on self-love (9.4), Aristotle cites a common definition of a friend as one who ‘shares in the pain and the pleasure of his friend’ (1166a7-8). Here again, one might conclude that it is impossible to separate out the good of a friend from one’s own good. The words that Aristotle employs here are *sunalgēin* and *sunkhairein*, literally ‘to feel pain together with’ and ‘to enjoy together with’ someone else; in similar contexts, Aristotle uses the synonymous expressions *sullupein* and *sunhêdesthai*, which again begin with the prefix *sun-* or ‘with’. This reference to participation in the feelings (pain or pleasure) or the emotions of another person

suggests a high degree of intimacy. It is worth noting that, in this respect, love or friendship is quite different from a more distant emotional connection such as pity (*eleos*). In the *Rhetoric*, Aristotle observes that ‘people pity their acquaintances (*gnôrimoi*), provided that they are not exceedingly close in kinship; for concerning these latter they are disposed as they are concerning themselves’ (2.8, 1386a18-20). Just as, for Aristotle, pity does not involve participation in the grief of the other, so too in his discussion of *philia*, which presupposes such identification, there is no place for the emotion of pity. Toward loved ones, people ‘are disposed as they are concerning themselves’.

The commentators on Books 8 and 9 of the *Nicomachean Ethics* do not themselves appeal to the distinction that I have indicated between pity, which requires a certain distance from the pitied, and love. Indeed, it is not clear that they consulted the *Rhetoric* at all in their analysis of *philia* in the *NE*. Like Aristotle, however, they systematically employ compound words beginning with *sun-* to indicate the identification characteristic of *philia*, and indeed they add some to Aristotle’s stock. It is crucial, it seems to me, that the reader of the translation be able to recognize such terms, and I have therefore been careful to make the translation as transparent as possible in this regard. Such precision has inevitably resulted in a less fluent version than I might have desired; the repeated rendering of *sunalgein* as ‘suffer with’, for example, is both cumbersome and inelegant, but it is less likely to mislead the reader than varying it with expressions such as ‘condole’ would do, not to mention ‘sympathize’, which carries with it a history of its own in English philosophy. So too, I have preferred to render *sunaisthanesthai* as ‘co-perceive’ rather than ‘be conscious of’ or the like (cf. *NE* 1170b4), both in order to indicate the connection with other *sun-* words, and to avoid possibly irrelevant meanings associated with the notion of consciousness.

In the same spirit, I have elected not to substitute abstract nouns for the concrete nouns and substantivized adjectives that the commentators and Aristotle regularly employ. Thus, the reader will find expressions such as ‘the things that are beautiful’ as opposed to ‘beauty’, and read that friends wish on behalf of their friends ‘things that are good’ rather than, say, ‘well-being’ or the like. If the commentators have, as I believe, something important to contribute to an understanding of Aristotle, it will only be revealed through close attention to their vocabulary. For they raise a host of ingenious problems in connection with Aristotle’s views about *philia*, and while their explanations are not always to a modern philosopher’s taste, they speak Aristotle’s own language. Even the prolix Michael, with his Christianizing asides, amply repays careful study.

Any translation, however literal, is at the same time an interpretation, and this one is no exception. I have already noted some implications of my decision to render *philia* as ‘love’. The Greek word *eudaimôn* presents similar problems.⁵ I have usually translated it as ‘prosperous’ or, alterna-

tively, 'flourishing', rather than 'happy', because to say that a person is *eudaimôn* normally implies that he is well off, and has sufficient resources to benefit friends (*eudaimonia*, however, is rendered as 'happiness'). I realize that my departure from common equivalents here and elsewhere may cause confusion, but I trust that the reader, with the help of the indices and the standard translations of Aristotle, will readily sort out the terminology. A further problem involves words that may have acquired new senses between the time of Aristotle and the commentators. The term *makarios* is a case in point. It is often translated as 'blessed'. When it occurs in the texts under consideration here, however, it seems rather to mean something like 'prosperous'; thus, at 8.5, 1157b20-1, Aristotle explains that friends characteristically wish to live together: those who are in need desire help, while those who are *makarioi* desire to spend the day together. Now, for Michael of Ephesus, *makarios* may well have had the religious connotations associated with a word like 'blessed'. Nevertheless, I have stuck with 'prosperous' or 'happy'. In other cases, however, I have found it more convenient to use different translations for the same word as employed by different commentators. Again, the several indices will provide the relevant equivalents.

In general, I have, where possible, translated each Greek word by one and the same English word. Many terms, of course, such as *logos* ('word', 'reason', 'argument', etc.), defy reduction to a single equivalent. The English equivalent(s) of Greek words, and the Greek word(s) corresponding to English, are indicated in the Greek-English and English-Greek indices to each of the commentators. These indices identify all key terms in Greek and list their first occurrence (a complete concordance would have been unwieldy and, I expect, of little use to anyone). The literal translation, in combination with the indices, should enable anyone with a knowledge of the Greek alphabet to locate the relevant terms in Heylbut's text.

*

The Greek commentaries on the eighth and ninth books of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* are collected in volumes 19 (1889) and 20 (1892) of the *Commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca*, or *CAG*, the great edition, in twenty-three volumes plus supplements, compiled under the general supervision of Hermann Diels. The editor of all three of the commentaries translated here was Gustav Heylbut.

Of the three commentaries, much the earliest is that by Aspasius, and dates to the first half of the second century AD. Aspasius is, indeed, the earliest of the Aristotelian commentators whose works survive. It is reasonable to suppose that he had predecessors, but evidence for their contribution is indirect and obscure.⁶ The existing text of Aspasius' commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* covers Books 1-4 and a portion of Book 7, and it concludes with Book 8. Toward the end of the eighth book,

the commentary becomes scrappy and abrupt. Aspasius begins to use brief citations of Aristotle as lemmas within the text; he skips over several passages in Aristotle; his interpretations of Aristotle's words are at times particularly careless; and in one place (see 182,22-8 with note 58), there are what seem to be two alternative interpretations of the same segment in Aristotle. Not all these features are the fault of transmission, and one should be cautious in positing lacunas. Perhaps Aspasius began to tire of his labours; we do not know for certain that he completed his comments on the entire ten books of the *Ethics*.

Book 8 of Aspasius' commentary survives in two manuscript traditions. On the one hand, there is the unitary text, consisting, as indicated above, of Books 1-4, part of 7, and 8. For this tradition, Heylbut employed the manuscript group he labels Z (chiefly Parisinus 1903) up to p. 178,5, where it gives out; for the rest of the book, Heylbut mainly follows a Laurentian MS he calls R for the unitary tradition. On the other hand, Aspasius' commentary on Book 8 was adopted into the composite commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* compiled (in two versions) in the twelfth century, and which includes Michael of Ephesus' commentary on Book 9. For this tradition, Heylbut made use of the MSS (or rather, sets of MSS) he collectively labelled N and B. In addition, he cites the Aldine edition of 1536, under the siglum a.

The second of the commentaries translated here is rather in the nature of a paraphrase, and covers both the eighth and the ninth books of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. In this case, unfortunately, the commentator's identity is in doubt. The majority of the manuscripts ascribe the work to one Heliodorus, who is himself little more than a name (he may be the brother of Ammonius), and in the CAG edition (vol. 19) it is assigned to him. But at least one manuscript attributes the paraphrase to Andronicus of Rhodes, and excerpts from the work are assigned also to Olympiodorus. Subsequent scholars have challenged the attribution to Heliodorus, and the consensus has been to treat the author as anonymous, and the date as uncertain. Heylbut's edition of this commentary relies chiefly on the Parisian MS he calls B (Parisinus 1870), up to the middle of Book 6 chapter 4, where it gives out; for the rest of the paraphrase, which includes the portions translated here, Heylbut follows the MS he labels D (Parisinus 1872). Heylbut also records, and sometimes adopts, the readings of the early seventeenth-century printed editions by Danielis Heinsius (h). Heinsius' departures from D are almost invariably inferior, and are worthless as an independent witness to the text.

The last of the commentators is Michael of Ephesus, one of the scholars who flourished under the patronage of the Byzantine princess Anna Comnena in the first half of the twelfth century.⁷ Michael's commentary on Book 9 survives as part of the composite commentary on the *Nicomachean Ethics* mentioned above, which made use of Aspasius' commentary for Book 8; Michael himself also composed the commentaries on

Books 5 and 10 included in this compilation. Heylbut based his edition of Michael's commentary on Book 9 (in CAG 20) on the Codex Coislinianus 161 fol. Bombycinus (B), and checked it against the Aldine edition (a), published in 1536, as well as against Vaticanus Graecus 230, written in the thirteenth century; this latter, Heylbut reports, contains numerous good readings, but is heavily interpolated and not consistently reliable. I have not recorded different readings between the two manuscripts, but have indicated by the use of angle brackets (following Heylbut's own practice) those places in which the text in the manuscripts has been supplemented by one or more words from the Aldine edition.⁸

Departures from Heylbut's text are indicated in the lists of textual emendations preceding each translation, as well as in the notes. I have not usually remarked on changes of punctuation, except in some dozen or so instances where the punctuation seemed particularly relevant to the sense.

Notes

1. Attribution of the *Magna Moralia* is disputed; cf. Anthony Kenny, 'A stylistic comparison between five disputed works and the remainder of the Aristotelian corpus', in: P. Moraux and J. Wiesner (eds), *Zweifelhaftes in Corpus Aristotelicum. Akten des 9. Symposium Aristotelicum, Berlin, 7.-16. September 1981* (Berlin and NY, 1983).

2. Kassell marks this sentence as a later addition to the text by Aristotle himself, on no sufficient grounds, in my opinion.

3. I have discussed these and other matters relating to the nature of *philia* in *Friendship in the Classical World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997); the reader should be alert to the fact that some of my views remain controversial.

4. *Stergein* is commonly used of parental affection; cf. LSJ s.v.

5. cf. Robert W. Sharples, 'Aspasius on eudaimonia', in Antonina Alberti and Robert W. Sharples (eds), *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin, 1999) 85-95.

6. For a full discussion of what is known of Aspasius and his commentary, see Jonathan Barnes, 'An introduction to Aspasius', in Antonina Alberti and Robert W. Sharples (eds), *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin, 1999) 1-50.

7. For the dating of Michael of Ephesus to the early twelfth century see the important article by Robert Browning, 'An unpublished funeral oration on Anna Comnena' in Richard Sorabji (ed.), *Aristotle Transformed: The Ancient Commentators and Their Influence* (London and Ithaca NY, 1990) 393-406.

8. Barnes (above, n. 6) 13 n. 43 reports that there also exists 'an unpublished commentary by the Emperor John Cantakuzenos (c. 1360) which apparently derives from Olympiodorus'.

ASPASIUS

On Aristotle

Nicomachean Ethics 8

Translation

Textual Emendations

- 159,17 Reading *ésti* for *esti*
- 162,8 Reading *haplôs to* for *to haplôs*
- 162,25 Adding *agatha*
- 162,31 Inserting *to de tini* before *agathon*, and deleting (*to de spanion*)
- 162,32 Reading *taúta* (= *ta auta*) for *tauta*
- 166,19 Reading *tês erôtikês* (sc. *philias*) for *tois erôtikois*
- 166,24-5 Reading *tês toutôn erôtikês* for *tois toutôn erôtikois*
- 166,28 Reading *tois erôtikois* for *tês erôtikês*
- 166,29 Reading *tois erôtikois* for *tês erôtikês*
- 168,7 Adding *pisteusantes* as a stopgap
- 168,14 Reading *hómoia* for *homoía* (misprint)
- 172,28 Reading *tôn de tou opsou* for *tou de tou opsou* (a misprint?)
- 176,6-8 Joining *kai gar estin allotriôtera* (for *allotriôteron*) to the lemma
- 176,20 Reading *phusikai kai oikeiai* for *phusikai oikeiai*
- 178,13 Reading *gunaiki de <kai> andri amphoterois esti philian einai* for *gunaika de <kai> andra amphoterous esti philous einai*
- 180,24f. Reading *stratiôtai* for *sustratiôtai*
- 180,25 Putting a question mark after *toutois* (Heylbut has a full stop)
- 181,1 Reading *autois* for *tois autois*
- 181,24 Rejecting the lacuna as indicated by Heylbut
- 182,3 Rejecting the lacuna as indicated by Heylbut
- 182,15 Reading *tês tôn basileôn* for *kai basileôn*
- 182,22 Adding *huperekhei* after *gar*
- 183,5 Deleting Heylbut's supplement *hêkista*
- 183,17 Deleting Heylbut's supplement *alla ou philousin*
- 183,18 Perhaps reading *hautôn* for *autôn*?
- 186,21 Reading *timan* for *timasthai*
- 186,22 Deleting *kai lambanonti* as a copyist's error (MS a only)
- 186,25 Deleting either *poiêsas* or *dedrake* as redundant

1155a3-1156a3 'After this, about love' to 'going unnoticed as to how they are disposed toward one another'.¹

It is most appropriate for one who is investigating character and virtues to discuss love.² 'For it is a virtue or connected with virtue', as [Aristotle] says (1155a3-4). In fact, it is possible to call love one of the virtues just like courage and moderation and each of the character-based (*êthikos*) virtues. For, indeed, it too is about feelings and actions like the rest [of the virtues], since there are loving (*philikos*) actions³ and loving (*to philein*) is a kind of feeling. Furthermore, [love] might be called a mean between flattery and some nameless disposition, such as a certain fierceness or churlishness that is [characteristic] of a person who is not naturally inclined to converse in a pleasing way [cf. *NE* 4.12]. In fact, the flatterer goes to excess in wishing to be extremely pleasing; the friend practises it [being pleasing] in an intermediate way, being pleasing when one should, and not being so when one should not; while the one utterly deficient in being pleasing is classed under deficiency. It is perhaps also possible to understand differently the one who exceeds and the one who falls short [of the mean]: the former is the kind who engages in loving madly and excessively, as Satyrus is said to have done in respect to his father (he did not even choose to live after his father had died); the latter is completely unfeeling and neither can nor wishes to love; while the friend engages in loving in an intermediate way.

Looking to the preceding one might perhaps say that love is a virtue. But insofar as love seems to be a thing characteristic of a virtuous man and to belong to those only who are perfectly good, love would seem [rather] to be connected with virtue. It is possible to assign it to one of the virtues, [namely] justness (*dikaïosunê*).⁴ For justness is a kind of distributive equality and love confers equality upon friends. For it is necessary that those who are really friends be equal, and thus it [love] would be a part of justness. This is why he called [love] either a virtue or connected with virtue.

Since of good things some are necessary, while others are noble, he wishes to show that love is a good according to both these [criteria]. He usually calls 'necessary' that without which it is not possible to

live [cf., e.g., *Metaphysics* 4.5, 1015a20], but here he takes ‘necessary’ as that without which no one among those who are in accord with nature would choose to live. For love is such a thing, since no one among those whose nature has not been corrupted would choose to live without it. He says that it is necessary to those who are wealthy and those who hold great positions of power, to the poor and to the young, and to the elderly and those in their prime. The wealthy and those in positions of power have need of friends because there is no benefit from wealth or power if they do not use them; but the use of wealth and power resides in doing services, and the noblest and most trusty service is that toward friends. [Now], this argument will seem to show not that love is something necessary but rather that it is a noble thing or a cause of what is noble, if, that is, it [love] is causative of service, and service [causative] of noble things. But one must remember how he is taking ‘necessary’, [namely] as that without which one who has [his] wealth in accord with nature would not choose [to live], even if it is possible⁵ to live as a wealthy man without doing services: it is of this [capacity to do services] that the friendless person is deprived. Next he shows that love is also strictly necessary to one who is wealthy. For great is the power that comes from friends in regard to the protection and preservation of what belongs to those who are wealthy. In poverty too, of course, friends are a refuge and a support.

Again, when [Aristotle] says that friends assist ‘the young as well in not erring’ (1155a12-13) by correcting them, he would seem to be saying that love is something noble rather than necessary. Perhaps correction is indeed a noble thing, but nevertheless a necessary thing as well, for it prevents one from stumbling into great evils. It is obvious that [love] assists both the elderly and those in their prime.

Furthermore, nature produces love for offspring necessarily,⁶ ‘not only in human beings’ (1155a18) but also in other animals, so that they are nurtured. Here he takes ‘love’ more generally in the sense of ‘a feeling of love’ (*philêsis*), which is perhaps a source of love but not yet love [itself], since love [in the strict sense] is [found] in those who love mutually.⁷ Nature has implanted a love for one another necessarily ‘in those of the same species too’ (1155a19), so that they may receive support from one another. Love also appertains by nature to all human beings in regard to all others; this is especially obvious ‘in travels’ (1155a21), for people point out roads to those who do not know them, and they welcome them and give them support, at least if they have not been perverted by greed.⁸ Again, in the case of those of the same species, and of human beings in particular, one must take an aptitude and tendency toward love as [equivalent to] love.

Love binds ‘cities too’ (1155a22-3) together, ‘for concord is something similar to love’ (1155a24-5). Those who are in concord desire a

common good, and this is similar to a loving [kind of] activity (*philikê energeia*).⁹ 'When people are friends there is no need for justness' toward one another, 'but although they are just they need love in addition' (1155a26-7) because of what has been said concerning the rich and the poor, the young and those in their prime and the elderly. 'And of just things the most [just] seems to be [of a] loving [kind] (*philikon*)' (1155a28). For there are many kinds of just thing, as was said in the [sections] on justness (*NE* 5.10), for example civic and paternal [justice] and that of the slavemaster; of these the most just is the civic, which is something similar to the loving [kind], for it accords with the equality of the partners. It has been said that love also wishes friends to be as friendly as possible [cf. 1155a29-30]. Perhaps one might also in this way understand that of all just things the most just is that toward friends. For toward these one must above all maintain the loving [relationships] that are called just. He has [now] made it clear that love is not only just but also noble. 10 15

'There is disagreement concerning' love (1155a32). For some say it is a kind of similarity, since it seems to arise in accord with a similarity of character, but others say that those who are similar are oppositely disposed toward each other, while those who are somehow not similar but rather opposites are friends. He has argued each of these [positions] on the basis of opinion, citing what is said in proverbs as well as the views of poets and philosophers. Since some of the philosophers, who come at it in too unwieldy a way, say that the very universe was formed through similarity, while others [say] it was through oppositeness, he puts off these inquiries as [pertaining to] natural [science]. But he raises questions about whatever is relevant to a treatise concerning character (*êthikê*), and he puts forward two puzzles: first, whether it is possible for [love] to exist among all people, or it is impracticable 'for those who are wicked to be friends' (1155b11-12); and next, whether there are several kinds of love or one. One must not suppose that he is inquiring whether there are several kinds of it in the sense that they are classed under one genus, but rather whether, in the several kinds of love, love is just a common name and homonymous [term].¹⁰ He will make clear as he proceeds that this is the kind of inquiry he is conducting. 25 30

Those who think, he says, that love is [of] one [kind] 'because it admits of more and less, have trusted in a sign that is not sufficient' (1155b13-14). What he means is something like this. Some think that the fact that it admits of 'more and less' is a sufficient sign that love is not homonymous. Those [terms] that admit of more and less are under one genus and are synonymous with each other;¹¹ for example the hot, which admits of more and less, is not homonymous, and similarly for the sweet as well.¹² Accordingly, since love too is this one more and that one less, that of good men being more and that of evil 161,1 5

men less, love would not be a homonymous [term]. Of course, those who say this trust in a sign that is not sufficient [proof] of it, 'for things that are different in kind also admit of more and less' (1155b14-15), even though they do not share in the same genus. He says that 'these things have been discussed earlier' (1155b15-16), but it appears that they were discussed in the [books] that have fallen out of the *Nicomachean [Ethics]*.¹³

- 10 It is not a difficult matter to show that more and less [are found] in what is spoken of in multiple [senses]. For what exists [*to on*] is said to be in multiple [senses], but its essence is more and its attributes are less. For it is because of essence that being [*to einai*] belongs to the others [i.e. the attributes]. This can chiefly happen when what is spoken of in multiple [senses] is [called such] from a [term] toward that same [term],
 15 as in [the case of] what exists [see p. 215 n. 1]. It is the same also in the case of love. For it is according to their similarity to the love of good men that the other [loves] too are so called, and they obtain their name from this one. About this matter too it will be obvious later.

- Since there is love in loving and in being loved (and the lovable is loved), to those who have differentiated in how many [senses] the [term] 'lovable' is used, it will be known as well how many kinds of it
 20 there are in respect to love. Now, [the lovable] is differentiated in three ways: for he says that the lovable is either the good or the pleasurable or the useful.

- A question is raised concerning this division. For he seems to have crossdivided either the genus by the species or the common term by one of the [terms] designated [by it].¹⁴ For if the good is the genus of good things, and the useful is one particular [good] thing, he has crossdivided the genus by the species in saying that the one is good
 25 and the other useful (and he has done the same as if one were to say [of two species in a genus] that the one is an animal, the other a human); and if the good is among the [terms] used in multiple [senses], as indeed it seems to be, in this regard too the division is as if one were to say that [of two particulars] the one is a being and the other an essence. But in fact, he seems not to be crossdividing here the common [term] 'good' by the useful, but rather he is supposing
 30 that whatever is choiceworthy in itself is individually called good, whether this [being choiceworthy in itself] alone belongs to it, as in the case of happiness, or it is choiceworthy both on this account [i.e., in itself] and on account of something else, like health, keen senses and virtue. For these are choiceworthy both for themselves and on
 162,1 account of happiness. Here, he has called all these things individually good. What is choiceworthy on account of other things is useful. Wealth too is among the useful things, as he said as well in the arguments at the beginning [of the *Ethics*]. For when speaking about happiness he said, 'wealth is not the good that is being sought: for it

is useful, in fact, for the sake of something else' (1.3,1096a6-7). One
 need not be perturbed if he calls wealth now one of the simply good 5
 things, and now one of the things choiceworthy on account of some-
 thing else. For it is called simply good because for one who is disposed
 in accord with nature, I mean for a virtuous man, it is an instrument
 for noble activities, just as an instrument is called simply musical¹⁵
 when it is suited to a musical man for activities in music. It is
 choiceworthy on account of something else, because we choose wealth 10
 on account of the use (*khre̓sis*) that is derived from it. That is why,
 moreover, the parts of wealth are called money [*khre̓mata*, lit. 'useful
 things']. He himself makes it clear that what is choiceworthy for the
 sake of something else is useful. For he says 'what is useful is that by
 which some good or pleasure arises' (1155b19-20). Although, then,
 three things are lovable, the good and the pleasing would be lovable
 as an end, but the useful would be lovable as one of the [means] that
 tend and lead to some end.

He next inquires whether human beings love the good or what is 15
 good for themselves. For it was indeed said previously that one thing
 is simply good, another [good] for someone: what is simply healthful
 for a person whose body is disposed in accord with nature is called
 simply good, but what is [healthful] for a sick body is healthful for
 someone, for example, surgery, cautery and the other treatments.
 And one thing is simply pleasing, another [pleasing] for someone:
 simply [pleasing is what is pleasing] to one who is disposed in accord 20
 with nature, but [pleasing] for someone [is what is pleasing], at times,
 to one [who is disposed] contrary to nature. For bitter things at times
 seem pleasant to someone whose taste is corrupted.¹⁶ For the good
 man, then, what is simply good is also good for him, and they are not
 dissonant; in the case of the wicked man, however, they are dissonant.
 For the same thing is not simply good and good for him, but sometimes
 and to some people the simply bad becomes good, as is the case with
 sickness and poverty. For at times these [bad] things have brought 25
 <good things>¹⁷ to many wicked people.

These things being so, he inquires whether human beings love the
 simply good or the good for themselves. Each person seems to love
 what is good for him, or rather what appears to be good for him. For
 many err on account of appearance. In regard, then, to what is lovable
 on the grounds that it is the good: is it the simply good or what is
 [good] for someone or appears to be so? Differentiating them, now, he 30
 says that the simply lovable is lovable on the grounds of being simply
 good, <and that the good for someone>¹⁸ or what seems so is lovable
 for someone. Concerning the pleasurable, on the other hand, even
 though [Aristotle] has said nothing, the same things¹⁹ may be said:
 for [in the case of] what is lovable on the grounds that it is pleasing,

what is simply pleasing is simply lovable, and what is pleasing for someone is lovable for someone.²⁰

After this he distinguishes a feeling of love (*philêsis*) as being other than love. Now, this is evident also from other things: for mothers love their offspring when they are still infants. This is indeed a feeling of love, but in no way is this love:²¹ for they do not love mutually. Erotic lovers (*erastês*) also love (*phileô*), but it is not always [mutual] love (*philia*): for sometimes they are even hated by their beloveds. He uses a very vivid example: there is a feeling of love toward inanimate things, for example toward wine, but there is not love (*philia*). ‘For there is not a feeling of love in return nor even a wish for good’ (1155b28-9) for the other’s own sake, for one does not, indeed, wish good things for the wine, or rather if one does, one wishes that the wine be preserved and last for one’s own sake, so that one can use it.

Since from what has been said one will think that [Aristotle] is saying that love is a wish for good for the sake of that one for whom one wishes good things, he says that such a [sentiment] is good will. For one who wishes someone good things for his own sake has good will, even if the same does not occur on the part of the other. But love is good will ‘in those who feel it mutually’; ‘or must one add’, he says, ‘that it [the good will] must not go unnoticed’ (1155b33-4)? For it is possible that some people feel good will toward one another if they have [each] found out that they [i.e., the others, respectively] are decent or useful to themselves, but they escape one another’s notice that they are so disposed. These, then, one would not call friends, but rather one must say that those who feel good will toward each other and do not go unnoticed [in being so disposed] are friends. In saying this, he will seem to be speaking of love even [in the case] of people who have never met each other, if only they have good will toward one another, being confident that each is good for the other, and if they know that they are so disposed toward one another. But ‘not going unnoticed’ must not be understood as residing just in their having found out that they feel good will toward one another, but rather in having met each other frequently as well. For it is necessary, for those who are truly to be friends, to somehow join and fit their souls together through both company and life in common. There is need also for much experience so that they may trust firmly that they are decent to each other. He himself, when he has proceeded further, says such things about those who are truly friends [cf. 1156b26-32].

1156a3-1157a36 ‘It is necessary, then, that they feel good will toward one another’ to ‘for things incidental are not altogether coupled’.

Both from what has previously been said and from what is said here

one might suppose that Aristotle defines love as good will that does not escape the notice of those who feel it mutually, and good will as a wish for good for the own sake of the one for whom one wishes the good. If there is a single definition of all love, then the [several] loves would not be homonymous, as he believes.²² But it is possible to suppose a single notion of what is spoken of in multiple [senses], not as an exact definition, but rather as an outline. As to which are the things spoken of in multiple [senses] of which we said (161,13-14) that it was admissible to suppose a single notion, it is not unclear that it was of things that are not very distant. Rather, whenever many things are so called from one term, as a medical book and instrument are so called from a primary term, [namely], a medical person, it is possible to gain by means of an impression a single notion – medical – of them all, calling [medical] everything that is [derived] in any way from medicine. It is in a way the same in the case of love too. For the love of good men who are similar in respect to virtue is, as he will make clear when he proceeds further [cf. 1157a30-1], primary and in the proper sense love, while the others are called [love] because of their similarity to this one and take their appellation from this. Thus, nothing prevents one from gaining by means of an impression a common notion of them. 164,1

That [the several loves] are homonymous is also apparent from what is lovable. For they have the good and the useful and the pleasant [as lovable], not the same lovable. In fact, the good is choiceworthy and lovable in itself, while the pleasant and the useful are so incidentally and on account of something else. It is, indeed, because an object is pleasing or useful to the one who loves, that it is loved, but the good [is loved] for itself. This is especially obvious in the case of good men. For a good man is loved by a good man for nothing other than for himself, but a useful man [is loved] not for himself but on account of his usefulness, and a pleasing man on account of pleasure. He himself [i.e. Aristotle] extends [the idea of] objects that are lovable to men who are lovable in respect to friendship (*philia*), among whom the good man is one of the objects that are good and especially choiceworthy in themselves, while the useful man and the pleasing man are so on account of other things. 15

Now, the definition of love proffered is that of primary [love] and properly so called. For the definition is good will that does not go unnoticed among those who feel it mutually, and good will is a wish for good for the own sake of the one for whom one wishes good things. Wishing things that are really good is characteristic of the good man, for he, knowing what good things are, wishes that they belong to his friend. The friend in respect to pleasure or on account of the useful does not invariably wish good things for his friend, for he does not know what good things are, either. Furthermore, wishing good things 20 25

for the own sake of the other pertains to primary love. In the other loves, people wish good things for their friends by way of referring to themselves: those who are friends because of pleasure, [wishing good things for their friends] so that they [themselves] can be pleased, while those [who are friends] because of the useful [wish good things for their friends] because of their usefulness. Thus, there is no common definition, either, but rather just as primary love is properly [so called], while the rest appear so, so too the definition is that of primary [love], but it seems to be that of the others too.

That the definition of the [several] loves is not common has now been discussed. He says that friends 'wish good things for each other without escaping their notice on account of one of the items mentioned' (1156a4-5), [that is,] on account of the good or the pleasant or the useful. Now, these [causes of loving] differ from one another. That they do not differ from one another in the sense of being under the same genus, but rather as sharing a name, has been said. Thus, both the [several] feelings of love in accord with each [of the lovable] and the [corresponding] loves will differ in kind, and neither the feelings of love nor the loves will have a common genus with one another. For it is necessary that these too differ if the lovable] differ. Now, in what do a feeling of love and love differ? In fact, it is not unclear that in a feeling of love there is no feeling of love in return, but that in love there is.

'Those who love one another wish the good for one another in virtue of the way in which they love' (1156a9-10), good men in virtue of being good (for they love each other because they are good), pleasing men in virtue of being pleasing, and useful men in virtue of being useful.

'Those who love each other on account of the useful do not love [others] in themselves' (1156a10-11), but rather incidentally. They do not in fact [love others] on account of themselves (for they would love [others] in themselves), 'but rather in virtue of some good that ensues for them from one another' (1156a11-12). This is the useful; consequently their love is incidental, for it arises because something happens to ensue from them [i.e. their friends], and not on account of [their friends] themselves. 'Similarly' and for the same reason those who love 'on account of pleasure' (1156a12) do not love [others] in themselves but rather incidentally, 'for not by virtue of being such a sort', he says (1156a12-13), do people love witty men. It may seem naive to say that love in respect to pleasure is incidental on this account, [namely] that they do not love [each other] because they are good men, for it is agreed that [these loves] are not the same kind. It would be similar to saying that the love of good men is incidental, since they are not loved by one another because they are witty. But he seems rather to be calling 'such a sort' people who are called so in respect to a plain [or absolute] quality, and not in respect to something

relative. Now, a witty man is 'such a sort' inasmuch as he has taken the name from wittiness,²³ but a pleasing man is relative: for he is pleasing to someone, and even if pleasure ensues as much as possible from this [i.e., his wit] for those who love witty men, nevertheless they do not love them in virtue of their being witty men but rather in virtue of their being pleasing to themselves. If indeed they were witty, but were not pleasing to them, they would not love them, either. Both those who love on account of the useful cherish [the other] on account of what is beneficial to themselves, and [those who love] on account of pleasure [cherish the other] on account of what is pleasing to themselves, 'and not in virtue of what the loved person is' (1156a15-16), whatever he is, whether witty or wealthy, but rather in virtue of the fact that the one affords pleasure and the other usefulness. 25

'Such loves are in fact easily dissolved' (1156a19), if those who were formerly loved do not remain similar [to what they were]. For nothing prevents one from remaining still witty or still wealthy. But if the witty man is not pleasing to the one who formerly was pleased [by his wit], the love is dissolved, and similarly if he should no longer be useful. 30

He observes that for the most part love on account of the useful occurs in old people, and further in whoever among those in their prime pursue what is advantageous. He is taking as the old and those in their prime not worthy people but rather the many. The elderly, because they have been engaged in much business and have not viewed what is noble, highly value making a profit and for this reason acquire friends who are useful to this [end]. Those who are in their prime, if they too are oriented toward profit, do not think it worth acquiring [as friends] any but those who are useful for profit. 35 166,1 5

'Such sorts do not much live together' (1156a27) with one another. For living together cannot occur without taking pleasure in one another. Those [who love] because of the useful sometimes do not even take pleasure in one another, or [do so] only insofar as they are useful, but they do not possess kindness and pleasantness, which is what joins together lives in common. Thus they miss at that time [in their lives] the greatest and noblest thing in true loves – living together – and the enjoyment that comes from living in common with one another.

The love of young people is for the most part for the sake of pleasure: for they live according to feeling, not reason, and pleasure is a feeling. Thus whenever they are pleasing to one another, they love one another. The love of these too is easily dissolved, for the things that are pleasing too change with age, and loves based on pleasing things [change] with these. However, these [young people] do live pleasurably with one another, for they obtain as much as possible what accords with the [type of] love they have. For it is [love] 10 15

based on pleasure, and by living together they most enjoy the pleasure that comes from one another. When he says, 'if such pleasure' alters 'there is a rapid change' (1156a36), he means by 'such' either that based on mere feeling or that based on youth.

He says, 'for²⁴ the young are erotic, too; for most of erotic [love]²⁵ is on the basis of feeling or on account of pleasure' (1156b1-3). By this he makes it clear that the young are erotic on the basis of feeling only, and not also on the basis of reason as well, as worthy people are. For among good men there arises a certain feeling too for those of the young who are naturally fine, just as there does among horsemen toward those of the colts that are naturally fine; but in them there is also reason bidding them to be concerned about such sorts [i.e., the young]. But the erotic passion of the young is based on feeling, for most of the erotic [love] of these²⁶ is on account of pleasure. But most of the [erotic love] of worthy people is based on the benefit and education of the young, for those who pursue this [love] are especially inclined toward passionate loves for those who are fine by nature. [The sentence] is also written [in some manuscripts] thus: 'for the young are erotic; for it is mostly, for those who are erotic, based on feeling and pleasure'.²⁷ This reading makes it clear that the young are, understandably, erotic, since for the most part, for those who are erotic,²⁸ it is based on feeling and on pleasure, but reason is of few and in few. Thus, since the young live according to feeling, they are understandably erotic.

Now, the aforementioned loves are incomplete. But 'the love of men who are good and similar in respect to virtue is complete' (1156b7-8). For they have everything in regard to the definition of love, for they wish good things for one another on account of those for whom they wish the good things. The other [loves] are incomplete, for they do not have everything that is in the definition: for they wish for one another the good things that they think [are such], but not on account of those who are loved, but rather they love them on account of their own selves. Further, the former love [those they love] in their own right (for they love [them] by virtue of their being good), while the latter [love] incidentally: for those who are loved are not [loved] by virtue of their being witty, as we said, or of their being wealthy, but rather by virtue of being pleasing or useful to them [i.e., those who love]. Now, everything that is [such and such] in itself is complete, while that which is incidental is incomplete. This [distinction] is itself a sign that the [several] loves are homonymous. For it is not possible for that which is in itself and that which is incidental to be of like genus. For that which is incidental is posterior to that which is in itself.

The love of good men, then, understandably remains firm, for they love one another because they are good and because of virtue, and virtue is firm and enduring. Now, it is not necessary that those who

are pleasing to someone, and are loved because of this, be simply
 pleasing, nor that those who are useful to someone be simply useful. 15
 But the good man is both simply good and good to his friend. For [good
 men] are not only good but they are also beneficial to one another.
 That they are beneficial to one another follows [logically]: they love
 one another because they are good. Good men are also pleasing both
 simply and to each other, for to each both his own actions and those
 similar to these are pleasing, and the actions of good men are either 20
 such [actions, i.e. good ones] or beyond all others similar to [them].
 Therefore they are also pleasing to one another, and because of this,
 then, the love of good men is both complete and indeed enduring, for
 it unites in itself everything that belongs to loves. For every love is
 either for the good or for pleasure, and [moreover either] for what is
 simply good and simply pleasing, which pertains to the love of true
 [friends], or for what is good or pleasing to the one who loves,
 according to a certain similarity [to the love of true friends]. For those
 who love not on account of what is simply good or simply pleasing but 25
 rather on account of what is [good and pleasing] to themselves would
 have a love that is so called according to similarity [to true love] and
 not that [love] in the proper sense. But all [the qualities pertaining
 to friendship] belong to the [love] of worthy people, for they in fact
 love in accord with what is simply good and good to themselves and
 what is simply pleasing and pleasing to themselves. 'For by this', he
 says, '[good men] are similar²⁹ in the rest of the things also' (1156b22).
 If the reading is thus, this is what one must say, i.e. 'because of this':³⁰ 30
 for he is saying that, because they are good, they are also similar in
 the rest of the things, being similarly pleasing and useful, not only
 similarly good. Or else [the reading is]: 'to this the rest of the things
 are similar³¹ also', so that [the meaning] is 'to this³² love the remaining
 kinds of love are also similar'.

Such loves are rare. For good men are few, and furthermore one
 needs time for acquaintance and experience. Perhaps, indeed, there 168,1
 are times too when on a brief meeting a worthy man might know
 someone [to be a friend]. Nevertheless, someone might escape his
 notice in the degree to which he was [merely] emitting fine words.
 Therefore one needs experience and time. This is why we were saying
 earlier too (163,16-24), in the definition of friendship (*philia*), when
 he was calling it good will that does not go unnoticed among those 5
 who feel it mutually, that it is necessary to indicate also that they
 have met each other and in this way know each others' good will. For
 they could perhaps believe that they had good will toward one another
 and were good men, <if they trusted>³³ some other man who had
 gained experience [of them] and was good, but how could the matter
 of acquaintance exist for them if they have not met? One needs this
 for a love that is to be true and separate from [mere] feeling.

10 'This, then', – the love of good men – 'is complete in respect to time' (for it is judged over a long time) 'and the rest of the things' (1156b33-4). For it is love in itself, not incidentally, and it has all [the qualities]: the good, the pleasing, the useful. The most complete thing of all is in it, [namely,] virtue, or [at any rate], by [common] consent, the most complete good among existing things except for happiness. Further, 'each gets similar things³⁴ from the other, which indeed should
15 pertain to friends' (1156b34-5); for love [between friends] is equality, and it would not occur if they did not love each other similarly. Love 'on account of the pleasant' and 'on account of the useful' (1156b35-1157a2) are so called according to their similarity to this [love], for the former [sorts of friends] are pleasing to each other on account of pleasure and the latter useful to each other on account of the useful.

In what he says next, it is obvious that in these men too loves endure if they attain equality as much as possible, mutually affording
20 one another 'the same thing and from the same [kind of person]' (1157a4-5), whether the pleasing or the useful, and not like an erotic lover and beloved [youth]. He is supposing [here] a lover and beloved who are not worthy. 'Those who in an erotic [relationship] give in exchange not the pleasing but rather the useful' (1157a12-13), such as those who couple with their lovers for money, do not love in the proper sense and are easily separated. He calls neither [of these] a
25 man of the middle [sort], who is neither base nor good. He says that this latter man [i.e. one who is good] will be a friend also to a base man: it must be conceded both on account of pleasure and on account of the useful. Further, [he says] that the man of the middle [sort will be a friend] both to the worthy man and to the base man.

That the worthy man will be a friend to the base man either on account of the pleasing or on account of the useful is not easy to believe. For neither would the worthy man take pleasure in the base
30 man nor would he wish to be useful to him, nor the latter to him. Unless, indeed, he is calling 'base' one who is not incorrigible; and the worthy man, observing that he does not have an ignoble nature and has not been thoroughly corrupted, and wishing to correct him, submits to being useful and pleasant to him so that through these [means] he may win him over and correct him. On account of these [reasons] he will accept a certain pleasure and usefulness from him.
169,1

But the [love] that exists on account of the loved ones themselves arises among worthy and good men only. And only the love of good
5 men is unslanderable [cf. 1157a20-1], for because they have gained sufficient experience of one another they do not trust those who attempt to slander nor do they put up with them when they say [such things], but they emphatically trust each other and would never wrong each other. All these things should pertain to love, but they are only in the [love] of good men, since at times wicked men both

trust base men who speak against their friends and distrust their [own] friends, and some even wrong [their friends]; hence they are not friends in the proper sense. But since people, seizing upon a certain similarity to what is truly love, call such kinds love too, one must say that such kinds of men too are friends. But one must recognize the difference and that the [several] loves are not so called in respect to one genus, but rather that the [loves] of good men are properly [so called], but the others are so according to similarity. 10

'These [other loves] do not altogether combine' (1157a33-4) with one another – the one on account of pleasure with that on account of the useful. For what is incidental 'is not altogether coupled' (1157a35). This will seem not true: for the same man could be both blond and musical, and both these [qualities] are incidental. But he does not seem to be speaking of such things, but rather of [cases] when something is so called in the primary and proper sense and other things [are so called] from that: [thus], a man is [called] 'medical' in the primary sense, while an instrument or a drug [is called so] incidentally. For such kinds of accidents are not coupled.³⁵ Here too 20 good men are friends in the proper sense, but the rest of the [loves] are incidental and [so called] from the primary love. Hence they [the incidental loves] are not easily combined.

1157b1-1158b11 'Since love has been distributed into these kinds' to 'seem to be loves because of dissimilarity to that [love]'.

Since love has been distributed into three kinds, friends are homonymous with one another. Now, according to the primary kind base men will not be friends with one another, for decent men love each other on account of virtue, but base men have no share either in virtue or in the love based on it. But base men too might become friends because of pleasure, for it is possible for some wicked men to provide pleasure to one another and through this to adjoin to one another the love based on pleasure. They might also become friends on account of the useful, for some men are base, but turn out to be useful to one another, and base men pretty much entirely seek this love. For in order that they may get what they need from certain people, they help them in turn in whatever they may be in need of, and such mutual exchange and partnership is called love by mankind. In fact, they do 30 associate with one another to the extent that they are useful and help [each other] in turn. 'In this way', he says, 'they are similar' (1157b2-3), that is, they are similar in this respect, [namely] insofar as they are pleasing or useful to one another and in virtue of affording each other pleasure, and are friends on account of pleasure. For they are not simply similar: for the base are not always similar to themselves 170,1 or to one another. But though they are dissimilar, nothing prevents 5

them, in virtue of the fact that they are human beings, from becoming similar by being providers of pleasure to one another: in virtue of the fact that they are human beings they seem [to be similar] if they have like characters. For the same reason those too who are friends on account of the useful are alike in this way, [that is], in virtue of being useful; 'but good men are friends in themselves, for they are so in virtue of being good' (1157b3). Therefore these are friends simply and in themselves, but 'the others are so incidentally' (1157b4).

How those [who are friends] on account of pleasure and the useful are friends incidentally has now been discussed, and also that such men are called friends because of their similarity to friends on account of virtue; for since the latter, in addition to being friends in themselves, are also pleasing and useful to one another, they seem in this way to resemble the former. However, good men do not hold either the useful or the pleasing to be the aim of love; rather, these things follow upon them, but they love each other for their own selves. But friends on account of pleasure or the useful hold these to be the ends of love.

'Just as in the case of the virtues some' are called good 'in respect to habitual condition (*hexis*) and others in respect to activity' (1157b5-6) – in respect to habitual condition, such as [in the case of] people who are sleeping, and in respect to activity whenever people perform actions in accord with their virtue – so too, he says, in the case of love. 'Those who are sleeping, or those who have been separated in their locations' (1157b8-9), are friends in respect to habitual condition, while those who live together and delight in [each others'] company and provide good things to one another are friends in respect to activity. For they actively do the things that accord with love, and especially if they are good and have the complete [kind of] love. For in fact they will provide good things for the sake of their friends themselves, and they will take pleasure in hearing that they are doing well, and they will grieve if they find out that their friends have fallen upon some hardship. All these things are loving [kinds of] activities. But it is in loving itself that they will be active in the greatest way. For since they are friends on account of themselves and nothing else, it is obvious that, in loving one another, they will actively enough do the [kinds of] things that are loving (*philika*).

Aristotle says that love is not dissolved by locations, when they [friends] have been separated, but that the activity based on love is. Not unreasonably, perhaps: for absence dissolves the greatest activity [of a loving kind]. For nothing is so loving (*philikon*) as for friends to live together and to reap the enjoyment of [the others'] company and conversation and to confer this in return. Perhaps then it would have been safest to speak thus, [namely] that those who are distant in their locations will not actively perform the *most* loving activity. 'But if, he

says, 'the absence grows long, it seems to produce forgetfulness even of love' (1157b11-12). He did well to add 'seems' here. For since friends on account of pleasure or the useful do acquire forgetfulness of love if the absence grows long, to many people it seems that love is such a thing: easily dissolved, and dimmed by absence when it is long. But that of good men is not such, indeed, but is rather firm and enduring, and nothing is stronger than it, neither time nor distance in respect to location. 5

What has been said [by Aristotle] in the case of the elderly and acerbic occurs for the most part when the old men are not worthy. For they become least [prone to] loving, since all love is connected with pleasure; but the acerbic and old are for the most part pleasing neither to each other nor to others, unless virtue renders them pleasing. That is why those [old men] who are not virtuous are least [prone to] loving, but are rather for the most part too sullen, whether because of old age or because they are acerbic by nature. 10

'Those who welcome' and praise 'each other but do not live together resemble those who have good will [toward each other] rather than friends' (1157b17-19). For they wish good things for each other, but they neglect the thing that is greatest and characteristic of love, [namely] living together. Here he makes clear why he said a little earlier that those who do not live together are not active in respect to love. For he says that 'nothing is so [characteristic] of friends as living together' (1157b19). The [word] 'so' makes it clear that some other things too are [characteristic of] loving (*philika*), but the greatest is living together. A sign of this is also the fact that those who are really friends and are in the same location do not choose to live apart from one another, since this is the activity most [characteristic of] loving. He himself adduces as evidence the fact that flourishing people³⁶ desire to spend the day with their friends. For those who are in need and are friends because of usefulness just need aid, and it suffices for them if this eventuates, even if they do not live together with one another. But flourishing men, and these are the good men, at the same time as they are active in respect to virtue need to spend the day together with their friends, especially with those who are similar in respect to virtue, or if not [these, then] with those who are fine by nature and of a middle [sort]. For a human being is not simply a solitary animal like a lion or a wolf or whatever other animal can live by itself, but a civic and communal one. A virtuous and flourishing man knows exactly that which belongs by nature to a human being, and he needs someone who spends the day and lives together [with him]: and for this a friend is especially suitable. Thus a worthy and flourishing man needs a friend and would not choose to live by himself, not even if he were likely to have all other good things. For it is impossible for those who are not pleasing to spend time together 172,1

with each other, and a friend is most pleasing to a friend. Comradely love too – this is the [love] of young people and brings comrades together not according to usefulness – is based on this, that they delight both in each other and in the same actions.

- 5 ‘The [love] of good men’, as has been said previously as well, ‘is love most of all’ (1157b25). For ‘the simply good’ is simply ‘lovable and choiceworthy’ (1157b26-7), and the simply pleasing is pleasing. But to each [is good or pleasing] what is so to each, and a good man is, to a good man, a good and pleasing thing.

He says that the feeling of love resembles an emotion, but love [resembles] a habitual condition. However, some feelings of love seem to be habitual conditions and not just emotions. Temporary motions
10 in the body or soul are emotions, while certain enduring qualities, from which activities are derived, are habitual conditions. For we call some people wine-lovers or savoury-lovers when the feeling of love that is in them is a habitual condition; I mean that savoury-loving and wine-loving are a habitual condition in them. However, [Aristotle] calls emotion not only a temporary motion but also an emotional disposition; I mean by an emotional disposition that [found] in the
15 emotional [part] only, and not also in the rational [part of the soul]. For love is in the [part] of the soul that has reason as well as in the irrational [part], for one acquires a friend when one has both judged him and felt something for him, and a habitual condition comes into being in both parts. But a feeling of love according to emotion is engendered according to a mere emotion and is active according to an emotion. For this reason he said that a feeling of love is an emotion, but love is a habitual condition.

- 20 Love is also on the one hand a habitual condition, on the other an activity. Here he has associated a habitual condition with love. That love is a habitual condition of the kind we have mentioned – one that is in both parts of the soul – while the feeling of love has been called an emotion because it is a kind of emotional habitual condition from which only activities according to emotion arise, he makes obvious when he says that a feeling of love exists no less toward inanimate things, but loving mutually is connected with decision, and decision
25 derives from a habitual condition. For through these [statements] it is apparent that a feeling of love occurs as a kind of emotional disposition toward inanimate things too, for example wine-loving toward wine and savoury-loving toward savouries. From this habitual condition according to emotion only, derives the activity of those who are overcome according to emotion, some by wine, others by savouries.³⁷ But since love is connected with decision, and decision is a deliberative desire, love would be a habitual condition both in the
30 [part] that has reason and in the emotional [part]; from this [habitual condition] people wish good things for their friends for their own

sakes, not according to mere emotion but rather according to a kind of habitual condition in both parts of the soul.

In loving a friend they simultaneously love the friend and what is good for themselves. For a friend is good for his friend and they mutually exchange with one another what is equal. For each in fact wishes for the other good things for the other's own sake, and each is pleasing to the other. That is why love is also called a kind of mutual exchange, being that of a friend, and these [qualities] especially pertain to the love of good men. The other [loves] are so called because of a similarity to it, for the reasons we have mentioned. What he says concerning the old and the acerbic – why they become friends less – and concerning the young – that they become friends more – is both clear and has been discussed earlier. 173,1 5

He says it is not easy 'to be a friend to many according to complete love, just as it is not [easy] to love many erotically' (1158a10-12); for there is a certain excess in loving, and this is not easy in relation to many, for excesses are in relation to a few. One must speak [here] of excess in respect to what is fine. One might raise the question as to why, then, it would not exist in relation to many; for if there were, by hypothesis, many good men, what prevents a good man who has come to be acquainted with them from being a friend similarly to all? But one must adjoin the reasons he adduces for the fact that not many people will gratify a good man. For it is neither possible to be good to many, but rather one must be content to meet one or two; nor is it possible to acquire experience of many at the same time, but one invariably needs experience for something to be unslanderable. Further, [there is need] also for acquaintance, for it is this that in addition to virtue unites and familiarizes with one another the souls of good men. 10 15

However, 'on account of the useful and the pleasing' (1158a16) it is possible to be a friend to many, for indeed the stock of such people is large, and further there is no need either of much time or of testing, for in a short time benefactions in things that are useful or pleasing become readily apparent, and one may quickly recognize a man who is pleasing or useful to him. But when neither of these things obtains any longer, the love is dissolved, for, having arisen in a short time, it has a brief existence as well. 20

Of the two [types of love] – that on account of pleasure and that on account of the useful – so called because of their similarity to the primary love, that on account of pleasure more resembles the primary love whenever each gets what is pleasing from the other. For those who are really friends must associate pleasurably with and delight in one another, which pertains to those who love on account of pleasure. Furthermore, it is more liberal than that on account of the useful, for they [who love on account of pleasure] are not friends on 25

account of profit or benefit coming from money or other usefulness, but rather because at times they feel emotion for one another or delight in the same things, such as exercises or lessons or games. Love 'on account of the useful' is more [characteristic] of 'commercial' persons (1158a12) and illiberal ones. Evidence of the fact that love on account of the pleasing more resembles the true [love] is that successful and flourishing people too (these are the ones who, in important matters, are active in accord with virtue) 'do not need useful friends, but do [need] pleasing ones' (1158a22). For they would most wish to have their friends be more complete in respect to virtue and in every way similar to themselves; but if they do not find them available, it suffices for them if men of the middle [sort] happen along who are pleasing to them. For they wish to live together with some people, since it is impossible for them to be solitary, as was said previously.

It is impossible to bear very long what is painful, for one would not even endure the good itself, if it were painful. How did he mean this? For what else is the good itself if not happiness, which cannot be painful? For as soon as there is something painful there is no longer happiness, but nevertheless Aristotle said, on hypothesis: if happiness renders life painful, no one would wish to be happy [i.e., flourishing]. It is obvious, then, both that happiness is something choiceworthy on account of other things and that life in accord with it [i.e., happiness] is connected with pleasure. That is why, he says, human beings seek that their friends be pleasing, on the grounds that love cannot arise without these [qualities]. But one must seek not only pleasing men [as friends] but also good men. This is what he is bringing out when he says, '[that they be] good ... and furthermore for themselves' (1158a26), lest it [i.e., the argument] not be appropriate to good men and those who have acquired complete love. For it is not by referring to themselves that they love their friends, even if something good arises to those who love from those who are loved, but rather [they love them] because those who are loved are good. But these things are fitted to one another and are not disjoined, for a good man is also good for his friend. He bids that a person seek to acquire those who are really good as friends, and these would be simultaneously good and good for their friends.

'Those in positions of power' (1158a27-8) (he means tyrants in positions of power and those who are called kings, but are not really, since they are licentious) treat those who are termed their friends as differentiated, for some are pleasant for them, others useful. The cause is that 'they neither seek pleasing ones with virtue' (for the same ones would also be useful) 'nor ones who are useful for noble things' (1158a30-1) (for the same ones would also be pleasing). For virtuous men are useful for noble things. It has been said that virtuous men are also pleasing; but rulers pursue what is pleasing

and acquire witty men as friends, while for their needs [they acquire] 25
 those who are adept at doing what is bidden. These [qualities] are not
 coupled in most people, for those who are called witty, since they are
 buffoons, are for the most part useless for actions, while those who
 are adept and on demand for what is bidden are deprived of all charm
 and wit. Only the worthy man is simultaneously pleasing and useful,
 for he is effective for noble things on account of virtue, and pleasing 30
 to a good man on account both of the similarity of his character and
 of his noble actions. But a worthy man does not become a friend 'to
 one who exceeds him', unless he who exceeds in power 'is also 175,1
 exceeded in virtue' (1158a34-5). One must understand it in this way,
 'that the ruler is exceeded' in the sense that he knows and behaves
 toward the worthy man as toward his better. For thus there will be
 equality according to proportion, if he thinks that he exceeds in
 wealth and power, but reveres the good man as surpassing him in
 respect to virtue. Such a ruler would be naturally fine, an admirer of 5
 noble things, and it is obvious that he will entrust his own care to the
 worthy man. A good man, then, might perhaps put up with becoming
 a friend to such a person, but he would not endure [becoming one] to
 another [sort]; for a noble man is least able to bear tyrannical
 arrogance and illiberal treatment. Men in positions of power are 'not
 at all in the habit of being this sort' (1158a36), such as to behave
 toward worthy men as if they [i.e., the worthy] exceeded them; 10
 therefore good men do not become friends with them [i.e., the power-
 ful].

Since he said that a worthy man will not otherwise be a friend to
 a ruler, except if the ruler should behave toward him as toward one
 who exceeds him in virtue, some inquire whether, if a worthy man
 were in a position of power, [another] worthy man would then not be
 a friend to him, since he would not exceed him in virtue. But the
 puzzle is naive, for it is already agreed that a good man gladly 15
 becomes a friend to a good man. Even if one of them, then, is in power,
 his power will in no way prevent their love; rather, it is obvious that
 they will associate as equals in all other things, while in all matters
 that are specified by law in the civic community the one will gladly
 yield to the other who is in authority. For it is obvious that a worthy
 man will govern lawfully, and his friend will, accordingly, be governed 20
 lawfully. For, more than anything, a worthy man is the guardian of
 the civic community.

Now, the love of good men is in every way in accord with equality,
 and the rest of the [loves] are somehow [based] on equality as well.
 For in fact those [who are friends] on account of pleasure mutually
 exchange pleasure with one another and those [who are friends] on
 account of usefulness render in turn useful things. But some ex-
 change different for different, for example they confer pleasure but

25 gain a benefit in accord with the useful, such as those who on account of their wit think it right to get money. It has been said that such sorts are both lesser friends and last less [long as friends].

What he says next is obvious, that loves seem and do not seem [to be such] according to similarity and dissimilarity to the same thing. For in the respect in which both the pleasing and the useful pertain
 30 to love according to virtue, these loves are believed to resemble the latter; but in the respect in which the [love] of good men is unslanderable and enduring, while these [others] admit of slander and do alter, it is easily not the case [that they resemble each other]. They differ in addition in that the [love] of good men is [love] in itself, for
 176,1 they love one another for themselves, while the other things are incidental. And good men are far from wronging one another – indeed they do not even wrong those who are not related – while those who have the other loves would even wrong one another. One could find many other differences in them [i.e. the other loves], too, by virtue of
 5 which they are dissimilar to the primary love and do not appear to be loves.

1158b11-1159b23 ‘Another kind of love is that in accord with superiority’ to ‘let these things then be dismissed. For in fact they are rather foreign [to the topic at hand]’.³⁸

Just as there is what is just according to equality and what is just according to superiority – for example [the justness] of a father toward a son and of a master toward a slave and of a husband toward a wife
 10 and in general of one who rules toward one who is ruled – so too there is love according to equality and love according to superiority. For it [i.e. love] somehow resembles justness, and love according to superiority is in the same people in whom there is what is just according to superiority. For the love of a father toward a son and in general of an older man toward a younger (for the older is more sensible, and therefore may rule) and of a husband toward a wife and in general
 15 the love of one who rules toward one who is ruled is according to superiority. For it is obvious that what rules exceeds, what is ruled is exceeded. Love too, then, goes with this, [that is], with ruling and being ruled.

These [loves] according to superiority differ too from one another. For the same things are not due to parents from children and to those who rule from those who are ruled, nor to sons from parents and to
 20 those who are ruled from those who rule. But there are some services that are natural and due to parents³⁹ from children, as well as some orders and care [that are natural and due] to children from parents, which have nothing to do with those who rule and are ruled. The loves too, accordingly, differ in this way. [He says] that the same things do

not pertain 'to a father in regard to a son and to a son in regard to a father, nor to a husband in regard to a wife and a wife in regard to a husband' (1158b16-17). For it is appropriate to parents and to husbands to rule, but not to sons and wives, and this renders their love not one according to equality but rather according to superiority. Now, everyone would concede these things, but the reason that he adduces for that fact that a father in regard to a son and a son in regard to a father, as well as a husband in regard to a wife and a wife in regard to a husband, do not have the same love is highly debatable. For he says as follows: 'each of these has his [or her] different virtue and function' (1158b17-18). But some deny that there is one virtue for a father and another for a son, or one for a husband and another for a wife. 25 30 177,1

It suffices to test the argument in the case of husband and wife, for the same things are to be said about a father and a son. The Socratics⁴⁰ above all question [the view] in the following way. – Is it, then, right that the husband be just, but the wife unjust? – No indeed. – What then? That the husband be temperate, and the wife be licentious? – Not this, either. Proceeding thus by way of each virtue, and supposing that it is necessary for a husband and wife to have all the virtues, they conclude that there is the same virtue for a husband and a wife. 5

What, then, is to be said against these things? One may begin with the one who rules and the one who is ruled, for if the virtue of the one who rules is in ruling rightly, and that of the one who is ruled in being ruled rightly, here there would not be the same virtue for the one who rules and the one who is ruled. And in fact it is a vice on the part of one who is ruled if he does the things proper to one who rules, and a vice on the part of one who rules if he does the things proper to one who is ruled. Thus, it is virtue in a pilot if he does the things proper to a pilot and rules the sailors, and it is virtue in the sailors if they are ruled by the pilot. If [one objects that] ruling and being ruled belong to the same science, this is no obstacle to the argument; for one might reply to this too on the grounds that someone may be competent to be ruled but not at all to rule. For those who are accustomed to obeying those who rule would be able to be ruled out of habit, but do not know how to rule. If it should further be posited that the same person knows both, nevertheless that by which he rules is one virtue, and that by which he is ruled another. If there is one virtue for one who rules, and another for one who is ruled (in all the above-mentioned associations there are those who rule and those who are ruled, for a father rules, but his sons are ruled, and a husband rules, but his wife is ruled), there would be a different virtue for each of these. 10 15 20

Now, one must look further into these things. In all rulerships and loves according to superiority it is not only necessary that love be

25 proportional but also that the feeling of love be so. And it is pretty
much on account of the feeling of love that love too will be propor-
tional, for if the better and more beneficial person is loved more than
the one who is such to a lesser extent, both the feeling of love and the
love will be proportional. For just as in political allocations it is
necessary that [each] office be distributed in accord with worth, so too
in loves according to superiority being loved must be distributed in
30 accord with worth. For there will be equality if loving and being loved
occur proportionally and in accord with worth. This argument shows
that parents should be loved more by their sons than they love them,
even if it does not happen thus: for they are more beneficial and better.
The same argument [applies] too concerning the others who rule, for
178,1 by however much they are better, they should be loved the more.

One might inquire concerning loves according to superiority
whether they occur in the above-mentioned kinds or whether these
are other kinds of love. Eudemus and Theophrastus say that loves
according to superiority too occur in the same [kinds]: on account of
5 pleasure or of the useful or of virtue. For one who rules and one who
is ruled might become worthy friends: they will be friends [like
equals] in other respects, but they will observe what is lawful in being
friends, the one being exceeded in whatever the law bids, and the
other exceeding. A father and son too [may be] worthy [friends], and
more than anything a son will concede paternal superiority to his
father. Similarly a worthy wife [may be so] to a worthy husband, for
10 since each of them follows nature one will rule and the other be ruled.
Among those who are not worthy, it is obvious that it is admissible
for those of the middle [sort] to be friends both on account of pleasure
and on account of the useful, the one exceeding and the other being
exceeded, as in the case of one who rules and one who is ruled; and it
is possible that both a wife and a husband have love <on this basis>.⁴¹
Concerning a son and a father, one might raise the question whether
it is possible for them to love one another in accord with the useful,
15 or indeed for a father to wish good things for his son on account of
anything other than for the son himself, if at all events he loves him
according to nature, inasmuch as this seems rather to be a natural
kind of love. Perhaps both the pleasant and the useful follow upon
such a [love] whenever it is by nature. One must look into how these
things stand.

He says that the equal is not similar 'in things that are just and in
20 love' (1158b29-30); for in things that are just the primary equal is that
in accord with worth and [the principle] that the better not get the
same as the worse, while that in accord with quantity is secondary;
in other [passages of the *Ethics* (cf. 5.6, 1134a28)] he calls this equal
according to number. It occurs whenever all free men get equal things,
and those who live in a democracy especially think it right to practice

this equality, for because all are free they think it right that they should get the same and similar things.⁴² 'But in love the equal
accord with quantity' is primary (for those who are really friends must
be equal to one another), 'and that in accord with worth secondary'
(1158b5-7), for love properly [so called] does not wish to be in [a
condition of] superiority to the other. This is obvious in those in whom
the gap between one another is large in certain respects. For a person
who is worthless does not become a friend to a virtuous and worthy
man, nor do the very lowly to kings, nor again are worthy men and
those who are called dear to the gods in fact friends to the gods in
respect to love properly [so called], I mean that in accord with
equality, for there is a large gap in between. But we must be content
if we find them [the gods] favourable and propitious and they are
venerable to us. It is apparent, then, that these terms too differ when
the situations differ, for we do not say that a friend venerates a friend
nor that he is propitious and heedful of one's prayers; but venerating
is the part of one who is far more lowly, while being propitious is that
of one who far exceeds.

One cannot exactly define in argument up to what amount in an
existing superiority it is [still] possible for there to be love, for neither
is it possible to define exactly the things to be done in other respects.
Nevertheless, when the gap in between is large, love does not arise.
Therefore the question is also raised whether a friend will wish the
greatest goods for his friend, for example that he become a god. Now,
it is apparent that a sensible man will not wish for impossible things,
and becoming a god out of a man is such a thing. But on hypothesis,
if it were possible to become a god, will he then wish it? For he will
hardly wish that his friend not be a friend, so that neither will he [i.e.
the friend] have a good. For a good friend – if a friend wishes good
things for his friend for his own sake – will wish him to have every
excess of good [including friends]. Let these things, then, be raised as
a question.

What he says next, when he says that a friend most wishes good
things for himself, is not said about those who have the primary love
but rather about those who are called friends homonymously. He next
mentions the reason on account of which most people wish to be loved
more than to love, for they feel this way because of love of honour,
since they believe that being loved is the same thing as being hon-
oured. But it is different; for people choose to be honoured not 'for
itself' but rather 'incidentally' (1159a17-18). For they delight in being
honoured by those in positions of power because of the hope of getting
things and since they are simultaneously pursuing power, and [they
delight in being honoured] by their sons because they believe that
they [thereby] have witnesses that they are good: they are gladdened,
then, by confirming the opinion they hold of themselves. 'But people

- 25 delight in being loved in itself' (1159a25). Being loved, then, is a better thing than being honoured, and love is better than honour, for what is choiceworthy in itself is better than what is so on account of something else.

Now, love is in loving and in being loved, but it seems to be more in loving than in being loved. For the activity of each of the friends is
 30 in loving, but being loved is not their activity, and each thing [e.g. love] is connected with that thing [e.g. loving] in connection with which it has its activity. He adduces as a sign of this the fact that mothers delight in loving, even if they are not loved. For sometimes, if, well, they are not recognized by [children] who have been given to
 180,1 other women to raise, they are not loved; but it is sufficient for them 'if they see that they are doing well' (1159a31). But he has supposed [here] not love but the feeling of love, for love is in those who love mutually.⁴³ But, nevertheless, the [feeling] of parents toward their children is a trace of love: I say 'trace', because sometimes their sons
 5 do not love them in return; and yet it strongly resembles love, because parents wish good things for their sons for their own sakes, and the chief function of love is in this. If, then, love is in loving more than in being loved in return, and those who love their friends are praised,
 10 loving would be the virtue of friends. For to each <...>⁴⁴

Having said in the beginning that opposite pursues opposite, for example 'the parched earth is passionate for the rain' (1155b3),⁴⁵ he loosely brings out the solution to this and says that opposite pursues opposite not in itself 'but rather incidentally' (1159b20). For in itself it pursues the middle, for this is the good. An example of the fact that
 15 opposite pursues opposite not in itself but rather incidentally is, he says, the following: the moist does not wish to be overparched but to go toward the middle. For if the atmosphere should be overmoist, it does not on this account drive the rain downwards, that it may be overparched, but rather so that it may cast off the [overly] plentiful moisture; and similarly in the case of the hot and the other things.

- 20 **1159b25-1161b10** <'It seems, according to what was said in the beginning' to 'for many things are common to those who are equal'.>⁴⁶

What was, in fact, said in the beginning, where he said 'and of just things the most [just] is [that which is] loving' (1155a28), seems to be similar to what is said here; for love and what is just are about the same things and in the same things: among those soldiers⁴⁷ and other
 25 fellow-craftsmen in whom there is love, there is also what is just. For will one not choose to gain from these that which is in accord with worth [and hence just]?⁴⁸ And it is also about the same things: for love among soldiers is about soldierly things.

He says by way of constructing an argument that in those people in whom there is love, there is in them⁴⁹ also what is just; for it seems that in every association there is something just and also love, 'to the extent that they share' (1159b29-30). He says that in accord with those crafts in which they share they are also friends, as, for example, if one person happened to be both a soldier and a jurymen, but the other was only a soldier, they will have both love in accord with that in which they share and also what is just: for in the craft in which they share, they wish to gain that which is in accord with worth. Wealth and possessions and the rest are common to brothers and comrades, but soldierly things [are common] to soldiers alone, and similarly in the case of the other [fellow-craftsmen]; and there are more things common to brothers, to the others fewer. And in fact the love of brothers is greater than that of fellow-soldiers, and also what is just too is such, for what is just among brothers and what is so among the rest differs. For what is just acquires an increment by how much the more it is in relation to friends.⁵⁰ Wishing to show this, he argues from the opposite: for if it is more terrible 'to deprive a comrade of money' (1160a5) than a [fellow] citizen, so too [doing] what is just in relation to friends is better. If love will be increased, what is just too will be increased, since they are in the same people.

The communities of soldiers and the rest are parts of the civic [community], and the loves of soldiers follow upon the communities of those <...>⁵¹

He says that the third kind of government is the 'timocracy', which is so called because it arises out of [property] valuations (*timēmata*); for they used to acquire rule by giving money: this is why it is called a 'timocracy' ... and⁵² they are ... by the vice of those who rule,⁵³ whenever it [i.e. the government] changes from an aristocracy to an oligarchy, and this a base one. For if an oligarchy is good, nothing of the worst will happen.⁵⁴ 'A democracy is least wicked' (1160b19-20): he says that a democracy is a lesser evil than a tyranny and an oligarchy because a democracy, being the government it is, deviates a small amount.⁵⁵ But if you look at it in itself, you will find that democracy is worse than the others; for if in a democracy everyone rules, while in a tyranny and an oligarchy few do or one does, it is worse that many base men rule than that few or even one do. Consequently, democracy is worse than the other deviations.⁵⁶

'In each of the governments' (1161a10): mentioning three kinds of government, he says that there is love in each 'in the amount in which there is also what is just' (1161a10-11). For if there is more of what is just on the part of a king in regard to those beneath him, and on the part of aristocrats and 'timocrats' in regard to those under their control, the love too will be better. Paternal [love] is analogous to

- 10 kingly [love], but the paternal surpasses it in services, for a father 'is
causative of the existence [of the child]' (1161a16-17), which is the
greatest thing. 'But these things are also attributed to grandparents'
(1161a17-18): then either let it be conceded by us that they brought
us into being and the rest, although it was not immediate but through
our fathers as middle men, or else these things are attributed to our
grandparents indeed, [but] by our fathers, that they brought them
15 into being. The love of fathers exceeds that of kings,⁵⁷ and what is just
is not the same for a father in regard to sons and a king in regard to
those who are ruled, nor is [their] love similar.

The love of a husband in regard to his wife is similar to aristocracy,
for it is in accord with what is fitting. For in fact the husband has
more [of the] good; so too for what is just.

- 20 Having said that the love of brothers is similar to timocracy, he
here says that [it is similar] to comradely [love] because they [i.e.
comrades] are similar [to one another], although comradely [love] is
slightly better. The timocratic [love] too resembles the comradely, for
just as those who rule on the basis of [property] evaluations wish to
be equals, so too do comrades.

- <... for in each respect love toward children <exceeds>⁵⁸ the love
that a king has in regard to his subjects and what is just in relation
to them. And the love of all grandparents for their grandchildren and
25 what is just [in their case] is in excess of all [others], and if any of
those further back is still alive⁵⁹ [the more so in their case]. And what
is just in these [i.e. parents, grandparents, etc.] is that in accord with
worth, not that in accord with equality. That of a husband toward a
wife is aristocratic love and the aristocratic just, but the love of
brothers resembles the comradely.>⁶⁰

- 30 Comradely [love] is that of age-mates and of people similar in
character to one another and of those who feel similarly. Such too is
that of brothers, for they are more or less of the same age and like in
character and of similar feelings, at least if they do not happen to have
been corrupted in their souls. Such too is timocratic love; for in fact
those in this government wish to be equal and decent, and though
they are not strict in respect to virtue, they have been brought up
liberally and educated in moderation in accord with the laws. This is
183,1 why it [a timocracy] is better than a democracy, in which those who
happen along and have never shared in a liberal education are in the
habit of ruling. In timocracies ruling is by turns and equal. Thus too,
then, are the loves – it is obvious that they are equal and not
associated with excess.

- 5 'In the deviations, just as what is just is small, so too is love [small]'
(1161a30-1): love is least in the worst, I mean of course in a tyranny.
For in fact what is just⁶¹ exists in these [i.e. tyrannies] too. Timocratic
men rule by turns, and their love exists by turns: for it exists in those

who are ruling. As the deviations have what is just 'in small amount', they have love too this way: the tyrant loves not at all, but uses those who are ruled as instruments for vice, and as the body uses the soul;⁶² 10 for just as the body cannot exist without the soul, so too this man cannot exist without those who serve him. Tyrants, then, frequently love in small amount because they use [those who are ruled] for vice; for in those cases in which there is nothing common to the one who rules and the one who is ruled, but the one who rules draws off everything to himself and seizes it, there is neither love nor what is just. For there is neither love nor what is just in a craftsman toward 15 his instrument, nor in a soul toward a body, nor in a master to a slave. For those who rule them care for these things and benefit them,⁶³ the craftsman carefully disposing his instrument, the soul its body, and the master his slave, but for their own sakes⁶⁴ [rather than that of the things], and so that the things may serve them.

So that it may be obvious how he meant that there is no love in a master for a slave, he explains further by stating, 'in that in point of 20 which he is a slave there is no love for him' (1161b5) <...>⁶⁵ equality, but rather that the master commands everything to the slave, referring the usefulness to himself. 'But in that in point of which he is a human being' (1161b5-6), [he says] that there will be a certain love for him. And some, ere now, have perceived that their slaves are better than the fortune that is theirs, and have acquired them as comrades instead of slaves.

In tyrannies too, of course, there are loves in small amount or not 25 at all in the tyrants for those who are ruled, while in democracies love and what is just are greater than in the other deviations. 'For many things are common to those who are equal' (1161b10), and where there is community there is also a certain love and what is just.

1161b11-1163b28 'Now, in community' to 'about these things let us be done speaking at this point'. 30

It has been said that all love is in community. 'But one might distinguish', he says, 'kindred and comradely love' (1161b12-13), or rather separate them as having something that differs from the communal [loves]. He takes as communal those according to some 184,1 agreement. He makes this clear when he says, 'civic [loves] and tribal and voyagerly and all such sorts resemble communal [loves], inasmuch as they appear to exist by a kind of agreement' (1161b13-15). If communal love is such a thing, then understandably neither the 5 kindred nor the comradely [loves] are communal, for kinsmen do not love one another by agreement but rather by being induced by nature; nor again do comrades [love by agreement]. Now, all loves are in community: he says that fellow-voyagers and those who build ships

together and the rest love [each other] because they share [in something], as do citizens and tribesmen; for one must separate the kindred and the comradely from those sorts. For the love in these
 10 latter sorts is not on account of community but rather on account of the noble itself; for all kinsmen love their kinsmen naturally, while comradely love is on account of the good and acquaintance and being equal in age. One might perhaps class hospitality-based [love] among the communal [loves].

Kindred love too is of many kinds, for example that of a father for
 15 sons, that of sons for a father, that of brothers for one another and of the rest of the kinsmen, but these [loves] have their source from fathers. A father is more proprietary⁶⁶ to his child than a child to his father, and of children nothing is proprietary toward their father. For the sameness in relation to the parents renders brothers the same as one another, because things that are the same as the same thing are also the same as one another. Blood and root are analogous, for as
 20 shoots from the same root bear a similarity both to one another and to the root⁶⁷ because they are from the same root, so too those from the blood of [the same] parents bear a similarity to one another because they are from the same blood. They both have a similarity in respect to blood and they are the same as the father although they
 25 have been differentiated in regard to their bodies.

‘Cousins and the remaining kinsmen’ (1162a1) such as grandchildren and great grandchildren⁶⁸ bear a relationship to one another because they have been begotten from the same brothers. They are the more related in the degree that they are near to the founder of the lineage. ‘By the degree’, he says, ‘that a household is more
 30 fundamental than a city’ (1162a18-19) and more primary, in that degree is childbearing [fundamental] to animals and especially human beings; for just as the city would not arise if the household did not exist, so neither human life nor love would exist if children were not begotten as the dearest things.

A man who inquires about the life of a husband in relation to a wife and that of a friend in relation to a friend [cf. 1162a29-31], inquires about nothing other than if they have the justness that is like [the relationship in question]; since if [they do not have] the justness that is like [it], neither will they live like that.

35 ‘Loves being threefold’ (1162a34): having said that love is threefold, [that is] on account of the good and the pleasant and the useful, in accord with each love there are equal people and those who exceed.⁶⁹
 185,1 They are equal when both are good, but in accord with superiority when one is good, the other rich – one must add the fact that the rich man knows that by however much he exceeds in wealth, by that much he is exceeded in virtue – or in accord with superiority as when one is good, the other base, but of such a sort that he has not been wholly

corrupted, but is able to be led up to the better. Again, they are equal 5
 too when the two are witty, but in accord with superiority when one
 exceeds in wit, the other in wealth. Similarly, they are equal when
 they are similarly useful, but superiority occurs when one is more so,
 the other less. It is necessary that those who are equals in respect to
 equality on account of the good and the pleasant and the useful be
 equal also in respect to loving. For if they are equals as good men, 10
 they will love [as equals], and similarly in the other cases; but if they
 should be unequal, it is necessary that they grant that the rich man
 be honoured proportionally as rich, the other as virtuous. No one
 takes hardly to someone who does him a good turn, but if the one who
 is done a good turn is gracious, he requites or rather helps his
 benefactor by doing a good deed for him.

As he says that what is just is either written or unwritten (unwrit-
 ten when one is done justice on the basis of habit, written when on 15
 the basis of law), so too love on account of the useful is character-based
 and law-based. People bring an accusation when they are not paid as
 they contracted. For if someone should give to someone else, as to a
 friend, fifty coins, saying nothing about interest but contracting in an
 unwritten way, and then later demands interest, he contracted in one
 way but strives to be paid in another. Now, law-based [love] is either
 the commercial sort, as in 'take this, give that', or the sort that is over 20
 time, for example if I should give you ten coins until the coming year
 so that you [then] give me these plus five more.⁷⁰ It is obvious, then,
 that the debt is in [accord with] the liberal, law-based [love]: if the
 one who has taken delays a while and does not pay back, not to
 demand is a loving thing [to do].

Now, [accusations arise when] the character-based [love] gives as
 to a friend, but demands equal or more as if one had not given for the
 sake of the benefit of the one who takes, but rather as though one had 25
 lent in order to make a profit from these things. Having contracted
 without interest, but striving to be paid with interest, he may bring
 an accusation. Bringing an accusation and contracting in one way,
 and being paid in another, occur because some people wish to appear
 noble: first they give, asking for nothing in return, so that they may
 seem to be good men; but later they wish to be benefited, and for this
 reason they bring an accusation. If the one who has taken is able, he 30
 should pay back 'the value of what was done for him' (1163a2), for a
 friend who owes must not act involuntarily. It is as though, indeed,
 when you took in the beginning it was you who erred, because you
 were done a good turn by someone by whom you ought not have been
 – since, then, you contracted with an evil man, pay back as if you had
 agreed on specified [terms], even though you did not so agree. But
 that those who do not have the resources give [back] – not even the
 one who gave thinks it right to take [back]. 'One must look into it in

35 the beginning' (1163a8): he says that it is necessary to look to whether one is being done a service by a good man and upon what agreement, so that it may remain or not on these [terms].

186,1 'It is a matter of debate whether' (1163a9-10) one should trust in the benefit to the one who has been done [a service] and on this basis give in return, or in the service of the one who has given. By way of solving this, he says that since the love is on account of the useful, the benefit of the one who has been done [a service] is the measure of the return exchange. For if someone has given someone else ten coins, and that one has made a profit of a hundred, he should give half to
5 his benefactor; for he [i.e. the benefactor] has so given on the basis that the profit will garner equal amounts [for both of them]. The one who has taken is the one who needs; if, then, the one who has taken has been benefited by a hundred, the one who has given has helped him in this amount, and one must pay back half of the profit or even more. In the case of those [who are friends] in accord with virtue, it is not possible to bring accusations; for if the decision of the one who has done the good is the measure, he who has done the deed demands
10 nothing, nor will he ever bring an accusation.

Since the loves are three, and they [each] also have [forms based on] superiorities, there is a difference in the superiorities too. For a better man, or rather a good one, thinks it right that he have more, and the rich man in turn [thinks similarly], for in this respect he is more beneficial. For the rich man says that since you are useless in [the matter of] wealth, it is not right that you should have equal to me: for it is a benefaction [rather than an exchange] that I alone
15 should give, while you take on an equal basis as I; and the other in turn [feels] similarly. It is necessary, then, he says, to give honour to one who exceeds in wealth or in virtue, and money to one who is in need.

Those who exceed in wealth and who do services for the commonwealth are seen to be honoured in governments. Is it not strange,
20 then, both to take money and be honoured? For no one chooses the lesser, so as both to give money and to honour [others].⁷¹ For one must bestow honour on the one who gives money, and one must give in return honour to the one who does a benefit <and takes>⁷² or leads the way to virtue, insofar as is feasible and possible – for it is not possible [to give] to all [e.g., to parents or the gods] what is in accord with their worth.

This is why he says that it may be thought not to be possible for a son to renounce his father; for it is necessary that the son pay back, since he owes, and the son has done⁷³ no deed worth the things that
25 have been done for him by his father. There is the possibility, accordingly, for the father to disown, to whom indeed the son is in debt. No one will ever stand aloof from his son, unless he should see

that he is wicked. For all wish that they be helped, but contributing to a son [who is wicked] is to be avoided or [at least] not striven for. And about these matters I have had these things to say.

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

1. On the origin and value of the lemmata, see Roland Wittwer, 'Aspasian Lemmatology', in Antonina Alberti and Robert W. Sharples (eds) *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin, 1999) 51-84; unfortunately, they cannot be treated as a reliable early witness to the text of Aristotle.

2. However one renders *philia* into English, the translator is obliged to take a stand on the interpretation of Aristotle's argument in Books 8 and 9 of *EN*. Most often, *philia* in Aristotle is translated as 'friendship', although scholars are careful to note that the extension of *philia* is wider than friendship in the modern sense, and includes relations between kin, fellow citizens, and other associations. It is also commonly held that *philia* represents a condition of mutual obligation that need not entail feelings of affection. Taking *philia* to mean 'love' rejects the latter assumption, and more naturally accommodates the range of relations that the term designates. It does not do justice, however, to the sense of an objective relationship obtaining between two or more parties conveyed by the word 'friendship'. The phrase 'bond of affection' comes closer to expressing Aristotle's meaning, at least in certain contexts, but is awkward and not always exact; when the bond is between friends, 'friendship' renders the idea precisely. The reader is advised to keep in mind the controversial nature of the concept central to this portion of *EN*.

3. i.e., actions based on or motivated by love.

4. 'Justness', rather than 'justice', to indicate that Aspasius is speaking of a quality of character or disposition rather than a set of principles.

5. Reading *ésti* instead of *esti*.

6. Understand 'as something necessary to survival', on the assumption that Aspasius is continuing to argue that love is necessary as well as noble; perhaps, however, he means rather that love for offspring is instinctive.

7. Aspasius understands *philia* as entailing mutual affection, in accord with the description Aristotle gives at 1155b27-34, where he treats *philia* as a bond between friends. Aristotle does not consistently use *philia* in this specific sense, however, and his flexible usage, characteristic of classical Greek, has created puzzles – needless ones, in my judgement – for Aspasius and many commentators since.

8. With the last clause Aspasius qualifies Aristotle's suggestion that one could normally count on hospitality from strangers.

9. i.e., the actualization of a disposition to love.

10. i.e., a single name applied to different kinds of thing. On Aspasius' technical discussion, which depends on *Categories* 1 and other passages in Aristotle's works (e.g., *Eudemian Ethics* 7.1-2), see Enrico Berti, 'Amicizia e "Focal Meaning"', in Antonina Alberti and Robert W. Sharples (eds) *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle's Ethics* (Berlin, 1999) 176-90. Note that Aristotle himself does not assimilate the three kinds of friendship to the medical case (focal meaning). Aristotle does not use this example in *NE*, and probably does not intend it there. But it does occur in *EE* 1236a16-22.

11. i.e., the name under which they are grouped applies to one kind of thing.

12. What is more sweet or less sweet is sweet in the same sense of the term.

13. Aspasius is probably inferring from this reference in Aristotle that books of *EN* have been lost, and not referring specifically to those books of *EN* incorporated in *EE*; see Francesco Becchi, 'Aspasio, commentatore di Aristotele', *ANRW* II.36.7 (1994) 5365-96, esp. pp. 5368-9 (ed. Wolfgang Haase, Berlin). But see Barnes (Introduction, n. 6) 19-21.

14. i.e., he has included the genus or general term in the number of species or particulars.

15. Reading *haplôs* to instead of *to haplôs*.

16. Heylbut in app. crit. remarks that 'the sequence of sentences is disturbed', but the sense is reasonably clear: Aspasius has chosen to insert here, as in the following paragraph, a discussion of the simply pleasant corresponding to that of the simply good.

17. I suspect that *agatha* has fallen out here.

18. Inserting *to de tini* before *agathon*, and deleting as senseless (*to de spanion*) = 'which is rare'; cf. the following account of the pleasant. *To de spanion* is probably an expansion of a copyist's note meaning '*to de* is missing'; Aristotle's remark about the rareness of such love at 1156b24 (see below 167.34) no doubt facilitated its intrusion into the text.

19. Reading *taúta* = *ta auta*, which makes sense of the following *gar*, instead of Heylbut's *tauta* = 'these things' or 'the following'.

20. Aspasius does not mention what seems pleasant because (I presume) in the case of the pleasant, as opposed to the good, what is pleasant for someone is the same as what seems pleasant to someone.

21. i.e., *philia* of the kind that obtains between *philoî* or 'friends', as Aristotle describes it; Aspasius here as elsewhere takes this to be the only sense of the term.

22. Homonymy presupposes that the same name is applied to different things or notions, each of which has its own definition.

23. i.e., wittiness pertains to one who is pleasing.

24. 'For' (*gar*) not in Aristotle, who has *de* ('and').

25. Reading *tês erôtikês* (sc. *philias*) here with the majority of the MSS; Heylbut reads *tois erôtikois* = 'for those who are erotic' with the Aldine edition. Aspasius knew both readings (as do we from the MSS of Aristotle), and he comments on them in turn. Which does he take up first? The MSS are scrambled and inconclusive. However, the antecedent of *tês* in line 25 and *tautês* in 26 must be *erôtikê*, which seems decisive for the precedence of this reading. In 30, furthermore, *oligoi* ('few') contrasts better with the number of *erôtikoî* than with the quality of *erôtikê*. See also the following two notes.

26. Reading *tês toutôn erôtikês* instead of Heylbut's *tois toutôn erôtikois* = 'for the erotic among these'; Aspasius is here contrasting the young with the worthy or mature, not selecting out a group of the young as worthy.

27. Reading *tois erôtikois* with a; Heylbut reads *tês erôtikês* with the majority of the manuscripts. Jonathan Barnes (Introduction, n. 6) 43-50 discusses this crux in detail, and concludes that *tês erôtikês* should be printed throughout. What then was the difference between the two readings Aspasius distinguishes? Barnes concludes that the first reading (see above, n. 25) must have been something like *kai erôtikoî gar hoi neoi kata pathos. di' hêdonên gar to polu tês erôtikês* (p. 50), 'for the young are erotic in accord with feeling; for the greater part of the erotic is on account of pleasure'.

28. Reading *tois erôtikois* with a, instead of Heylbut's *tês erôtikês* with the majority of the manuscripts.

29. Reading *homoioi* (masc.); the correct reading in Aristotle is in doubt.

30. Taking *tautêi* as adverbial.
31. Reading *homoia* (neut.).
32. Understanding *tautêi* to modify *philiâi*.
33. Some word has surely fallen out here, unless the corruption is deeper; I have supplied *pisteusantes* as a stopgap, not a textual emendation.
34. Reading *hómoia* instead of Heylbut's *homoía*, which appears to be a misprint.
35. i.e., the same thing is not likely to serve both as a drug and as an instrument, though both are medical items.
36. i.e., *tous eudaimonas*; on the meaning of *eudaimôn*, see Introduction, pp. 7-8.
37. Reading *tôn de tou opsou* for Heylbut's *tou de tou opsou* (a misprint?).
38. Heylbut has transferred the final sentence of the lemma ('for in fact they are rather foreign') to the text proper, and reads *allotriôteron* instead of *allo-triôtera* with N and B (and the text of Aristotle). This yields the translation 'For in fact it is rather strange that, just as there is what is just', etc. But there is nothing at all strange in what follows.
39. Emending Heylbut's *phusikai oikeiai* to *phusikai kai oikeiai*. Heylbut's text might be rendered 'naturally due', but the syntax is odd.
40. I take it that the 'Socratics' are Cynics, with perhaps a more specific reference to Antisthenes (cf. Barnes [Introduction, n. 6] 29); this passage is not included in Giannantoni 1990, presumably because it is too vague to warrant attribution. But cf. Plutarch *Virtues of Women* 242 F: 'the virtue of a man and a woman is one and the same'; as an Academic, Plutarch perhaps counted for Aspasia as a Socratic. As Barnes notes (pp. 29-30), the Stoicizing philosopher Musonius Rufus maintained that girls should be educated like boys; however, he does not pose the issue in terms of kinds of virtue.
41. Reading *gunaiki de <kai> andri amphoterois esti philian einai*, instead of Heylbut's *gunaika de <kai> andra amphoterous esti philous einai*, 'it is possible that a wife and husband both be friends' (followed by William W. Fortenbaugh et al., *Theophrastus of Eresus: Sources for his Life, Writings, Thought and Influence* II [Leiden, 1992] p. 354, Fr. 533). The MSS are perturbed here: R reads *gunaikes d'andria amphoterois esti philia einai* (*amphoterois* not reported in Heylbut's apparatus criticus); N reads *gunaika d'andri amphot-? estin philian einai*. In Heylbut's text, *amphoterous* ('both') is pointless. I expect that Eudemus and Theophrastus did not speak of a husband and wife as *philoï* ('friends'), but rather as having *philia* ('love') for one another.
42. cf. *Politics* 5, 1301b29, 6, 1317b4.
43. Aspasia understands *philia* in the restricted sense in which it pertains to the relationship between *philoï* and must be reciprocal.
44. Heylbut indicates a lacuna here; the commentary on 1159a25-1159b19 is missing.
45. Euripides fr. 898.7 (*incerta fabula*) Nauck².
46. The lemma is missing in the Greek MSS; it is supplied from the Latin versions.
47. Preserving the MSS *stratiôtai*s; Heylbut emends to *sustratiôtai*s, 'fellow-soldiers'.
48. Punctuating as a question; Heylbut punctuates as a declarative sentence with a full stop. Cf. 178,20, and 181,5-6.
49. Reading *autois* with the MSS; Heylbut emends to *tois autois*, 'the same people'.
50. i.e., those who are the more loved or dearer; for discussion of the passage

in Aristotle, see D. Konstan, 'Greek Friendship', *American Journal of Philology* 117 (1996) 71-94.

51. Heylbut indicates a lacuna; the commentary on 1160a9-33 has fallen out. If the last three words are not corrupt, their sense will have been clarified in the lost conclusion to the sentence.

52. A lacuna precedes; the text resumes with the commentary on 116b12.

53. Adopting Heylbut's emendation *arkhontôn*, following the text of Aristotle, for MSS *anthrôpôn*, 'human beings'.

54. Heylbut indicates a lacuna in the commentary (unnecessarily, in my judgement), corresponding to Aristotle's mention of the change from timocracy to democracy (116b16-17).

55. sc. from its better counterpart, the timocracy.

56. Heylbut indicates a lacuna here, unnecessarily in my judgement; Aspasius skips to 1161a10, passing over Aristotle's extended analogy between forms of government and relationships in the household.

57. Emending *kai basileôn* ('and of kings') to *tês tôn basileôn*; cf. 182,22-6 below.

58. Supplying *huperekhei*; cf. 182,15 above.

59. i.e., great grandparents, etc.

60. This paragraph, bracketed by Heylbut, is out of place and seems to duplicate, although with different nuances, the material at 182,9-18, commenting on 1161a19-25.

61. Omitting Heylbut's supplement *hêkista*, which gives: 'the just is least in these'. Aristotle (1161b9-10) acknowledges that there may be a small amount of the just in tyrannies.

62. Aspasius has reversed Aristotle's analogy here; but see below.

63. Omitting Heylbut's supplement, *alla ou philousin*, 'but they do not love them'.

64. It is perhaps preferable to read *hautôn* ('their own') for *autôn* ('their'), though Greek usage is loose in this respect.

65. A lacuna has swallowed the beginning of the sentence.

66. This is a strange sense of *oikeios*, and reverses the use in Aristotle (1161b22-3), who says that 'a thing from a person [i.e., the child] is own (*oikeion*) to the one from which it comes [i.e., the father]'; I suspect that Aspasius is being careless rather than original here.

67. Omitting *alla tên pros allêlous homoiotêta*, which Heylbut brackets as redundant.

68. LSJ wrongly gives the meaning 'second cousins' for *disekgonos* on the basis of this passage.

69. The anacoluthon is Aspasius'.

70. In the discussion of commercial exchange, Aristotle seems to strain the idea of love or friendship, but he is thinking of compacts made between private individuals in which an element of good will or affection is indispensable.

71. Reading *timan* as corrected in MS B and endorsed by Heylbut in the apparatus criticus, instead of *timasthai*, 'be honoured', which Heylbut retains in the text.

72. These words are probably a copyist's error, unless Aspasius had grown especially careless at this point.

73. Either *poiêsas* or *dedrake* is redundant.

English-Greek Glossary

absence: *apousia*
accident: *sumbebêkos*
accustom: *ethizô*
action: *praxis*
acquaintance: *sunêhtheia*
actively do: *energeô*
activity: *energeia*
adept: *deinos*
advantageous, be: *sumpherô*
age (of the same): *hêlix*
agree: *homologeomai, sumphônêô*
agreement: *homologia, sumphônia*
aid: *ôpheleia*
aim: *skopos*
allocation: *dianomê*
alter: *metapiptô*
analogous: *analogos*
appearance: *phantasia*
appropriate: *oikeios*
appropriate (be): *prosêkô*
aptitude: *epitêdeiotês*
argument: *logos, enkheirêsis*
aristocracy: *aristokrateia*
aristocrat: *aristokratês*
aristocratic: *aristokratikos*
arrogance: *huperêphania*
association: *koinôsis, koinônia*
attribute (v.): *aponemô*
attribute (n.): *sumbebêkos*
authority: *arkhê*

base: *phaulos*
beginning: *arkhê*
being: *to einai*
believe: *hêgeomai, nomizô, pisteuô*
beloved: *erômenos*
benefaction: *hupêresia*
benefactor: *euergetês*
beneficial: *ôphelimos*
benefit (v.): *ôphelêô*
benefit (n.): *ôpheleia, ophelos*
blameless: *anamartêtos*
body: *sôma*

buffoon: *bômolokhos*
business: *khreia*

care (n.): *epimeleia*
care for: *kêdomai*
causative: *aitios*
cause: *aition*
change (n.): *metabolê*
change (v.): *metabainô, metaballô*
character: *êthos*
character (similar in): *homoêthês*
character (like in): *sunêthês*
character-based, concerning
character: *êthikos*
characteristic: *oikeios*
charm: *kharis*
cherish: *stergô*
choiceworthy: *hairetos*
choose: *haireomai*
churlishness: *duskolia*
citizen: *politês*
city: *polis*
civic: *politikos*
coin: *nomisma*
commercial: *agoraios*
common: *koinos*
commonwealth: *to koinon*
communal: *koinônikos*
community: *koinônia*
company: *sunousia*
competent: *hikanos*
complete: *teleios*
comrade: *hetairoi*
comradely: *hetairikos*
concord: *homonoia*
concord (be in): *homonoeô*
condition (habitual): *hexis*
confident (be): *pisteuô*
construct an argument: *kataskeuazô*
correct (v.): *epanorthôô*
correction: *epanorthôsis*
courage: *andreia*
craft: *tekhnê*

crossdivide: *antidiaireô*

dear: *philos*

debt: *ophlêma*

debt (be in): *khreôsteô*

decent: *epieikês*

decision: *proairesis*

define: *diorizô, horizomai*

definition: *horismos, horos*

deliberative: *bouleutikos*

democracy: *dêmokratia*

democracy (live in a): *dêmokrateomai*

desire (v.): *potheô, oregomai*

desire (n.): *orexis*

deviation: *parekbasis*

die: *apothnêskô*

difference: *diaphora*

difficult: *aporos*

disposition: *diathesis*

dissimilar: *anomoios*

dissimilarity: *anomoiotês*

dissolve: *dialuô, luô*

dissonant (be): *diaphônêô*

distance: *diastasis*

distinguish: *aphorizô, diaireomai*

distributive: *aponemêtikos*

division: *diairesis*

educate: *paideuô*

education: *paideia, paideusis*

emotion: *pathos*

emotion (feel for): *prospaskhê*

emotional: *pathêtikos*

end: *telos*

endure: *diamenô, hupomenô*

equal: *isos*

equal (be): *isazô*

equality: *isotês*

erotic: *erôtikos*

erotic lover: *erastês*

erotic passion: *erôs*

err: *hamartanô, diamartanô*

escape one's notice: *dialanthanô*

essence: *ousia*

evidence: *tekmêrion*

evil (adj): *kakos, ponêros*

evil (n.): *kakia*

example: *paradeigma*

exceed: *huperballô, huperekhô*

excess: *huperbolê, huperokhê*

exchange (v.): *katallattomai*

existence: *huparxis*

feel: *paskhê*

feel emotion for: *prospaskhê*

feel mutually: *antipaskhê*

feel similarly: *homoiopatheô*

feeling: *pathos*

feeling of love: *philêsis*

feeling of love in return: *antiphilêsis*

feelings (of similar): *homoiopathês*

fine: *khrestos*

fine (naturally): *euphuês*

flourishing: *eudaimôn*

forgetfulness: *lêthê*

fortune: *tukhê*

free: *eleutheros*

friend: *philos*

friendless: *aphilos*

friendly: *philos*

friendship: *philia*

function: *ergon*

fundamental: *anankaaios*

gap: *diastêma*

genus: *genos*

genus (of like): *homogenês*

gladdened (be): *asmenizô*

good: *agathos*

good will: *eunoia*

good will (feel): *eunoeô*

good will (having) (adj.): *eunous*

government: *politeia*

grant: *apodidômi*

greed: *pleonexia*

habit: *ethos*

habitual condition: *hexis*

happiness: *eudaimonia*

happy: *eudaimôn*

homonymous: *homônumos*

honour (v.): *timaô*

honour (n.): *timê*

honour, love of: *philotimia*

hospitality-based: *xenikos*

human: *anthrôpinos*

human being: *anthrôpos*

hypothesis: *hupothesis*

illiberal: *aneleutheros*

impression: *tupos*

inanimate: *apsukhos*

incidental(ly): *kata sumbebêkos*

inclined (be naturally): *pephuka*

incomplete: *atelês*

indicate: *sêmainô*
 inquire: *zêteô*
 inquiry: *skepsis*, *zêtêsis*
 instrument: *organon*
 intermediate: *mesos*
 involuntary: *akôn*
 irrational: *alogos*

just: *dikaïos*
 justice (do): *dikaioô*
 justness: *dikaïosunê*

kind (n.): *eidos*
 kind (adj.): *prosênês*
 kindred: *sungenikos*
 kinsman: *sungenês*
 know: *epistamai*, *gignôskô*, *oida*

law: *nomos*
 law (specified by): *nomimos*
 law-based: *nomikos*
 lend: *khraô*
 liberal: *eleutherios*
 life: *bios*, *zoê*
 life in common: *sumbiôsis*
 lineage: *genos*
 live: *bioô*, *zô*
 live in common: *sumbioô*
 live together: *suzô*
 location: *topos*
 lovable: *philêtos*
 love: *philia*
 love (feeling of): *philêsis*
 love of honour: *philotimia*
 love in return, love mutually:
 antiphileô
 love erotically: *eraô*
 loving (n.): *to philein*
 loving (adj.): *philikos*

master: *despotês*
 mean (n.): *mesotês*
 moderation: *sôphrosunê*
 money: *khremata*, *argurion*
 motion: *kinêsis*

naive: *euêthês*
 natural: *phusikos*
 naturally fine: *euphuês*
 naturally inclined, be by nature:
 pephuka
 nature: *phusis*

necessary: *anankaios*, *anankê*
 need (n.): *khreia*
 need (in): *endeês*
 noble: *kalos*, *gennaios*
 notion: *logos*
 number: *arithmos*

office: *timê*
 oligarchy: *oligarkhia*
 opinion: *doxa*
 opposite: *enantios*
 oppositeness: *enantiôsis*
 owe: *deô*, *opheilô*
 own: *oikeios*

partner: *koinônos*
 partnership: *koinônia*
 passion (erotic): *erôs*
 passionate (be): *eraô*
 pay back: *apodidômi*
 payment: *timêma*
 person: *anthrôpos*
 philosopher: *philosophos*
 pleasant, pleasing, pleasurable: *hêdus*
 pleased (be), pleasure (take): *hêdomai*
 pleasure: *hêdonê*
 political: *politikos*
 possession: *ktêma*
 possibility: *exousia*
 poverty: *penia*
 power: *dunamis*
 power (position of): *dunasteia*, *exousia*
 prayer: *eukhê*
 preservation: *sôtêria*
 preserve: *sôzô*
 prime: *akmê*
 profit: *kerdos*
 profit (make a): *kerdainô*
 proportion: *analogia*
 proportional: *analogos*
 proportionally: *analogon*
 proprietary: *oikeios*
 puzzle: *aporia*

quality: *poiôtês*
 quantity: *poion*
 question (v.): *erôtaô*
 question (raise a): *aporeô*

rational: *logistikos*
 reason: *logos*
 reason (cause): *aitia*

refer: *anapherô*
 related: *oikeios, prosêkôn*
 relationship: *oikeiotês*
 relative: *pros ti*
 relevant: *oikeios*
 rulership: *arkhê*

sameness: *tautotês*
 science: *epistêmê*
 seek: *zêteô*
 senses, keen: *euaisthêsia*
 sensible: *phronimos*
 service: *euergesia, euergetêma, hupourgia*
 services, do: *euergeteô*
 share: *koinôneô*
 sign: *tekmêrion, sêmeion*
 similar: *homoios*
 similar, become: *homoioô*
 similar in character: *homoêthês*
 similarity: *homoiotês*
 slave: *oiketês, doulos*
 soul: *psukhê*
 source: *arkhê*
 species: *eidos*
 species, of the same: *homoethnês*
 stock: *genos*
 successful: *makarios*
 superiority: *huperokhê*
 support: *epikouria*
 support, give: *epikoureô*
 synonymous, be: *sunônumeô*

temperate: *sôphrôn*
 terrible: *deinos*
 test: *exetazô*
 testing: *exetasis*

think it right, think it worth: *axioô*
 timocracy: *timokrateia*
 timocrat: *timokratês*
 timocratic: *timokratikos*
 trace: *ikhnos*
 true: *alêthês, alêthinos*
 trust: *pisteuô*
 tyranny: *turannis*
 tyrant: *turannos*

understand: *epinoeô*
 unequal: *anisos*
 unfeeling: *apathês*
 universe: *to pan*
 unjust: *adikos*
 unnoticed (go): *lanthanô*
 use (n.): *khreîsis*
 usefulness: *khreia*
 useless: *akhreios*

valuation: *timêma*
 value: *axia*
 vice: *kakia*
 virtue: *aretê*
 virtuous: *enaretos*

wealth: *ploutos*
 well disposed: *eunous*
 wicked: *mokhthêros*
 wish (v.): *boulomai*
 wish (n.): *boulêsis*
 word: *logos*
 worth (adj.): *axios*
 worth (n.): *axia*
 worthy: *spoudaios*
 wrong (v.): *adikeô*

Greek-English Index

- adikeô*, wrong, 169,7
adikos, unjust, 177,4
agathos, good, 158,20
agoraios, commercial, 173,29
aitia, reason, 165,15
aitios, causative, 159,15
aition, cause, 159,14
akhreios, useless, 174,27
akmê, prime, 159,26
akôn, involuntary, 185,31
alêthês, true, 169,16
alêthinos, true, 166,9
alogos, irrational, 172,16
analogia, proportion, 175,3-4
analogon, proportionally, 177,26
analogos, proportional, analogous, 177,25; 182,9
anankaios, necessary, fundamental, 159,3; 184,29
anankê, necessary, 159,1
andreia, courage, 158,6
aneleutheros, illiberal, 173,30
anisos, unequal, 185,11
anomoios, dissimilar, 170,6
anomoiotês, dissimilarity, 175,28
anthrôpinos, human, 184,31
anthrôpos, person, human being, 158,10; 159,27
antidiaireô, crossdivide, 161,22
antipaskhô, feel mutually, 163,12
antiphileô, love mutually, love in return, 159,29; 180,4
antiphilêsis, feeling of love in return, 165,6
apathês, unfeeling, 158,17
aphilos, friendless, 159,18
aphorizô, distinguish, 183,31
aponemêtikos, distributive, 158,22
aponemô, attribute, 182,12
apousia, absence, 170,31
aporeô, raise a question, 160,26
aporia, puzzle, 160,27
aporos, difficult, 160,10
apothnêskô, die, 158,16-17
apsukhos, inanimate, 163,5
aretê, virtue, 158,4
argurion, money, 168,23
aristokrateia, aristocracy, 181,22-3
aristokratês, aristocrat, 182,8
aristokratikos, aristocratic, 182,27
arithmos, number, 178,22
arkhê, source, beginning, 159,28; 162,3; authority, rulership, 175,19; 177,24
atelês, incomplete, 166,31
axia, worth, value, 177,29; 185,30
axioô, think it worth, think it right, 166,4; 175,26
axios, worth, 178,29
bioô, live, 184,34
bios, life, 184,31
bômolokhos, buffoon, 174,27
boulêsis, wish, 163,6
bouleutikos, deliberative, 172,29
boulomai, wish, 158,18
deinos, adept, terrible, 174,25; 181,13
dêmokrateomai, live in a democracy, 178,24
dêmokratia, democracy, 181,25
deô, owe, 185,31
despotês, master, 176,9
diaireomai, differentiate, distinguish, 161,19; 162,34
diairesis, division, 161,22
dialuô, dissolve, separate, 165,31-2; pay, 168,24; 185,16-17
diamartanô, err, 162,28
dianomê, allocation, 177,28
diaphôneô, be dissonant, 162,22
diaphora, difference, 169,13
diastasis, distance, 171,7
diastêma, gap, 178,28
diathesis, disposition, 158,9-10
dikaioô, do justice, 185,15

dikaïos, just, 160,8
dikaïosunê, justness, 158,21-2
diorizô, define, 179,7
doulos, slave, 176,9
doxa, opinion, 160,23
dunamis, power, 159,11
dunasteia, position of power, 159,8
duskolia, churlishness, 158,10

eidos, kind, species, 160,11; 161,23
einai, to, being, 161,13
eleutherios, liberal, 173,26
eleutheros, free, 178,23
enantios, opposite, 160,22
enantiôsis, oppositeness, 160,25
enaretos, virtuous, 158,19
endeês, in need, 171,22-3
energeia, activity, 160,7
energeô, actively do, be active, 170,22; 170,27
enkheirêsis, argument, 159,13
epanorthôô, correct, 159,23
epanorthôsis, correction, 159,24
epieikês, decent, 163,14
epikoureô, give support, 160,2-3
epikouria, support, 159,20-1
epimeleia, care, 175,6-7
epinoeô, understand, 158,14
epistêmê, science, 177,14
epitêdeiotês, aptitude, 160,4
eraô, love erotically, be passionate for, 173,7; 180,11
erastês, erotic lover, 163,3
ergon, function, 176,30
erômenos, beloved, 163,4
erôs, erotic passion, 166,24
erôtaô, question, 177,3
erôtikos, erotic, 166,18
êthikos, character-based, concerning character, 158,7; 160,26
ethizô, accustom, 177,17
ethos, habit, 177,17
ethos, character, 158,4
euaisthêsia, keen senses, 161,32
eudaimôn, happy, flourishing, 171,22
eudaimonia, happiness, 161,31
euergesia, service, 159,12
euergetêma, service, 182,10
euergeteô, do services, 159,12
euergetês, benefactor, 185,13
euêthês, naive, 165,17
eukhê, prayer, 179,5

eunoêô, feel good will, 163,13
eunoia, good will, 163,10
eunous, having good will, 163,12
euphuês, naturally fine, 166,22
exetazô, test, 177,2
exetasis, testing, 173,18
exousia, position of power, possibility, 174,18; 186,26

gennaios, noble, 175,9
genos, genus, stock, lineage, 160,29; 173,17; 184,28

haireomai, choose, 159,6
hairetos, choiceworthy, 161,30
hamartanô, err, 185,31
hêdomai, be pleased, take pleasure, 164,29; 166,6
hêdonê, pleasure, 162,13
hêdus, pleasing, pleasurable, pleasant, 158,11; 161,21; 166,8
hêgeomai, believe, 179,20
hêlix, of the same age, 182,30
hetairikos, comradely, 172,2
hetairos, comrade, 172,3
hexis, habitual condition, 170,18
homoêthês, similar in character, 182,29
homoethnês, of the same species, 159,30
homogenês, of like genus, 167,10
homoioô, become similar, 170,7
homoiopatheô, feel similarly, 182,29
homoiopathês, of similar feelings, 182,30
homoios, similar, 160,6
homoiotês, similarity, 160,19
homologia, agreement, 184,2
homonoieô, be in concord, 160,6
homonoia, concord, 160,5
homônumos, homonymous, 160,31
horismos, definition, 164,1
horizomai, define, 163,28
horos, definition, 164,21
huparxis, existence, 173,21
hyperballô, exceed, 158,14
hyperbolê, excess, 158,11
huperekhê, exceed, 174,31
huperêphania, arrogance, 175,8
hupêresia, benefaction, 173,19
huperokhê, superiority, excess, 176,9; 179,15

hypothesis, hypothesis, 173,10
hupourgia, service, 176,20-1

ikhnos, trace, 180,3
isazô, be equal, 185,10
isos, equal, 159,1
isotês, equality, 158,22

kakia, vice, evil, 177,11; 181,25
kakos, evil, 159,25
kalos, noble, 159,4
katallattomai, exchange, 175,24
kataskeuazô, construct an
 argument, 180,27; dispose,
 183,17-18

kêdomai, care for, 183,16
kerdainô, make a profit, 166,2
kerdos, profit, 166,4
kharis, charm, 174,28
khraô, lend, 185,25
khreia, need, usefulness, 159,10;
 164,18; business, 166,1
kh rêmata, money, 162,10-11
khreôsteô, be in debt, 186,27
kh rêsis, use, 159,11
kh rêstos, fine, 168,3
kinêsis, motion, 172,10
koinon, to, commonwealth, 186,19
koinôneô, share, 161,8
koinônia, partnership, community,
 association, 170,1; 175,19; 177,20
koinônikos, communal, 171,28-9
koinônos, partner, 160,14
koinos, common, 160,6
koinôsis, association, 181,1
ktêma, possession, 181,7

lanthanô, go unnoticed, escape,
 notice, 163,13; 163,14
lêthê, forgetfulness, 171,2
logistikos, rational, 172,15
logos, argument, notion, 162,3; 164,2;
 reason, word, 166,11; 168,3
luô, dissolve, solve, 173,21; 186,2

makarios, successful, 173,31
mesotês, mean, 158,9
metabainô, change, 181,23
metaballô, change, 166,13
metabolê, change, 166,17
mokkhêros, wicked, 160,28

nomikos, law-based, 185,16
nomimos, specified by law, 175,18
nomisma, coin, 185,17-18
nomizô, believe, 175,30
nomos, law, 178,7

oikeios, appropriate, 158,4;
 characteristic, 158,20; relevant,
 160,26; own, 167,19; proprietary,
 184,16; related, 184,28
oikeiotês, relationship, 184,27
oligarkhia, oligarchy, 181,23
opheilô, owe, 186,24
ôpheleia, benefit, aid, 166,25; 171,23
ôpheleô, benefit, 183,17
ôphelimos, beneficial, 165,26-7
ophelos, benefit, 159,11
ophlêma, debt, 185,22
oregomai, desire, 171,22
orexis, desire, 172,29
organon, instrument, 162,7
ousia, essence, 161,12

paideia, education, 183,2
paideuô, educate, 182,33
paideusis, education, 166,25
pan, to, the universe, 160,24
paradeigma, example, 163,4
parekbasis, deviation, 182,3
paskhô, feel, be done, 172,17; 185,13
pathêtikos, emotional, 172,14
pathos, feeling, emotion, 158,7; 172,8
penia, poverty, 159,20
pephuka, be naturally inclined, be by
 nature, 158,10
phantasia, appearance, 162,24
phaulos, base, 168,25
philein, to, loving, 158,8
philêsis, feeling of love, 159,28
philêtos, lovable, 161,18
philia, love, friendship, 158,4; 164,19
philikos, loving, 158,8
philos (n.), friend, friendly, 158,12;
 160,15
philos (adj.), dear, 184,32
philosophos, philosopher, 160,23
philotimia, love of honour, 179,19-20
phronimos, sensible, 176,14
phusikos, natural, by nature, 160,26;
 176,20
phusikôs, by nature, 178,17
phusis, nature, 159,6

pisteuô, trust, be confident, 160,34;
163,18; believe, 168,6
pleonexia, greed, 160,3
ploutos, wealth, 159,11
poiôtês, quality, 165,21
polis, city, 160,5
politeia, government, 181,20
politês, citizen, 181,14
politikos, civic, political, 160,12;
177,28
ponêros, evil, 161,6
potheô, desire, 160,6
praxis, action, 158,8
proairesis, decision, 172,24
prosêkô, be appropriate, 176,25
prosêkôn, related, 176,2-3
prosênês, kind, 166,7
prospaskhô, feel emotion for, 173,28
pros ti, relative, 165,21
psukhê, soul, 163,22

sêmainô, indicate, 168,5
sêmeion, sign, 160,34
skepsis, inquiry, 160,25
skopos, aim, 170,15
sôma, body, 162,18
sôphrôn, temperate, 177,5
sôphrosunê, moderation, 158,6-7
sôtêria, preservation, 159,19
sôzô, preserve, 163,8
spoudaios, worthy, 165,35
stergô, cherish, 165,27
sumbebêkos, attribute, accident,
161,12; 169,20
sumbebêkos, kata, incidental(ly),
164,14
sumbioô, live in common, 166,9-10

sumbiôsis, life in common, 163,21
sumpherô, be advantageous, 165,34
sumphônêô, agree, 185,33
sumphônia, agreement, 185,36
sunêtheia, acquaintance, 168,1
sunêthês, like in character, 182,30
sungenês, kinsman, 184,6
sungenikos, kindred, 183,32
sunônumeô, be synonymous, 161,3
sunousia, company, 163,21
suzô, live together, 166,5

tautotês, sameness, 184,18
tekhnhê, craft, 181,2
tekmêrion, sign, evidence, 167,9;
171,21
teleios, complete, 167,1
telos, end, 162,14
timaô, honour, 179,20
timê, office, honour, 177,28; 179,26
timêma, valuation, 181,20-1
timokrateia, timocracy, 181,20
timokratês, timocrat, 182,8-9
timokratikos, timocratic, 182,21
topos, location, 170,21
tukhê, fortune, 183,24
tupos, impression, 164,6
turannis, tyranny, 181,25
turannos, tyrant, 174,18

xenikos, hospitality-based, 184,13
zêteô, inquire, seek, 160,29; 162,4
zêtêsis, inquiry, 160,32
zô, live, 158,16
zoê, life, 182,26

Index of Names

Aristotle, 158,1; 163,28; 170,29; 174,6
Aspasius, 158,1
Eudemus, 178,3

Satyros, 158,16
Socratics, 177,3
Theophrastus, 178,3

This page intentionally left blank

ANONYMOUS

*Paraphrase of Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics 8 and 9*

Translation

Textual Emendations

- 165,23 Punctuating with a comma rather than a question mark
(Heylbut)
- 172,17 Reading *ephelkesthai* (Heylbut *in app.*) for *ephelketai*
- 174,19 Reading *tôn* for *tôi*
- 175,10 Deleting the raised stop after *enteuthen*
- 176,23 Reading *ê* for *êi*
- 191,9 Deleting the raised stop after *hapasi*
- 191,16 Deleting the supplement *kata to deon*
- 191,21 Deleting the comma after *philountos*
- 192,1 Deleting the supplement *to de ponêron*
- 192,11 Deleting the supplements *te kai* and *on*
- 193,16 Reading *periekhei* for *parekhei*
- 193,31 Reading *auta* for *autêi*
- 199,4-5 Reading *tou euergetoumenou ê tou euergetou* for *tou euergetou ê tou euergetoumenou*
- 201,22 Reading *tois spoudaiois* for *tôi spoudaiôi*
- 201,23-4 Deleting Heinsius' supplements *anêr ... ho* and *de*
- 201,38 Deleting the supplement *khronon*
- 203,16 Inserting *to* before *prattein*
- 203,17 Deleting the supplement *to gar zên ... prattein*
- 203,29 Reading *khalepon* for *khalepos*
- 203,30 Reading *sunekhestera* for *suekhestera* (misprint in Heylbut)
- 204,23 Inserting *esti* after *hêdea*. Deleting the supplement *kai tôi spoudaiôi ... hêdea*
- 205,33 Reading *philôn* for *philon*
- 208,23 Reading *áp'* for *ap'*
- 208,24 Deleting the supplement *gar*

On love. Chapter 1

‘After this’ it follows ‘that one discuss love’ (1155a3). For love is a virtue or follows upon virtue; and in fact the virtue that is between churlishness and flattery, when it takes on cherishing in addition, is love, as was said in the eighth chapter of the fourth book (= 4.6, 1126b20-2). And it follows upon complete virtue: for true love, as will be said presently, is found in worthy people only. Therefore in the treatise concerning the virtues it follows that one speak also about this, since it is indeed highly necessary for life. ‘For without friends no one would choose to live, though he had all other good things’ (1155a5-6); and in fact those who are rich and hold offices and positions of power seem most to have need of friends. ‘For what benefit is there of such’ prosperity (1155a7-8) for those who are unable to confer benefactions? But people do not confer benefactions if they do not have friends. For the benefaction that most occurs and is most praised is that toward friends. Indeed, how could a prosperous man persist and be preserved in his happiness without friends? For the greater the prosperity, the more precarious it is. It is not only the prosperous who have need of friends, but also the unfortunate and poor. For everyone thinks that friends are the only refuge.

Love is profitable not only to every condition but also to every age: for friends guide young men toward correct reasoning, so that they do not err through inexperience of the good, and they tend the elderly and make up for what falls short in their action due to the weakness of their age; and they add to the good actions of those in their prime, and make their deeds better, ‘as when two men proceed together’ (1155a15 = Homer *Iliad* 10.224). For in fact with friends we become more capable of thinking and acting, and love belongs to us by nature: for by nature what begets loves what is begotten, and not only in human beings, but in birds and most animals as well. And not only in what begets and is begotten, but also in things of like genus with one another, and most of all in human beings. This is why we praise humane (*philanthrôpos*) people, because they are doing something human. ‘One may see this also in travel, how every human being is a related and dear thing to [every other] human being’ (1155a21-2). For those who stay in place welcome and tend the traveller with

pleasure, and the traveller, should he just meet human beings, absolutely rejoices.

10 It was love too that united cities in the beginning and forever binds them together; and the law-givers who found cities are more concerned about love than about justness, for in fact justness is sought through concord, and concord is something similar to love, while dissension is similar to enmity, which law-givers always strive to expel from their city. Besides, when the citizens are loving toward one another, there is no need of justness in the city, but when they are just, there is [still] need for love: for with this they will be better
15 in concord than with justness. Further, what is most just seems to be [something that is] loving, for in fact when someone observes all that is just concerning his neighbour, even if it is necessary that he suffer some loss, he is loving. Thus, love is sought more than justness on the part of law-givers, and it is something necessary for being able to be thoroughly in concord.

20 Not only is it a necessary thing and one that leads to another good, but it is also a noble and praiseworthy thing in its own right. 'For we praise those who are loving of their friends, and having many friends seems to be one of the noble things' (1155a29-30); and some say that a friend differs in no way from a good man, but is absolutely the same.

What love is, and that there are three kinds of it. Chapter 2

25 Such, then, is love. But not a few things are debated concerning it: whether love is similarity and those who are similar are friends, or oppositeness and those who possess it are opposites. For some regard it [love] as similarity and those who are similar as friends, 'whence they say "like to like" [cf. Homer *Odyssey* 17.218] and "jackdaw to jackdaw" [cf. Hesiod *Works and Days* 25-6] and the like' (1155a34-5), but others say that friends are opposites and they elevate the argu-
30 ment to a more general and physical [level]: 'Euripides says that

the parched earth is passionate for the rain,
the august sky, filled with rain,
is passionate to fall upon the earth (1155b2-44)',

while Heraclitus says that 'an opposite is advantageous' (1155b4-5), 'and that the most beautiful harmony [is] from things that differ, and
35 that all things occur in accord with strife; opposite to these things' (1155b5-6) is what Empedocles in particular, along with many others, asserts concerning love when he says that like pursues like. Now, elevating the argument to general and physical arguments and seeking simply how opposites pursue opposites and likes, likes is not

appropriate to the present inquiry. Let us inquire into as many things as pertain to human nature only, and of human things as many as bear upon [kinds of] character and emotions; for these are the material of the present treatise. 165,1

One must inquire, then, whether love occurs in all people, or whether it occurs in the good but is incapable of occurring in the wicked, and whether there are many kinds of love or one: for it is not the case that, because love 'admits of a more and a less' (1155b13-14), there is [only] one kind of it, 'for things that are different in kind also admit of a more and less' (1155b14-15). For essence and attribute, which are different in kind, admit of a more and less, for they are not things that *are* in a similar way.¹ Thus, those who think that there is one kind of love because of the [capacity to admit a] more and less 'have trusted in a sign that is not sufficient' (1155b14). But these matters have been discussed earlier.² The things that are being investigated, then, are these, and they would be apparent if the argument about what is lovable were apparent; for we do not love all things but only so many as are of a nature to be loved, and these are the things that are lovable. Lovable things are the following: the good, the pleasing, the useful. The good and the pleasing are loved for themselves, but the useful is loved either on account of the good or on account of pleasure. For that is useful by means of which either the good or pleasure occurs. Thus, the good and pleasure are lovable things as ends, but the useful is [lovable] as something ordered toward an end. 5 10 15

Let us inquire how the good is lovable: whether it is what is simply good or what is good to the one who loves. For sometimes these differ from one another, and what is simply and in the proper sense good is one thing, while what seems to some to be good is another. Similarly, the pleasing too differs: the simply pleasing and what is pleasing to some. Which, then, are the things that are lovable? Now, it is obvious that things that seem pleasing and good are lovable,³ and similarly that useful things that lead to what seem pleasing and good things are lovable: not all things that seem pleasing and good, but those that seem pleasing and good and useful *to them*, are lovable [to them]. Thus, the good is simply lovable, but what is good to some is lovable to some. What seems good to some is what *appears* lovable, and similarly for the pleasing and the useful. 20 25

'There are three' (1155b27) lovable things on account of which a feeling of love arises, but it is not the case that in all things that are loved love too immediately arises; for we love inanimate things too on account of one of these three lovable, but such a thing is not love [in the sense of friendship]. For there is love [i.e., friendship] when the loving person is loved in return and wishes good things for the loved one, who himself [in turn] wishes good things for the one who loves. One who loves, say, wine is neither loved in return by it nor 30

35 wishes good things for the wine: for that is ridiculous; 'but even if he wishes that it be preserved', it is not for the sake of the wine itself but for himself, 'so that he may have it' (1155b30-1). But for a friend we wish good things for his sake. Therefore, a feeling of love toward inanimate things is not love [in the sense of friendship]. Further, not even if someone should love a human being and wish good things for him is there any necessity that such a thing is love [i.e., friendship]. For it is necessary that he be similarly loved in return. If not, he is
 40 not a friend but is called someone who has good will. It happens that some people, although they go unnoticed [by the other], love one another, because they suppose [each of the other] that they are good and useful and decent people, and they wish good things for each other. But one would not properly call these friends, because they do not know that they are loved nor what they are in relation to one another, but one would say that they have good will toward each other. Neither, then, is a feeling of love for inanimate things love, nor
 5 that for human beings, when it lacks one of the things mentioned, but it *is* love [in the sense of friendship] when they feel good will toward one another either on account of the good or the pleasing or the useful, and wish good things for one another, and do not go unnoticed [by the other] in loving each other.

What love is has now been stated; it is clear from what has been said that there are three kinds of love: for since there are three things on account of which love arises – the pleasing, the good, the useful –
 10 and these differ from one another in kind, <love too> is equal in number to lovable things. For it is possible for love to arise in accord with each of the lovable things, or rather a feeling of love that does not go unnoticed and a feeling of love in return, and further a wish of good things for one another. For to the extent that we love something, we wish it good. Consequently, there are three kinds of love, in accord with the good and the pleasing and the useful.

15 **On love on account of the useful and that on account of pleasure, that such loves are incomplete. Chapter 3**

One must inquire about each kind. Now, 'those who love one another on account of the useful' (1156a10-11) do not love one another for their own selves, but rather on account of the good or the pleasing thing in respect to which they are useful, and they love so long as 'some good comes to them from one another. Similarly, those who love one another on account of pleasure' (1156a11-12) do not love [one another] for themselves, for they do not love them because they are simply pleasing, but rather because they are pleasing to them; for if they were pleasing to others [but not to them], they would not love them. 'Those indeed who love on account of the useful' (1156a14) and those

on account of the pleasing do not cherish [one another] on account of
 the good or the pleasing simply, but rather on account of the good and 25
 pleasing to them; and they do not love because the one who is loved
 is such as he is, but rather because he is pleasing and useful to them.
 Thus, it is obvious that these loves are incidental, for the one who is
 loved is not loved because he himself is such a sort, but rather because
 he provides, in the one case a good, in the other pleasure. And such
 loves are easily dissolved, for people who are pleasing and useful are 30
 not permanently pleasing and useful; for we are pleased by different
 things at different times, and different things are useful at different
 times. Since, then, the cause of the love does not endure, [the love]
 itself is not able to endure, but rather it is dissolved, since it is relative
 to those things and has these ends.

Such love – the kind that is easily changed – seems most to arise
 in old people, for those of such an age do not pursue the pleasing either 35
 vigorously or continually; therefore they also lack the love according
 to pleasure, but, ever seeking only what is beneficial, are friends
 according to the useful. And not only old people but also as many of
 the young who seek not pleasure but the beneficial. Nor do such sorts
 much live together with one another, for sometimes they are not even
 pleased by one another. For they are pleased with one another only
 when they prove beneficial or when they afford hopes of benefit, but 167,1
 not the rest of the time: since they are not pleasing to one another,
 neither are they able to dwell together. Such too, they say, is love
 based on hospitality, for it too has arisen on account of the useful.

The love of young people is, for the most part, on account of
 pleasure: 'for these live according to emotion and most of all pursue 5
 what is pleasing' (1156a32-3), and not the benefit to come but the
 present pleasure. For since they live mainly by sensation, they enjoy
 the present and what charms sensation [i.e., the senses]. 'When their
 age alters, the things that are pleasing too become other; therefore
 they quickly become and stop being friends' (1156a33-5). For when
 what is pleasing alters, the love too alters: this sort of pleasing thing 10
 alters quickly; and thus the love, too. And young people are erotic[ally
 disposed], because they live according to emotion and pleasure; for
 most of erotic [love] is according to emotion and pleasure. Therefore
 they love and quickly stop loving, 'altering many times in the same
 day' (1156b3-4), because they do not love by reason and judgement of
 some sort, but rather because they are carried away by emotion.
 'These [i.e., young people] wish to spend the day together and live 15
 together' (1156b4-5) with one another, for from this [i.e., pleasure]
 the beginning [or: principle] of their love arises, and pleasure
 demands dwelling together. Such, then, is the love according to
 pleasure and according to the useful: incomplete, and not in itself,
 but incidental.

**On love on account of the good, that it is
the complete love. Chapter 4**

- Love on account of the good – that of good men who are similar in respect to virtue – is complete and in itself. For they wish good things for one another because they [i.e., the ones who are loved] are good, and not on account of any other thing, but rather for themselves: those who wish good things for their friends not for their own sakes but rather for the sake of their friends are those who are most of all friends. For they love their friends and wish good things for them on account of themselves, and not on account of some other thing and incidentally. Such love is both firm and enduring, for it endures as long as the friends are good and worthy and enjoy good things. For virtue is an enduring thing. And each of them is in himself [both] simply good and good to his friend, for good men are both good in themselves and to one another. Similarly, they are both beneficial and pleasing, for those who are in themselves and simply good are also pleasing to one another; for each enjoys his own actions, and therefore also is pleased by those [actions] of the others when they are similar to his own actions or the same. The actions of worthy and good people are the same and similar, and thus it is evident that worthy people are pleasing both to themselves and to each other. Therefore such love is enduring. For only this love has collected in itself all that the other loves have individually and of which friends have need: for in fact it has the good and the pleasing and the useful, for the beneficial follows upon the good and the pleasing. And the good of this sort is good not only in itself, but also to the one who loves; and similarly it is pleasing and beneficial not only in itself, but also to the one who loves. The similarity produces the pleasure for such friends, and this love above all possesses pleasure and the beneficial.
- 5 The other loves are so called in accord with their similarity to this one. For this is the best love, and these things that produce this [love] are above all and properly speaking lovable. ‘It is plausible that such loves are rare’ (1156b24-5), for those who are good in this way are few. Not only does such love need virtue and good qualities of character but also time and familiarity: ‘for, according to the proverb, it is not possible to know one another before consuming together the oft-mentioned amount of salt’ (1156b26-8); nor is it possible to approve and love one another before each appears lovable to the other and is himself believed [firmly] to love [the other]. Those who quickly perform loving [acts] toward one another ‘wish to be friends, but are not’ (1156b30-1), unless by means of a long [period of] time and familiarity they should become lovable to one another and believe [firmly] that they are loved. Now, a wish for love arises very quickly, but love does not. This [kind of] love, then, is complete both according to time and

the other things, as has been said, and it occurs in accord with all the lovable things: and each gets similar things from each, which should be so for friends. For, in fact, they [i.e., friends of this sort] are each similar, since they are worthy people, and they are similarly pleasing and lovable to one another.

That the incomplete loves are so called according to similarity with complete love. Chapter 5

20

The love on account of pleasure and that on account of the useful have a likeness to this love [on account of the good], for what is in the proper sense pleasing and useful is the good, and good people are most of all pleasing and useful to one another. And in these [friends] who are so called according to similarity, the loves endure when they [the friends] afford one another the same thing – for example if each is useful to the other, or pleasing – but not when one is useful and the other pleasing. Not only is it necessary that they afford one another the same thing, but also from the same thing [i.e., on the same basis], if at any rate they are going to endure in their love. For example, if they afford each other pleasure, they will afford it from the same qualities of character, in the way that witty people gratify one another with wittiness, and not in the way that a lover and beloved do: for these do afford pleasure to one another, but not in the same way. Rather, the lover enjoys the sight of his beloved, but he [the beloved] enjoys being tended by his lover. ‘When the bloom ceases sometimes the love too ceases’ (1157a8-9), for the pleasure, on account of which the love [arises], stops; for neither does the lover enjoy the sight of the beloved nor is the beloved tended. But many such people also persist in their love if, as a result of their familiarity, they cherish one another’s characters, since they have similar ones. But those who do not afford the same thing to one another, but rather the one [affords] pleasure and the other the useful, do not endure in their love, and when they do love each other, they love less. In general, when what is advantageous stops, those who are friends on account of the useful stop loving and break up, ‘for they were not friends of one another but rather of the gainful’ (1157a15-16).

25

30

35

169,1

Now, it is possible both for base people, and for a base person and a decent person, to have these loves – that on account of pleasure and that on account of the useful; for a base person loves a base person on account of these things, and a base person a decent one, and a decent one a base, and a person of the middle [sort] either of these. For a decent person, too, often has need of a base one: for it is possible that a good captain or the best general not be altogether good in his qualities of character; but nothing prevents a worthy person from having need of them. And it is not impossible for a worthy person to

5

10 be pleased by base people; for there are those who are discordant in their qualities of character, but who converse and philosophize and, by virtue of the fact that they are adept, hit upon the truth and the good and so are pleasing to worthy people.

Now, those who are loved in this way are not loved on account of themselves, but rather on account of pleasure or on account of the useful. Only good people are loved by good people on account of their
 15 own selves; and such love is not subject to slander, because it is tested by much time and complete familiarity. When people have thus been tested, it is not easy for the one who has tested them to believe worse of them. In this love there is trust in one another, and confidence about the most important things, and the fact that one would never wrong [the other], and all the other things that are sought by those
 20 who have chosen to love truly. 'In the other [loves], nothing prevents' (1157a24-5) people from being suspicious of one another, and wronging one another by not preserving equality, and suffering other things. Hence, neither are such people properly speaking friends. But since human beings are in the habit of calling such people friends, either on account of utility, as cities call their allies friends, or on
 25 account of pleasure, as children who are acquainted do with one another, for this reason we too call them friends, but not in the same way as we do good people. For we do not think they are of the same kind, but rather we call them friends according to a certain similarity. Therefore we say that there are many kinds of love.

It is the [love] of good people, as good, that is primarily and properly
 30 speaking love, while the rest are so according to similarity. And in fact the pleasing, insofar as it is a good thing, unites, as pleasing, those who are pleasure-loving; for the pleasing is something good to those who are pleasure-lovers. And it resembles a good thing because it seems good to them. The useful too seems good to the one who uses it; therefore such loves are so called because of their similarity to the true love.

Love that is mixed out of the useful and the pleasing – so that one
 35 of the friends loves on account of the pleasing, the other on account of the useful – does not much occur; for what unites [such] friends is in them incidentally. Enjoying the same things and loving the same things unites friends: for that is why Socrates loves Plato, because both love Socrates and both enjoy the good things that are of Socrates,
 40 or [in other cases] because they both love pleasure or both [love] the useful. In the case of mixed love, they do not enjoy the same thing, for one [enjoys] what is pleasing, the other what is useful. They love
 170,1 the same thing incidentally, for each rejoices with the other and joins in praying for good things – not on his account, however, but rather on account of the useful and the pleasing. Therefore, accordingly, such love does not much occur, because what is in common [in this case] is

one incidentally, and what is one incidentally does not unite [people] very much.

**That living together and being together allow
friends to be friends actively. Chapter 6**

5

‘Love having been’ differentiated ‘into these kinds, base people will be friends on account of pleasure or the useful, since they are similar in this respect, while good people’ (1157b1-3) will be friends on account of themselves, for they love one another on account of that by virtue of which they are both good. The latter, then, are friends simply and in the proper sense and in itself, but the former are so incidentally and have the name of love by way of being assimilated to the latter. ‘Just as, in the case of the virtues, some people are called good according to habitual condition, and others according to activity’ (1157b5-6) (for some people have a habitual condition of justness, but are not active in accord with it when they are prevented by external things, while others are active in [doing] just things in accord with the habitual condition of justness that they acquired), so it happens in the same way in the case of love. ‘For those who live together’ (1157b7) with one another enjoy the good things of one another and provide each to the other the good things that are possible, ‘while those who are sleeping or have been separated in their locations are not active’ (1157b8-9) toward one another in [doing] loving [deeds] (*philika*), ‘but they are such as to be active in a loving way (*philikós*), for [separate] locations do not dissolve love simply, but rather the activity [of loving]’ (1157b9-11). If the friends’ absence occurs over a long time, it seems that there occurs a forgetfulness of love; ‘whence it is said, “want of conversation has dissolved many friendships” ’ (1157b12-13).

10

15

20

Old and acerbic people appear as though they are not able to be loving, ‘for there is little of pleasure in them’ (1157b14-15), and a person who has no pleasure is not able to be together and spend the day together [with others]; for no one would choose to spend time together with a painful person or one who is not pleasing. For it appears that nature flees what is painful and always pursues what is pleasing. Someone with whom it is impossible to be together cannot possibly have a friend, for familiarity and spending time together produce friendships. For those who ‘approve of one another but do not live together’ (1157b17-18) have good will toward one another rather than being friends, ‘for nothing is so [characteristic] of friends as living together’ (1157b19). For not even those [who are friends] on account of the useful are able not to live together, for since they are in need of one another they need to make use of one another, which is not possible without living together. Nor, all the more, those [who

25

30

are friends] on account of pleasure, nor those who are in the proper sense friends (these are those who are flourishing); for while they are not in need of one another, they are pleasing to one another, and therefore it is impossible for them to wish not to spend time together. For it is not appropriate, indeed, that flourishing people be solitary sorts; rather, it is a necessity that they be with each other, rejoicing in the same things. This, namely rejoicing in the same things, also produces comradely love – that of young people – when they are earnest about the same thing. ‘What is above all love, then, is that of good people, as has been said many times, for what seems lovable and choiceworthy is the simply’ (1157b25-7) and properly good or pleasing. For each person, what is good for him is lovable and choiceworthy, and a good man loves a good man on account of both these things: for his good is simply and properly good and good for his friend. Thus a good man is lovable, and in accord with both ways; and therefore there is every necessity that worthy people wish to live together with one another, rejoicing in one another as similar, as good simply, and as good for one another.

<On love and the feeling of love. Chapter 7>⁴

Since love is a virtue, and in every virtue some emotion and habitual condition is observed, one must inquire what is the emotion in love and what the habitual condition. Now, the feeling of love resembles an emotion, while love [resembles] a habitual condition; for what happens even to those who do not decide is an emotion, while a habitual condition is something that arises with decision, and it is with decision that we are active in accordance with it [the habitual condition]. The feeling of love, then – both that toward inanimate things and, in general for things whence it is not possible to be loved in return – is affection (*agapê*), and such a thing is an emotion; for it is not by having judged and reasoned, nor by deciding, that we feel affection, but rather merely by being moved by that thing, which is purely emotion. But love toward those who love is an affection that is an emotion accompanied by a decision; for we judge that one should love one who loves [us], and we are moved not merely from outside but also from our own selves and by reason, and a motion that is accompanied by reason and a decision comes from a habitual condition. The feeling of love, consequently, is an emotion, while love is a habitual condition.

Furthermore, friends wish good things for those who are loved for their own sakes, not according to emotion but according to a habitual condition, for they do so not irrationally but rather by reasoning about the reason [why]. To wish good things for those who are loved for their own sakes is in the definition of love. Consequently, love is a habitual

disposition. Further, one loves a good person as a friend because he is good for oneself, for when a good person becomes a friend, he is good for his friend; thus, each loves the other as his own good, and wishes good things, and is similarly pleasing. And in general, 'they mutually exchange what is equal, for it is said that equality is amity' (1157b36). These things are not without decision, and decision comes from a habitual condition. Consequently, love is a habitual condition, while a feeling of love, since it is without decision, is purely an emotion. 30

<That it is not possible to be a friend completely to many, and what kinds of loves those in positions of power have. Chapter 8>

All loving [qualities], then, and things that are appropriate to friends happen in the love of good men only. 'In the acerbic and aged love occurs less, to the degree that they are more churlish and rejoice less in conversations' (1158a1-3), for conversation and being together seem to be productive of love. This is why young people quickly become friends, but old people do not; for it is not possible for someone to become a friend of someone in whom he neither rejoices nor is pleased when he is together with him. But this does not much happen in old people, for they have a small [amount] of pleasure. For the same [reasons] neither do acerbic people much become friends, but rather they have good will toward one another. For they wish good things for one another on account of utility and they get from one another that which each needs from the other; 'but they are not fully friends because they do not spend the day together or enjoy one another, which seem indeed to be the most loving [acts]' (1158a8-10) and productive of love. It is not possible for a worthy person to be a friend to many in accord with complete love, just as it is not possible to love many erotically at the same time; for complete love is a kind of excess of love, and such a thing by nature occurs toward one person. For rejoicing vigorously in the same things is not easy among many, nor is it easy, furthermore, for there to be many good and worthy people. Besides, for such a love one needs a long time and familiarity and accurate experience of one another, and this is difficult. But it is possible to love many in accord with the other loves, for in fact it is possible for someone to be gratifying to many on account of the useful and to attract⁵ many on account of pleasure. For those who enjoy these things are many and they love on account of them, nor do they need much time in order to acquire accurate experience of their friends; rather, they acknowledge⁶ on the spot that they love [one another] on account of need or pleasure. 35 172,1 5 10 15

Now, complete love is [love] on account of the good, while the [other loves] – that of the useful and that of the pleasing – are so according 20

to similarity [with complete love]. Of those according to similarity, that of the pleasing is more similar to true love when the friends get the same things from one another 'and they enjoy one another or [enjoy] the same things; such are the loves of young people' (1158a19-20). And in fact there is more of what is liberal in the love of the pleasing than in that of the useful, for that of the useful is characteristic of commercial and illiberal people. Furthermore, the true
 25 [kind of] love needs the pleasing too, but not the useful at all, for flourishing people do not need useful people, but they do pleasing people: 'for they wish to live together with some people' (1158a23), and they cannot be together with painful ones, for people bear what is painful for a short time. 'For no one would continually endure'
 30 (1158a24) being hurt, nor will anyone be able to bear the good itself if it should be painful for him. Therefore, worthy people seek that their friends, who are good and good for them, be pleasing, for thus there will pertain to them all that should pertain to friends. Consequently, love according to pleasure more resembles complete love than that according to the useful.

'Those in positions of power' (1158a5) do not treat the same friends
 35 as useful and as pleasing, for some are useful to them and others are pleasing, 'but the same people are rarely both' (1158a29-30). The cause is that the useful and the pleasing are [combined] in complete love, which is that of worthy people, but they [i.e., those in power] do not seek such people. For they neither seek those who are pleasing on account of virtue nor those who are useful for noble things, but
 40 rather they use witty people for their pleasure and adept people as useful, since they are able to do what is bidden; but these things rarely come together in the same person. For the worthy person is simultaneously pleasing and useful, as has been said; and he does not become
 173,1 a friend to one who exceeds him [in power], unless he [the one in power] is exceeded in virtue and classes himself below the worthy person and believes that he [the virtuous person] is better than himself. For thus the worthy person will be equal to the one who exceeds him in position of power, proportionally exceeding and being
 5 exceeded, and being equal he will be a friend; but he will not be if he is not equal in this way. Since those in positions of power do not often prove to be such people, they do not have worthy people as friends.

**<On pleasing and useful love, that in one respect
 they are loves and in another respect not; and
 on love according to superiority. Chapter 9>**

All the loves that have been mentioned are in equality, for the friends
 10 get the same things from one another and wish the same things for one another, or else they give in exchange one thing for another, equal

for equal, for example pleasure for benefit; that these latter loves are less than the others and briefer has been stated. Of the loves, those on account of the useful and pleasing seem in one respect to be loves, but in another not; for insofar as they resemble complete love they are loves, but insofar as they are dissimilar to it they are not loves. 15 For they resemble it because complete love has both the good and the useful, but they do not resemble it because the one is not subject to slander and enduring, while the others quickly alter and differ in many other things.

Now, all these [loves] are [loves] according to similarity and equality. But another 'kind of love is that according to superiority, for example a father's toward a son and in general an older person's 20 toward a younger, and a husband's toward a wife and anyone who rules toward one who is ruled. And these differ from one another, for parents' [love] toward their children and that of ruler toward the ruled are not the same; nor indeed is a father's toward a son and a son's toward a father nor a husband's toward a wife and a wife's toward a husband' (1158b11-17). Thus, not only do the loves differ 25 here, but also the feelings of love as against the feelings of love in return; for the virtue and the function of each of these friends⁷ is different, and the things on account of which they love and are loved are different; and therefore the feelings of love and the loves are different too. In the aforementioned loves the fact that each of the friends got the same things from the other produced their enduringness, but here it is not like that: for a father will not demand the 30 same things of a son as a son does of a father. For such people should not observe equality in these things, but rather when each gets from the other what the one should give and the other get, 'the love of such people will be enduring and fair' (1158b22-3). The feeling of love, too, should be proportional in the loves according to superiority, for the better person ought 'more to be loved than to love, and so too the more 35 beneficial person, and similarly each of the other [kinds of] people' (1158b25-6). For there should be a certain equality among these, too; for this binds love together, and equality occurs in a certain sense when the feeling of love is according to worth.

What is just too is preserved in equality, but the equal is not similar 174,1 'in things that are just and in love' (1158b29-30); for in things that are just the equal is sought primarily according to worth and proportionally among those who accept, while the equal according to quantity is sought secondarily. For if an allocation is according to worth and proportional, it is just, and even if it differs greatly in amount, 5 nothing prevents the rationale of the just from being preserved; but if it should be equal according to quantity and not proportional, it cannot be just. In the case of love it is the reverse: for in this, the equal is sought first according to quantity, and secondarily according to

proportion. For if they much differ from one another and the gap in
 10 between is not small, but one exceeds the other greatly in virtue or
 resources or some other thing, they are not friends, for they neither
 can be nor wish to be. This is more apparent in the case of ourselves
 and God; for because he maximally exceeds us in all good things, love
 [in the sense of friendship] has no place there. 'It is obvious also in
 15 the case of kings, for those who are much more lowly do not think that
 they are worthy of being friends' with them, 'nor do those who are
 worth nothing with the best and wisest' (1158b36-1159a3).

Those, then, who differ greatly are not able to be friends, but it is
 possible with moderate superiority; but as to how much, it is not
 possible to say definitively and give an exact account. For in fact when
 many things are taken away from one of the friends,⁸ so that the other
 exceeds him, it happens that the love still abides, but it also happens
 20 that it is dissolved when a huge gap arises in between, as in the case
 of ourselves and God. Therefore 'it is even debated whether friends
 do not wish for their friends the greatest of goods' (1159a6-7); for if
 they do wish it, they will pray for them that they become gods; but
 this will dissolve the friendship. Therefore, if they wish for them the
 greatest of goods, they wish that they not be their friends; but this is
 25 opposed to the definition of love. And further, they will not even be
 good for them, since they are not friends. Consequently, they will not
 pray for such good things for them. To this one must say that a friend
 prays for good things for a friend for his sake, and if it is for his [i.e.,
 the friend's] sake, it is necessary that the friend abide [as a friend]
 and that the good things happen to him. But he would abide [as a
 friend] if he should be a human being, and not out of a human being
 30 become a god. To him as a human being a friend will wish the greatest
 goods; but perhaps not all [goods], as the majority of friends go:⁹ 'for
 each person most wishes good things for himself' (1159a12).

**<On whether love is more in loving or in
 being loved. Chapter 10>**

35 'On account of love of honour, most people seem to wish to be loved
 more than to love; therefore most people are lovers of flatterers'
 (1159a12-14), and are pleased when they are together with flatterers,
 because they exceed them, though they think they are friends. Ex-
 ceeding their friends is pleasing to lovers of honour. For indeed
 flatterers pretend that they are less in all respects than those who
 are with them, and that because of this they love more than they are
 175,1 loved. 'It seems that being loved is close to being honoured, which
 indeed is what most people aspire to' (1159a16-17); but those who
 seek to be honoured do not seek it for itself, but rather incidentally,
 for honour seems to them to be a good on account of something else.

To the many, if they are honoured by those who exceed them, [it seems to be a good] ‘on account of hope, for they think’ (1159a20) that they will get what they need from those who honour them, and ‘they enjoy the honour as a sign of favour’ (1159a21). But the more decent people who desire to be honoured by decent people pursue honour because they aspire to suppose firmly the best things about themselves, and they confirm their good opinions about themselves by the vote of those who honour them. They enjoy, then, the honour, and hence trust that they are good people.¹⁰

Being honoured, then, is sought on account of something else, but being loved [is sought] for itself; for in fact it is pleasing and lovable in itself. ‘Therefore [being loved] would seem to be better than being honoured, and love would seem to be choiceworthy in itself’ (1159a25-7); for since it consists in being loved and in loving, if each is choiceworthy in itself, it is clear that love is choiceworthy in itself. But not only is being loved choiceworthy in itself, but also loving, and by so much the more as it is better. Whence love is more in loving than in being loved. ‘A sign of this is that mothers enjoy loving’ (1159a28), and do not seek to be loved by their children, for some give their own [children] for adoption to other women or give them in some other way to be nurtured by them, and because they [the mothers] are not recognized, they are not loved. These women ‘know and love [their children], but do not seek to be loved in return if both [loving and being loved] are not possible; but it seems to be sufficient for them if they see’ (1159a29-31) that their children are well off. ‘Since love is more in loving’ than in being loved, ‘and those who are loving of friends are praised, the virtue of friends seems to be in loving. Thus, those in whom this exists according to worth are enduring friends, and the love of such people’ (1159a33-b1) is firm. Thus, unequal people may also be friends, if they love one another worthily, for they would thus become equal to one another, and equality is amity.

**<On the firmness of love and whence come
loving and being loved. Chapter 11>**

Now, this similarity is chiefly and in the proper sense found in worthy people, but in base people dimly, though more in those [who are friends] on account of the useful and the pleasant. For worthy people are both similar to themselves (for they are not easily changed nor do they enjoy now some things and now others, but rather worthy deeds [only]; for their virtue is enduring because it is a habitual condition), and therefore they are permanently similar to one another and endure in their love; ‘and also they neither need base things nor do they do such [i.e., base] things as services. Rather, they actually prevent them by and large, for it is the part of good people neither to

err themselves nor to entrust their friends' (1159b5-7) to do services [of such a sort]. But wicked people are wicked in this respect too, that they do not always enjoy the same things, and hence they are neither permanently similar to themselves nor to their friends. And therefore they endure a short time in love, 'enjoying the wickedness of one another. But useful and pleasing people' (1159b10) are greater in similarity, for the search for the useful and the pleasing is more enduring; and therefore they are similar to themselves and to one another, by virtue of the fact that both seek the useful or the pleasing so that they may provide pleasures or benefits to one another.

Such, then, are the loves from similarity. Love seems also to arise out of oppositeness – that [love], indeed, which is on account of what is useful – for example a poor person becomes a friend to one who is rich, and an ignorant person to one who knows: 'for one aspires to that of which one happens to be in need and bestows in return something else' (1159b14-15) which one is able to give. A lover and beloved may also be subsumed in this love, and the love of a beautiful and an ugly person. This is why lovers often seem ridiculous, since they expect to be loved in return by their beloveds in a similar way, though they are ugly and the [beloveds] beautiful. For if indeed they are lovable in a similar way, what they expect is reasonable and it is just that they be loved in a similar way; but if not, they are ridiculous. Therefore love seems to arise out of opposites, too, because ugly people are passionate for those who are beautiful, and so too poor people for those who are rich and ignorant people for those who are knowledgeable. In nature too parched things crave the wet. But such love of opposites is not [of opposites] in themselves but rather incidentally; for it is not insofar as they love one another that these things are opposites, but rather it [just] happens that they are opposites. For indeed a poor person is passionate for a rich because he is beneficial and useful to him, but one who is useful and beneficial to a person who deals with him is not his opposite in himself. For in that case¹¹ every person who was useful to the one who deals with him would be his opposite, but this is not so; for a soldier [in himself] is not opposite to a general nor a teacher to a pupil. Moreover, a lover loves his beloved because he is pleasing to him, but a pleasing person is not opposite [in himself] to one who is pleased by him, but rather it [just] happens that they are opposites. By nature, moreover, the parched craves not the wet, which is its opposite, but the mean; for desire is for the good, and the mean is good. 'Let these things, then, be dismissed' (1159b23), for in fact they are not closely related to the present treatise.

<On civic love. Chapter 12>

It seems, then, as was said earlier, that love and what is just are about the same things. And in fact what is just is sought in the associations of men with one another, and in these love too occurs. For in fact fellow-voyagers and soldiers, and in general those who share any actions and pursuits with one another, both seek to observe what is just toward one another and are loving toward one another; and insofar as they share, to that extent they also love one another and do what is just in respect to one another. Hence, the proverb says, 'friends' things are in common', and rightly, 'for love is in commonality' (1159b31-2). But associations differ, for brothers and comrades have everything in common, but others have not everything but rather certain defined things, and of these 'some have more, some less' (1159b33-4). 35 177,1

The loves too are proportional to the commonalities, for some are greater, some lesser, following upon the commonalities. Similarly, what is just too is proportional to the loves. For the same things are not just for brothers toward one another and for a father toward a son or for citizens or comrades toward one another, but rather different things are, and these things are greater or lesser as they follow upon the [different] loves. For it is not similarly unjust to deprive a comrade and a [fellow] citizen of money, and not to help a brother who is in need and a stranger, and to strike a father and any other person whatsoever. For 'what is just increases by nature together with love, since they are in the same things and extend over an equal [range]' (1160a7-8); and it is more terrible to wrong one who is dearer and who shares and loves more than one in respect to whom the commonality and love are less. 5 10

All associations in which there is love and what is just are parts of civic [association]; for civic association exists for the sake of advantage, and it was on account of this that government arose in the beginning and abides. Every association exists for the sake of advantage, one for one advantage and another for another; for we provide what is advantageous to ourselves through associations and we share with one another on account of these [advantages], so that we may provide ourselves with some of the things [that are advantageous] for our lives. This common advantage is what 'law-givers too aim at, and they say that the common advantage is just. Now, the other [associations]' – both the wholes and their parts – 'aspire to what is advantageous, for example sailors [aspire] to what is advantageous for the voyage', for example money or something else, 'and fellow-soldiers' desire what is advantageous 'for war' (1160a13-17), for example money or victory or a city, 'and similarly [fellow]-tribesmen and demesmen' (116a19).¹² Some associations aspire to what is pleasing 15 20 25

and ‘seem to exist on account of pleasure’ (1160a19), for example an association of worshippers or of meal-club members; for the one exists for the sake of the sacrifice, the other for sake of the gathering, both of which are rather [in the area] of the pleasing. These too are parts of civic [association], for they too are oriented toward the common advantage by civic [association]. And in fact it [civic association] seeks not only what is advantageous now but also what is not now advantageous but will be advantageous, and it pursues this; for it aspires not only to a present advantage but also to one that is for life. That is why [Aristotle] brought in reunions and gatherings accompanied by pleasure and relaxations from toil; for the reunions and the sacrifices take place after the gatherings of the harvests, and are a kind of first-fruits: ‘for they used to have leisure above all in these periods’ (1160a27-8). Through these associations, then, the divinity became propitious toward them, which, they thought, would be advantageous, and they themselves, relaxing, were fresh when they engaged in toils for the sake of advantage. Therefore it appears that every association – both that which arises for the sake of the pleasing and that for the sake of advantage – has advantage as its ultimate end, and all, therefore, are parts of civic [association]. Loves too follow upon these associations, and the loves will be differentiated just as the associations are, and the loves will be such as the associations are.

<On the three kinds of civic association. Chapter 13>

5 One must now speak about civic [association]. There are three kinds of this: kingship, aristocracy, and timocracy, which the majority are in the habit of also calling [simply] government. This last, indeed, exists on the basis of [property] valuations [*timēmata*], for people give money and get rulership; therefore it is appropriate to call it timocracy. Of these governments ‘kingship is the best, and timocracy the worst’ (1160a35-6).

10 These, then, are the governments. The deviations and, as it were, corruptions of the governments are, in the case of kingship, tyranny, ‘for both are monarchies, but they differ greatly: for a tyrant looks to his own advantage, while a king looks to that of those who are ruled. For one who does not’ suffice unto himself ‘and exceed in all good things is not a king’ (1160b1-4); for such a person [i.e., a king] will not need to draw to himself the things that belong to those who are ruled. Therefore, he does not look to what is beneficial to himself when he governs and transacts public matters, but only to that of those who are ruled. For he will provide what is advantageous to himself not from what is public but from his own household. One who is not like this would be a kind of official appointed by lot rather than a king.

Tyranny, then, is opposite to kingship, for a tyrant pursues his own good, and much more so than an official appointed by lot; and because he is even worse, the difference with respect to a king is more apparent. Therefore, tyranny is indeed something opposite to kingship, because the one is the best thing, the other the worst, and the worst is opposite to the best. A government passes, then, 'from a kingship to a tyranny, for a tyranny is the base form of monarchy, and a wicked king becomes a tyrant' (1160b10-12).

25

Tyranny, then, is the deviation of kingship, and that of aristocracy is oligarchy, when those who govern this [form of] government distribute the city's things – whether all or most – to themselves contrary to desert; they also continually give the offices of the city to the same people to manage, so that they may become their companions and through them be able to reap for themselves what is public. Hence it happens that there are a certain few people in charge of affairs, and wicked ones instead of the most decent. Democracy is the deviation of timocracy, 'for these are neighbouring; for timocracy too wishes to be of the majority, and all those who are in the [property] valuation are equal. Democracy is the least wicked' (1160b17-20), for it oversteps the form of timocracy only a little, for it shares with it more than it differs from it. For it differs from it in [the limits of] the [property] valuation, but shares with it in respect to equality (for all who are in the valuation are equal) and in respect to [the role of] the multitude.

30

35

<On the analogues of these kinds. Chapter 14>

179,1

The kinds, then, of political [association] pass above all into these; for each of the abovementioned governments changes by the least [transition] into the one that is contrary to it and passes most easily into this. Further, there are analogues and, as it were, examples of these [governments] in the household [sphere], for in households one may see an image of kingship and aristocracy and the others. 'For the association of a father in respect to his son has the form of kingship. For a father is concerned for his children; thus Homer too calls Zeus 'father', for kingship wants to be paternal authority' (1160b24-7). The Persians overstep this [limit] and produce tyranny [instead]; for they rule their sons as though they were slaves, and authority over slaves is [a kind of] tyranny, for the advantage of the master is always sought from his slaves. Now, such authority over children is erroneous, but that which resembles kingship sticks to what is needful; for it is necessary, since a son differs from a slave, that [the kinds of] authority over them also be different.

5

10

The association, then, of a father in respect to his son resembles kingship, but that of a husband in respect to his wife resembles

15

aristocracy. 'For the husband rules in accord with desert' (1160b33) and because he is the better; and it will, indeed be an aristocracy when the husband assigns to himself what is appropriate to a husband and concedes to his wife what is fitting to a wife. But such an association will overstep aristocracy and change into oligarchy when the husband controls everything; for he does this contrary to desert and not in virtue of being better. 'Sometimes wives rule' (1161a1), when they are heiresses and therefore exceed their husbands in wealth and power; for such authority does not arise on account of virtue, but rather, as in oligarchies, on account of wealth and power.

Such, then, are aristocracy and oligarchy in the household. But the association of brothers is timocracy, 'for they are equal, except insofar as they diverge in their ages; therefore, if they differ greatly in their ages, their love is no longer brotherly' (1161a4-6), but rather resembles a kind of paternal [love] in respect to children. 'Democracy occurs above all in houses that are masterless, for there, all are equal' (1161a6-8); and it occurs also in those in which the one who rules is weak and therefore each person has authority over himself.

**<On love in respect to each of the [forms of]
government. Chapter 15>**

These, then, are the associations in the civic and household [spheres]; and it appears that love follows upon all these associations and to the same extent as what is just does. Now, royal association has a hierarchical love if the king exceeds in services and helps his subjects and is concerned for them, since he is good, 'in order that they fare well, like a shepherd for his flocks; hence Homer [*Iliad* 2.243, etc.] too calls Agamemnon shepherd' (1161a13-15) of his people. 'Such too is paternal' (1161a15) love, for it too is hierarchical. 'But it differs in the magnitude of the services' (1161a16), for a father does greater services, for he is the cause of the existence of the child, which seems the greatest of all things, and also of its nurture and education. 'These things are also attributed to grandfathers' (1161a17-18), for a father is by nature sovereign over his children and a grandfather over his grandchildren and a king over his subjects. All such loves are in [accord with] superiority. 'Therefore parents are honoured' (1161a20-1); and what is just, conformably to the love, is not the same [for each] but in [accord with] superiority; for what is just in respect to a father exceeds that in respect to a son. For it is necessary to render in accord with worth: it is on this account that the love itself arises.

Hierarchical love follows not only upon royal association but also upon aristocratic, for the feeling of love is greater in respect to the better person. Such too is the love of a husband in respect to his wife, for such an association is aristocracy within the household; for the

husband rules in accord with his virtue, and it is necessary to bestow more of the feeling of love upon the better person. Similarly, there too the just is also in [accord with] superiority. 15

Comradely love, which is in [accord with] equality, follows upon a timocratic association, which is the same kind as that of brothers; for comrades are equals and agemates. Such people are 'similar in learning¹³ and similar in character for the most part' (1161a26-7), 20 such as those in a timocracy also are. 'For the citizens wish to be equal and decent' (1161a28-9), and each rules on an equal [footing] and is ruled in turn; both the love and what is just, indeed, are on an equal [footing].

Now, love and what is just follow in this way upon the healthy [forms of] government and association; but in the deviations of the governments, just as what is just is but little, so too is the love. Since tyranny is the worst of the deviations, for this reason love is found in it not at all or very little; 'for in those in which there is nothing 25 common to the one who rules and the one who is ruled, neither is there love' (1161a32-4), for neither is there what is just. But just as a craftsman is [disposed] toward his tool and the soul toward the body, so too a master will be [disposed] toward a slave and a tyrant toward one who is ruled. For a tool is benefited by a craftsman and the body 30 by the soul, but there is no love for them, for love cannot exist for inanimate things. Nor is there any of what is just toward them on the part of those who use them, just as there is not toward a cow or dog. In the same way, neither is there love of a master toward a slave nor a tyrant's toward those who are ruled, insofar as they are slaves, for there is nothing in common to masters and slaves; for a slave is an 35 animate tool and a tool is an inanimate slave. 'As a slave, then, there is no love toward him, but as a human being', it is possible for it to exist; 'for it seems that there is something of what is just in every human being toward every' (1161b5-7) human being who is able to share in some laws and rules. For a commonality of laws produces what is just toward one another, and a commonality in respect to what is just also brings in love. A tyrant, accordingly, will have love for 40 those who are ruled insofar as they are human beings. Therefore, both 181,1 what is just and love are somewhat dim there, but in a democracy they are at their greatest, 'for many things are in common to those who are equal' (1161b10).

<On comradely and kindred and household love. Chapter 16>

All love, then, is in commonality, as has been said, and only kindred 5 and comradely love do not seem to be in commonality. For those that arise according to some agreement and contract are commonality-

based loves, such as the tribe-based and voyage-based [loves] and as many as are of this sort; and one might class the hospitality-based [love] among these as well. But the kindred and comradely [loves] do not arise according to some agreement or contract, but rather nature
 10 binds together the one group [i.e., kinsmen], while the fact that they happen to be agemates and earnest about the same pursuits binds the other.

One must speak, then, about kindred [love]. Kindred love, then, is of several kinds, and every one depends upon paternal [love]; for brothers and kinsmen of other sorts love one another on account of a relationship to a common father or grandfather. For parents cherish
 15 their children as being a bit of themselves, while children [cherish] their parents inasmuch as they [themselves] are a bit [deriving] from them, and brothers [cherish] brothers because they have been born from the same [parents]. 'Parents better know' that their children are from them than 'the begotten [know] that they are of the former'; the cause and begetter 'is more bound to' (1161b19-21) what has been
 20 begotten or made than what is begotten¹⁴ is to the one who has made it and what has been begotten is to the one who has begotten it. For that which is from something is the own thing of that from which it is, as a tooth or hair is the own thing of the one who has it; but the one who has it is not the own thing of the hair and tooth. Accordingly, either the cause is in no way the own thing of what is caused, and that from which something is [is in no way the own thing] of that which is from it, nor has it any relation to it; or else, if it does have one, it has a lesser [relation] than the other [i.e., the thing caused]
 25 has toward it. And children indeed love their parents less than they are loved by them. Furthermore, this is also evident from [the aspect of] time, 'for these [i.e., parents] cherish those who are born immediately' (1161b24-5); but their children [cherish] them some time later after acquiring understanding and sensibility. Therefore, too, mothers love their children more than fathers do, since they cherish them sooner.

30 'Parents, then, love their children as themselves (for they are from themselves like' (1161b27-8) other selves, differing only in being separate); but children love their parents 'since they have been born from them, and brothers [love] one another because they have been born from the same [parents]' (1161b29-31). For the sameness in respect to their parents produces a sameness also in them in respect to one another, just as the sameness of the root unites the shoots.
 35 Therefore 'they say "the same blood and root" and such things' (1161b32), for each is one and the same in several differentiated things.

Having been brought up together and being of the same age 'are also important for love' (1161b33). For one of the same age loves

another of the same age, and 'companions are comrades; therefore brotherly [love] too is similar to comradely [love], and cousins and other kinsmen are bound to [one another]' (1161b35-62a) [by descent] from brothers. 'For by being from those who are the same' (1162a2) they too are somehow the same as one another. Among relatives, 'some are more [closely] related while others are more remote, by virtue of how near or far the founder' (1162a2-4) of the family is; for the commonality grows dim among those who have it from afar, since it is lessened the further it proceeds.

The love of children for their parents and of human beings for God is as for a good and superior thing (for they are benefactors who provide one the greatest benefactions: to exist and be nurtured and be educated), while that of kinsmen toward one another is in equality. Such love also has more of the pleasant and the useful than that of people who are remote in family, in the degree in which their life is more common to them and they share in more things with one another; and most of all brotherly love is so, for all those things pertain to it that [pertain] to comradely [love], and [pertain] to it more than they do to the latter. Therefore, if brothers are decent and similar they will love one another more than comrades do; for they are more related and similar to one another, and they cherish one another out of kinship and are more similar in character, because they have been born from the same [parents] and have been educated similarly. 'The test of time too' (1162a14) is greater and firmer here.

The greatest love, then, among the kindred [loves] is the brotherly, but the others are analogous to the relationship according to family. 'The love of a husband and wife seems to exist according to nature, for a human being is by nature' (1162a16-17) more a child-bearing 'than a civic [creature], in the degree that the household is earlier and more necessary than the city' (1162a18-19) and in the degree that child-bearing is more common to animals than government is. For the former occurs in all animals, while government occurs only among human beings. Other animals, then, have commonality only to the extent that it is possible for them to bear children, while human beings have commonality not only for child-bearing 'but also for the things that are [beneficial] for life' (1162a21-2); for their functions have been intrinsically differentiated and the functions of a husband are other than those of a wife. 'They support one another, consequently, by placing their individual things in common' (1162a23-4). This is why both the useful and the pleasing appear to be in this love, and the good and virtue would also be in it, 'if they [the husband and wife] are decent; for each has a virtue' (1162a26), and if they should each be worthy in respect to the appropriate virtue, they may enjoy one another also on this account. Children too seem to be a bond for love of this sort; 'therefore childless [couples] more quickly break up,

for children are a common good for both' (1162a27-9), and what is common binds together things that share.

**<On complaints in love according to
the useful. Chapter 17>**

35 'How ought a man to live in relation to his wife' (1162a29-30) and a brother in relation to his brother, and in general a dear one in relation to a dear one, is the same as [the question of] how one is just [in relation to each]. For what is just follows upon every commonality proportionally to the love, as has been said several times; and for a dear one to be just toward one who is dear, and for one [to be just] toward a stranger, do not appear to be the same thing, nor toward a brother or toward a comrade and a schoolmate.

Now, since the loves are three [in kind] – on account of the good, 40 on account of the pleasing, and on account of the useful – and in each [kind] some are dear in equality while others are so according to superiority (for indeed both those who are similar become friends according to the good or the pleasing or the useful, and so too those 183,1 who are better with those who are worse), those who are equal should love according to equality and should be equal in all other things, while those who are unequal should love and be loved proportionally to their superiority and deficiency.

5 Only in love according to the useful, or chiefly in this [love], 'complaints and recriminations' (1162b5) on the part of friends toward one another understandably occur; 'for those who are friends on account of virtue are eager' to help 'one another, for this pertains to virtue and love' (1162b6-8). When friends compete in respect to this [i.e., virtue], 'there are neither complaints nor battles, for no one is annoyed with one who loves him and helps him, but rather, if he is 10 gracious' (1162b9-10), he reciprocates by helping in turn. The one who exceeds the other in services, 'thus getting what he aspires to, would not lay a complaint against his friend' (1162b11-12); for each aspires to the good and to helping. Neither, indeed, can those who love on account of pleasure be much annoyed with one another, 'for both simultaneously get what they desire, if they enjoy spending time together' (1162b13-14). Indeed, one who laid a complaint against a 15 friend because he did not amuse him would be ridiculous, since it is possible to be amused by spending time together. Thus, neither love on account of the good nor that on account of pleasure involves complaints and recriminations; only that on account of the useful is liable to complaints, 'for, since they deal with one another on terms of benefit, they always need more and think they have less than what is appropriate, and they recriminate because they do not get as much 20 as they need, although they are worthy' (1162b16-19) of getting it.

For those who help them are not able to grant them as much as they need, since those who are helped always need more than their benefactors are able to help them in.

‘It seems that just as what is just is double (on the one hand unwritten, on the other according to law)’ (1162b21-2), so too of love according to the useful, one [part] is character-based while the other is law-based: law-based usefulness when someone gives something to someone on the condition that he get [in return] something specified and defined, and character-based when someone grants something to someone and thinks it right that he garner what is equal or more, but this is neither specified nor defined. Complaints and recriminations follow loves in accord with both [kinds of] usefulness, but most of all when one of the friends brings in law-based usefulness and the other character-based, for such people quickly break up. For if the one benefits [the other] in money and thinks it right that he be similarly benefited and that he get as much as he has given, but the other benefits [the first] with some other benefit, they are not able to abide in their love. 25

Of law-based usefulness, one [kind] is wholly commercial, while another is more liberal; for not giving unless it is possible to get it [back] at once, from hand to hand, is wholly commercial, but it is more liberal when the one who has given delays receipt. This too occurs according to an agreement about what one owes in exchange for what – for the debt is defined and is not ambiguous – but the delay in the return makes the contract somehow more liberal and loving. ‘Therefore among some [peoples]’ (1162b29) there do not exist law-suits for these things, nor do people go to law with one another over debts, ‘but rather they think that one should cherish those who have contracted according to trust’ (1162b30-1). One who benefits [another] according to character-based usefulness grants something or benefits [him] with some other benefit, not on specified [terms] but as to a friend; ‘and he thinks it right that he garner what is equal or more, as though he has not given but rather has lent’ (1162b32-3). And if he does not get it [back], he lays a complaint against the one who has not given [in return], not as if he has lent something but rather as against a friend. ‘This happens because all or most people wish noble things, but choose those that are beneficial’ (1162b34-6). It is noble to help ‘without doing so in order to be helped in return, while it is beneficial to have services done for one’ (1162b36-7); therefore people seek what is beneficial, but if they do not get it they wish to seem noble. Those who are able to should help such friends in all seriousness even if they are helping one so that they may be helped [in return]; and one should pay in return a worthy service. For they must not drag toward true love by force those who do not wish it, but they should rather be annoyed that it escaped their notice that they had been helped by one 184,1 5 10

by whom they ought not to have been – for it was not by a friend – and they should seek a way in which they may voluntarily erase the shameful services which they involuntarily accepted because they did not recognize the one who did the services. They will erase them, if they are able, by themselves paying in return and immediately dissolving [the debt] just as if it were on specified [terms]; and if they are not able to do so at that time, then by agreeing that when they are able they will by all means pay immediately in return. If, however, they are utterly unable to reciprocate, then those who have given will not demand anything from them either. Thus, if they are able, they should immediately pay in return. But before one is done a service, each person should inquire by whom he is being done the service and on what terms, so that he may know if he should accept it or not.

**<On the measure of return in useful [love]¹⁵ and more
on recriminations in love according to
superiority. Chapter 18>**

There is a puzzle involved in exchanges among friends toward one another. For, since from great services there often result small benefits to those who have been done the services, and from small [services] great [benefits] (for it is possible that one who has done and spent much has benefited his friend little, and the reverse), should those who reciprocate look to the benefit [to themselves] or to the measure of the service? For in fact those who have been helped say that they have got from their benefactors the kinds of things ‘that were small for them’ to give ‘and possible for them themselves to get from others’ (1163a13-14), in this way minimizing the services, while those who have helped, on the contrary, say that they have done the greatest services of which they were capable ‘and things which it was not possible’ to get ‘from others’ (1163a15), and amidst dangers and needs that are near to dangers. It is thus debated whether one should measure the recompense by the benefit to the one who has been helped or by the service on the part of the one who has performed it.

The case is not similar for every love. Rather, in the case of love on account of the useful the return will be proportional to the benefit [that accrues] to the one who has been helped or it will even exceed this [benefit], for in this way it is more noble; for in fact he [the beneficiary] is the one who is in need and [the other] ‘supports him on the grounds that he will garner an equal [benefit]’ (1163a18-19). The assistance, accordingly, has turned out to be as great as the amount in which the person was benefited, or even more; and in general it is a worthy thing to measure reciprocity by the benefit to oneself, because one is a friend on account of this [benefit].

In the case of love on account of virtue there are neither complaints

as in the case of the former [kind of love], in which each one wishes to draw the services in the direction of his own benefit, nor are recompenses measured by the benefit to those who are helped, but rather by the decision of those who help. For the authoritative [part] of virtue and character is in decision. Since, then, they love one another on account of virtue, and they will measure recompenses by the decision [of the other], such a love is innocent of every complaint, while the others are continually [enmeshed] in complaints. So too is [love] according to superiority, when a greater person loves a lesser or a more beneficial person one who is less beneficial; for the one who exceeds thinks it right that he have more, the one because he is better and the other because he is more beneficial. For, [Aristotle] says, if each of the friends should contribute according to his ability and will not receive according to the value [of what he has given], the love will be a kind of donation. Therefore [such people] say that they should get not similar things out of love but rather greater things; for they think that, just as when people contribute money in a business, those who contribute more have more of the profit, so it is right too in the case of love. Those who exceed say these things, but those who are exceeded deny that these things are appropriate to friends who exceed, but rather the reverse; 'for it is the part of a good friend to support those who are in need. For what benefit, they say, is there in being a friend to a worthy person or to a person in power if one is going to enjoy nothing' (1163a33-5) of the friend's goods? Laying complaints in this way against one another and each thinking it right that he have more, they easily break up. And it seems that each thinks correctly: for one should allot more [of something] to each [of the parties] as a result of love, 'but not of the same thing; rather, to the one who exceeds' (1163b2-3) one should allot more of honour, but render to the one in need more of what he needs. 'For honour is the reward of virtue and service, while profit', or whatever else the person is in need of, 'is the assistance for neediness' (1163b3-5).

In governments too it appears to work the same way, for honour is always rendered to benefactors. 'For one who provides nothing good to the public is not honoured; for what is public is given to one who benefits the public, and honour is a public thing. For it is not possible simultaneously to make money from the public [stores] and be honoured' (1163b6-9), but rather one who is in need gets money that is the public's, but is not honoured at all. For no one will accept being diminished in both respects – in respect to honour and in respect to money – but if he gives the one he will receive the other. Therefore they allot honour to the one who is diminished when it comes to money in behalf of the public, but money to the money-grubber: 'for what is according to worth (*axia*) equalizes and preserves the love, as has been said' (1163b11-12).

In this way too, indeed, one should associate with unequal friends, 'and the one who is benefited by means of money or virtue should pay in return honour' (1163b13-14) to the one who benefits him. And he will pay in return what is possible, 'for love seeks what is possible, not what is according to value (*axia*)' (1163b15). For not all people can pay in return according to the value of that which they owe. For it is not possible in the case of all people to find something that is [equal] in value; thus, in honours [paid] to the gods and parents no one is able to pay the value in return, but one who tends [the other] according to his ability and as much as is possible 'seems to be a decent person' (1163b18). Therefore it seems that it is not permissible for a son to disown his father and not obey him in what he thinks right concerning any matter whatsoever (for he always owes and therefore should always pay in return; for he has done nothing for his father that is worth that in which he has been benefited); but [it is permissible] for a father to disown his son. For it is permissible for benefactors to release those who owe them. Perhaps no father stands aloof from his son unless he should be exceedingly wicked, for both natural love induces one to this [i.e., caring for one's son] and at the same time it is human not to reject assistance [i.e., that which the son is expected to provide for the father]. But to a son who is truly wicked, supporting his father is hateful or not taken very seriously. For most people wish to be helped, but they avoid helping as being unprofitable. 'Concerning these things, then, let this much have been said' (1164b27-8).

[Paraphrase of Book 9]

<What kinds of things preserve love. Chapter 1>

Let us speak further about love and add what is needed to what has been said [in Book 8]. In loves according to equality, then, friends should render equal things in return to one another, while in loves dissimilar in kind [i.e., between dissimilar people, they should render] what is proportional, as has been said, for proportion equalizes friends in civic associations. For a shoemaker will acquire in return for shoes not shoes but rather that which is in accord with their value and is proportional, as has been discussed at length in the fifth book (1131a29-1133b28); similarly too the weaver and the like, for this preserves civic associations: giving and getting proportionally what each one either needs or is affluent in. But in civic associations there is also currency as a common measure, to which everything is referred, and by which we measure givings and gettings, while in character-based and loving [associations] there is nothing by which

it is possible to measure things dissimilar in kind. Therefore such associations are always [implicated] in complaints, as, for example, an erotic [association] is. For in fact sometimes the [erotic] lover lays a complaint against the beloved 'because he loves exceedingly but is not loved in return' (1164a3-4), though he is not worthy of being loved, if it so chanced; and often the beloved recriminates with his [erotic] lover because he [the lover] used previously to promise him everything <but now he fulfils none of it. Such things happen when the one is passionate (*erôn*) on account of pleasure, while the other is so¹⁶ on account of utility, but later, the latter is neither very pleasing nor the former useful; 'for because the love existed on account of these things', when they are not present, 'a dissolution occurs' (1164a8-9). For they did not cherish one another but rather one another's things, and these things, since they were not enduring, destroy the love besides. But those who cherish one another and one another's characters, as worthy people do, are enduring in their love, for they love one another for their own selves and nothing else, and if they abide in [being] themselves they also preserve the love.

Friends who are dissimilar in kind fall out too when they get different things from their friends and not what they desired; 'for it is like getting nothing when one does not get what one craved' (1164a14-15), just like the man who promised the cithara-player that he would give him more 'in the degree that he sang better, but when, toward dawn, he [the cithara-player] demanded [fulfilment of] the promises, he said that he had paid back pleasure for pleasure. If, then, each' (1164a16-18) had wished to get pleasure, the association would have been satisfactory, but if the one was seeking amusement but the other profit, and the one got what he was seeking but the other did not, 'what accords with the association would not be right' (1164a20); for each one gives what he himself happens to possess for the sake of what he needs.

<Concerning whose part it is to establish the recompense in a benefaction done without an agreement, and further on love according to virtue and that according to the useful in which there is no agreement. Chapter 2>

In dissimilar loves [i.e., between people of dissimilar status], then, what is proportional and according to value is sought. But there is a puzzle about which person is authorized to establish a worthy recompense, the one who gives first or the one who receives. For the one who gives first seems to leave it to the one who receives to establish the recompense, as Protagoras used to do: for he did not himself set and demand a fee from his disciples for his teaching, but rather he used to bid them to evaluate how much they thought what they

learned was worth, and he took that amount. In such associations some people are satisfied with proportional recompenses, and are content with the [words] of Hesiod: 'his wage should be sufficient for a man' [*Works and Days* 370]. But commercial people and those
 20 involved in business seek [to gain] more by using associations, and sometimes they receive money in advance and, although they have promised that they will pay it [back] immediately, they do not pay it back, nor do they do any of the things they said they would, and complaints are justly laid against them because they exceed their deeds with their promises. Therefore professors (*sophistai*) too do not teach before receiving a fee for their teaching, since no one would give
 25 them money on account of what they have learned, since it is slight. Promising to teach great things, they take the fee but then teach the slightest things.

'These people, then, if they do not do the things for which they took a fee, are understandably [involved] in complaints' (1164a32-3). But in those associations in which there is no agreement on the recompense or the service, those who benefit their friends on their [friends']
 30 account and give away their own things for the sake of their friends, like worthy people – 'it has been said that they are beyond complaint, for love according to virtue is of this sort, and one should make recompense in accord with one's decision; for this [i.e., decision or choice] is the part of a friend and of virtue' (1164a35-b2), as was shown in what was said previously. Such too is association according to philosophy; for the teacher of philosophy demands of the pupil not
 35 money or a fee on defined terms, for there is no [amount] in money or a fee that is worthy of philosophy. Rather, he looks to his decision; he believes that what is possible is sufficient action and recompense, in the way that [recompense] toward gods and parents too is just.

Those, then, who do favours for their friends on their [friends']
 189,1 account measure the worth of recompenses in this way. But those who [do favours] on some condition, either on account of the useful or on account of pleasure, will give and receive a recompense in a way that seems worthy to both; for in this way it would turn out that the association is innocent of complaints. But if this does not happen, and
 5 both in fact are not able to judge the appropriate recompense, but rather only one or neither, it is necessary that the recompenses occur according to the judgement of the one who accepts the benefactions. For if the one [who accepts] should say that he wishes to give so much in exchange for so much, and the other should grant it on these terms, then the former will give what he consented to give and will recompense [the other] by paying back either pleasure or some other
 10 benefit, and the latter will not lay a complaint when he has received what he judged it worthy to receive. Not only is this necessary and

frees the association of troubles, but it is also just, for if someone should get what he wishes, he is not wronged.

This is why in the case of commodities, too, it appears to occur in this way. For the one who buys establishes the price and measures it by his own benefit or pleasure, and says that the commodity that is sought is worth so much. There is even a law instituted among some [peoples] that there may not be law-suits over voluntary contracts, nor may one seek [out] another judge or other laws in such associations; rather, one should be reconciled with the person one trusted and with whom one has shared one's own things, even if one has abided by the contracts. For they think that it is more just that that one judge who was entrusted from the beginning to establish the recompense, rather than he who entrusted [the other]; for the latter will give his verdict after he has entrusted the one who accepts. Besides, no one is a trustworthy judge of his own things, since usually each person believes that his own things and what he gives are worth much. But if the one who shared his things gives trouble later, on the grounds that the other did not reciprocate worthily, then the latter, who was entrusted to establish the recompense of the benefactions he receives, is able to judge correctly, since he abided from the beginning by the contracts to which the one agreed and the other consented. For he will not grant the amount that he now believes the things are worth, after he has received them, but rather the amount at which he evaluated them when he had not yet received them.

<What should be paid back to whom. Chapter 3>

So much for these matters. But one must inquire into this too, whether one should pay back everything and obey in all respects those who are most honoured and dear, or are there some things that we shall pay back to those who are less honoured and loved rather than to those who are most honoured and dearest. For example, should one obey one's father in all things, whatever and whenever he bids? Or not always, but rather one should obey a doctor when one is ill and one skilled as general when one is at war. And it is worthy to elect as general not one's friend or father but rather a person skilled at war. Similarly, for whom should one rather do a service, one's friend or a worthy person? And should one do a favour for one's comrade, or one's benefactor, that is, the one to whom we happen to owe something, if, at all events, it is not possible to help both? Now, it is not easy to determine all these things severally and exactly, 'for they have many and all sorts of differences [or: differentiae]' and they differ variously from one another 'both in greatness and smallness and in what is noble and what is necessary' (1164b28-30). For not all things are similarly small or great or noble or necessary, but rather sometimes

tending one's friend seems more necessary than tending a worthy person, and sometimes it is more noble to help one's benefactor than one's friend, and also the reverse. Therefore it is not possible to give
 5 an exact account of each of these things. But it is evident that one should not pay back everything to the same person, but rather it is usually more just to render benefactions in return rather than to do a favour for one's comrades, just as one should pay back a loan to the one who has lent it rather than to a comrade. I say 'usually', because it happens [sometimes] that the reverse too is more just. 'So, for
 10 example, should one who has been ransomed from bandits ransom in return the one who redeemed him, no matter who he is' (1164b34-5)? Or if [the other] has not been captured, but demands [repayment], should one pay him back, or should one ransom one's father? For it would seem that one should rather [ransom] one's own father. This is why it was said that in general and usually one should pay back a debt rather than do a favour for one who is loved. But if doing a favour
 15 for one's friends is so very necessary and noble a thing as to exceed what is just in regard to benefactors, then one should lean toward that.

Moreover, neither is it always just to recompense a benefactor, if the benefactor should be wicked – for example, if a wicked person has made a loan to a good person; for a good person will not make a loan to a wicked one. For the latter has made the loan, knowing that he will get it [back] from the good person, but the good person, not
 20 expecting to get it back, does no wrong if he does not make a loan. If, then, the good person believes what is true concerning the wicked one, [namely] that he will be wicked in this matter too and will not pay back, then he [the good person] does the reasonable thing in not making him a loan; or if the latter is not such, but the former [i.e., the good person] thinks he is and for this reason does not recompense him in an equal amount, then in this way too he does what is not far from
 25 what is just. For it is not just that what a base person gives to a worthy person he [the base person] should receive from him as well; for what comes from a base person is not equal to what comes from a good one when both get the same thing from one another, for it becomes more because of the worth of the one who gives. This is why it was said that one should not always pay back benefactors rather than do a favour for one's friends. For as I said many times in the earlier [books],
 30 arguments about emotions and actions follow the emotions and the actions, and are different at different times, just as they [the emotions and actions] are; and it is not possible to provide [well] defined and exact [arguments] concerning each [instance].

'That one should not give back the same things to everyone, then, nor everything to one's father, just as not even to Zeus' (1165a14-15) do we sacrifice everything, is clear; but since we owe some things to

our parents, other things to our brothers, and still other things to our benefactors or comrades, one should bestow upon each what is proper and fitting. Almost all people, indeed, are seen to do this, for they invite to weddings not their benefactors or comrades but rather their kinsmen: 'for these have family in common and the actions, consequently, that concern it [i.e., the family]; and they think that kinsmen above all should come to funerals' (1165a19-21) for the same reasons. It would seem right to afford sustenance to one's parents, and to them more than to oneself, for people must preserve the existence of their parents, whence their own existence [derives]; and one should bestow honour upon them as one does upon gods, but not all and every sort of honour, 'for [one does not bestow] the same upon a father and a mother' (1165a25). Nor should one pay back to both of them the honour due to a wise man or that to a general, with which we of course honour a wise man or a general. Rather [one must render] paternal [honour] to a father, and the proper [honour] to a mother. One should also bestow upon every elderly person the honour that is in accord with his age, such as is obviously proper for a young man to render to an old man, by rising and giving a seat and such things. One should render to comrades and brothers frankness and sharing, and upon kinsmen and [fellow] tribesmen and citizens and all the rest¹⁷ one should also try to bestow what is proper to each, observing the relationship of each to oneself or their usefulness or virtue, and measuring by these things the honours and commonalities in respect to them.

Now, a judgement 'about people of like kind is easier' (1165a33-4), for we shall easily recognize what we should render to our kinsmen or [fellow] citizens or tribesmen or those who are otherwise of a like sort. But to find what we must bestow upon those who are alien and differ [from us] is more difficult. Nevertheless, one should not, on this account, indeed, give up what is likely but rather one should distinguish as well as possible concerning each person and watch closely what happens concerning everyone.¹⁸

<On dissolving friendships or not. Chapter 4>

One must inquire, furthermore, into this also, whether one should dissolve friendships (*philiai*) or not; for there is a puzzle whether sometimes one should desist from a friendship although one's friend still cherishes and loves one.¹⁹ We say, accordingly, that in respect to those who are loved on account of the useful or pleasing, it is not at all odd that [the friendship] is dissolved when they no longer have these [qualities]; for when what is pleasing or useful, which is what they were friends of, leaves off, it is reasonable that they do not love [any longer]. But when those who love on account of the useful or

25 pleasing pretend that they love on account of character and for the sake of the good, and are then exposed when they break up on account of this, they wrong [the other] and are justly [implicated] in complaints. 'For as we said in the beginning' (1165b6), such friendships are full of complaints when people are not loved and do not love one another on account of the same thing and similarly, and when they do not think they are loved in the way that they are [really] loved, but rather are deceived. For then, when the deception is exposed, they
30 lay complaints against one another.

When someone is mistaken, then, and supposes that he is loved on account of his character, although the other does and says nothing of the sort that is appropriate to one who loves on account of character, he may justly blame himself. 'But when he is deceived by the other's pretense, it is just to bring a complaint against the one who deceived him, and even more so than against those who counterfeit currency'
35 (1165b10-12), in the degree that the fraud concerns more valuable things.

In this way, then, it is just for those who are friends on account of the useful and the pleasing to break up. But if someone loves [another] on account of character and accepts him as good, but then that person should become wicked or even seems so to the one who loves him, should one still love him or should one dissolve [the friendship]? One must say, then, that neither is it possible for one who does not seem
192,1 to be good to be lovable, for the lovable is good, nor is it just [to love him]:²⁰ for one should not be a lover of evil nor should one be assimilated to a base person; but if one loves [the other], there is every necessity that one be assimilated, for it has been said 'that the similar is dear to the similar.

Should one, accordingly, dissolve it immediately' (1165b17-18), or should one not break up immediately with all people, but rather with
5 those who are incorrigible through an excess of wickedness? One should not dissolve [a friendship] with those who are sick with curable [ills] and able to accept correction; rather one should help them with every effort both to correct their character and to preserve their virtue more than their property, since virtue is a better thing than property and helping friends toward that is more loving than preserving their wealth. If one who can should expel poverty from a friend's household,
10 how much more just it is – or at all events more proper²¹ – to lead virtue into it, because they are friends on account of virtue. The better thing, then, is still to love a friend even after he has become wicked and to seek to correct him. But if one breaks off [the friendship] immediately, one does not seem to act beyond reason, for one was not a friend to the wicked person but to the good one, and one wrongs no one in not loving him when he is no longer good. Since, then, the good

man has been transformed and one is unable to save him, one 15
abandons one's friendship with him.

Now, if a friend becomes evil after being good, one should deal thus
with the dissolution. But if one of the friends becomes better than
himself and diverges greatly [from his former self] in virtue, while
the other abides as he was, should the worthy person [still] deal with
him [as a friend], although he is not such [as the worthy person now
is]? Or is this not possible, and should he rather dissolve [the friend-
ship]? 'This is most obvious over a great interval' (1165b25). For if 20
two children are friends on account of their age and because they
share pastimes and play, but when they develop into men one be-
comes worthy and is a man in all respects, while the other still abides
in having a childish character, how could they be friends, since they
are neither pleased by the same things nor do they enjoy or are they
hurt by the same things? For neither will be gratified by the other, 25
nor does either have what will make his friend more pleasing, if he
does it. Nor, further, will they be able to live together, without which
it is not possible for friendship to arise, as has been said. Must, then,
a worthy person be so disposed toward him as if he had never been a
friend? 'Or must one keep a memory of the past familiarity, and just
as we think that one must do favours for friends more than for
strangers, so too' (1165b32-4) one must allot more to those who once 30
were friends than to those whom we never treated as such? It seems,
accordingly, that something is owed to them 'on account of the
friendship that previously existed, unless the dissolution occurs on
account of an excess of wickedness' (1165b35-6).

**<On loving deeds and that a friend [is disposed] similarly
toward himself and toward his friend, but a base person 35
is not lovingly disposed at all, either toward
himself or toward another. Chapter 5>**

The dissolutions of friendships (*philiai*) may occur opportunely in this
way. Furthermore, let us speak about love (*philia*) itself. Things that
are loving (*philika*), then, and in which love consists, are thought to 193,1
have, as it were, as a kind of standard and beginning the things which
are owed by each person to himself: for friends seek those things from
one another which they [seek] also from themselves. This is why they
define a friend as one who wishes good things for his friend and does
things for his sake, 'or one who wishes that his friend exist and live
on his behalf; this is what mothers feel in regard to their children' 5
(1166a4-6), for they wish that their children live and fare well for the
sake of the children themselves, since often even when they are not
loved or even known by their children they pray for good things and
prosperity for them. Among friends, too, those who have had a falling

10 out or been neglected but still abide in loving feel this, for they wish
 all the good things for their friends, without expecting to share in
 them themselves, but rather for their [the friends'] sake. They define
 a friend also as 'one who suffers and rejoices with his friend' (1166a7-
 8), which also happens above all among mothers. From these things
 15 comes the definition of love, too, for the definition of a habitual
 condition is taken from the definition of those who have it;²² for the
 definition of a moderate person embraces²³ the definition of modera-
 tion.

These, then, are the definitions of love and of friends, and they have
 been taken from the things that are owed on the part of each person
 to himself, as has been said. For in fact a decent person is all these
 things to himself that a true friend is toward his friend; and a decent
 20 person, and one who thinks he is decent, is above all a friend to
 himself. But if not all people are [decent], and base people too bestow
 loving [kinds of] things upon themselves, it is in no way an obstacle
 to the argument. For in fact, the things that worthy and decent people
 do are what make the difference for human beings and their collective
 nature. And indeed virtue and the worthy man are the measure of
 human emotions and actions. But the things that a base man seeks
 25 are not subsumed under this collective nature, for we shall take the
 vote concerning these things not from those who are sick but rather
 from those who are healthy.

That a decent man bestows all the loving things upon himself is
 obvious, 'for he is of one mind with himself and desires the same
 things' (1166a13-14) in both his rational and his irrational soul; and
 it is not the case that, like the person without self-control, he seeks
 opposite things and his emotional [part] is at war with his reasoning
 30 [part]. And the worthy man indeed wishes good things for himself,
 both the things that are in the proper sense good (as many as lead to
 virtue) and those that appear good (which²⁴ also help virtue); and he
 wishes good things for himself for his own sake. For the base man
 does not [wish them] for his own sake; for the reflective [part] is what
 it is to be human, and the worthy man does everything and seeks all
 the good things for the sake of this, while the base man [seeks]
 35 nothing [for its sake]. For the base man does not have thinking as the
 goal of his actions but rather base pleasure. Hence, he does not wish
 good things for himself for his own sake.

Further, a worthy man wishes also that he himself live and
 survive, and above all in respect to his reflective [part], and he does
 all the things that he thinks are good for himself and those that lead
 194,1 to living and surviving. Of other people, those who have not entirely
 turned away from what is right, but are such as to be able to think
 that they are decent people, also seek what they think good and wish
 for themselves both to live and to survive; they are such because in a

way they resemble worthy people. But those who are very base and
 impious have none of these things: for they do not pursue what they
 think good, but rather they wish some things and desire different
 things, such as people without self-control do; and there are some
 who, on account of cowardice and laziness, abandon doing things that
 they think are best for themselves. They do not, accordingly, pursue
 what they think best, nor do they wish for themselves to live and
 survive; for some, because they are hated for the many and terrible
 things they have done, on account of an excess of wickedness 'flee
 living and do away with themselves' (1166b13).

But the worthy person wishes for himself to live, for existing is a
 good thing for a worthy person; for he pursues a life of thought <and>
 seeks to establish his own essence, for the essence of each person
 consists in thinking, or in this above all. But one who wishes his
 irrational [part] to exist and survive and wishes good things for
 himself although it [i.e., his self] has been diverted from what is
 proper [to it] does not wish good things for himself but rather for that
 into which he has been changed. Each person wishes that good things
 accrue to himself because he thinks that he remains what he is; but
 if he should be aware that he himself has become someone else, he
 would not choose that that thing that has come into being have all
 the good things, for to wish good things for some other person in no
 way differs from wishing them for oneself after it [one's self] has been
 changed. No one is content if good things accrue to someone else; for
 in fact all good things belong to God, but he is whatever he is. We are
 not content on this account, but rather we pray for good things for
 ourselves or for our friends, because our friends too are a bit of us.

Indeed, only a worthy person wishes to spend time together with
 himself, because he is self-sufficient and pleasing to himself; for he is
 pleased when he remembers by himself what he has done and he
 expects that he will still do good things and will meet good people,
 and he abounds in noble thoughts in his mind. All these things,
 indeed, make him most pleasing to himself, and he is pleased at being
 at leisure with himself and spending time together with himself. But
 wicked people seek those 'together with whom they will spend the
 day, while they flee themselves' (1166b14); for when they are by
 themselves they recall many annoying things, and they expect other
 such things which they forget when they are with other people.
 Further, a worthy person above all suffers and is pleased together
 with himself, because he wishes the same things and desires the same
 things and the rational [part] does not fight with the emotional.
 Therefore, too, the same thing is always painful to him and the same
 thing pleasing, for he is unregretting, so to speak. But wicked people
 are no longer so, for since they have nothing lovable they feel no loving
 [feeling] toward themselves. Therefore they neither rejoice nor suffer

with themselves, 'for their soul is in strife' (1166b19) and the irrational is at war with the rational; and the irrational [part] is pained when it refrains from wicked things, and at the same time the rational [part] does not suffer with it but rather rejoices, and vice versa. And in general 'one [part] draws [him] hither and the other thither' (1166b21), as if tearing [him] apart. And if it is not possible to be pained and pleased in the same respect, then rather after a little [while] it is pained at that by which it was pleased earlier; for it did not [then] wish that such a pleasure accrue to it. 'For base people are full of regret' (1166b24-5).

It appears, then, that a wicked man is not even loving toward himself, because he has nothing lovable. If being this way is extremely miserable, one must avoid wickedness with every effort, and each person should try to be decent and worthy, for in this way one can be loving toward oneself and become a friend of others. Since, then, what a decent person bestows upon himself he should also bestow upon his friend (for one should be toward one's friend as toward oneself, for a friend is another self), it is evident that the things that the decent person wishes for and bestows upon himself are just the loving things and the things in which love consists. Let the investigation of whether the affection of each person for himself is love or not be dismissed for the present; for love is of two or three people, as is obvious from what has been said, and if one also call the things [one feels] for oneself love, it would be love insofar as one differs in respect to oneself and one's emotional [part] makes peace with one's rational [part]. And because an excess of love resembles each person's affection for himself, this too may be called love.

<On good will. Chapter 6>

'Good will resembles love, but it is not indeed love' (1166b30), for in fact we feel good will also toward those with whom we are not friends, and good will arises both toward those who are not known [to us] and also when it is unnoticed by the one who is loved. But this is no longer love [in the sense of friendship], as has been said earlier and at length. Good will, then, is not love. Nor does it seem to be a feeling of love, for in fact a feeling of love involves a certain impulse and motion toward the one who is loved and a desire for him, and the one who loves is continually seeking the one who is loved. But good will is not such; for those who have good will wish good things for those toward whom they have good will, but they do not very much seek to be together with them. Further, a feeling of love comes with familiarity; for it arises over a certain [period of] time and through familiarity. But good will happens all at once, so to speak, to those whom it befalls, just as spectators are disposed toward contestants; for they come to

have good will toward them as soon as they see them winning, and they join in wishing good things for them, but they would not join them in doing anything; for they do not have a feeling of love toward them, after having cherished them over a certain [period of] time and through familiarity, but rather as soon as they saw them they were pleased by them. For this reason they cherish them superficially, which is what good will is. 30

Good will, then, appears to be a beginning of love, just as the pleasure [that comes] through sight is a beginning of loving erotically. And just as it is not possible to love erotically if one has not previously been pleased by the appearance of the beloved, whereas it is possible to be pleased by this and yet not love him erotically (for one loves erotically 'when one longs for someone who is absent and desires his presence), so too, indeed, it is not possible for people to be friends either unless they have [already] come to have good will' (1167a6-8). But it is possible for them to have good will but not be friends, for those who have good will wish good things for those toward whom they have good will, 'but they would not join in doing anything, nor would they take trouble in their behalf' (1167a9-10). Therefore one might metaphorically call it lazy love (cf. 1167a11); for when it lasts and arrives at familiarity, it becomes love – not the love that is on account of the useful or the pleasing, but rather that for the sake of the good. For one comes to have good will toward someone on account of virtue and decency, when one thinks he is noble or courageous or some such thing; but one who wishes that someone fare well on account of the pleasing or the useful does not have good will toward him but rather toward himself, just as neither is such a person a friend. Similarly, one who wishes his benefactor good things because of what he has received would not have, in the proper sense, good will; rather, although he does what is just and renders gratitude to his benefactor for the things in which he himself has been helped, he obviously enjoys not the virtue of the other but rather the good to himself. Good will is, then, neither love nor a feeling of love but rather a beginning of love, and when it has added time and familiarity and the other loving [qualities] it becomes the love that is on account of the good and virtue. 35 196,1 5 10

<On concord. Chapter 7>

Concord too is itself a loving sort of thing and follows love. Concord is not holding the same opinions, like a kind of consensus, for consensus may arise even among people who do not know one another; for nothing prevents people from holding the same opinions about the same things and having the same knowledge of the same things although they do not even know each other. But concord is 15

[found] in people who exist in some sort of association and love; for in fact they say that cities are in concord ‘when they are of like mind about what is advantageous and <choose> the same things and do what they decide in common’ (1167a26-8).

Concord, then, is like-mindedness among friends, not in what is to be thought about but in what is to be acted upon, and of these those things that are worthy of discussion and are of a certain magnitude; for neither a city nor friends are said to be in concord with one another concerning the small things in life, such as staying at home or walking to the market-place or saying or doing this particular thing – things on which no great benefit or harm follows. For they are not said to have concord concerning these and suchlike things but rather concerning matters that are important and advantageous either to both friends [in a friendship], or to the city collectively, such as when the entire city decides collectively that its magistrates be [chosen] not by lot (obtaining their office in a kind of rotation), but rather by election, or [decides] to ally themselves with the Lacedemonians, or whatever else is worthy of discussion and makes a difference to the entire city. And we say that friends similarly are in concord when they choose the same [way of] life, and the most important of the things in their life, and when each of the two similarly avoids or pursues the things that lead either to the harm or the benefit of both. For those who are in concord with one another should not only seek the same things but also do so in an altogether similar way: for example, if both friends decide that one of them is to be a guide of the other’s life, but should not [both] wish that it be the same person but rather each that it be himself. For then they seek the same thing but not in the same [respect] but rather each for himself, and this is not being in concord. In cities too people will be in concord in the choice of magistrates when all choose the same person or the best people to rule and not each himself, as Euripides staged it in *The Phoenician Women*; for in this way there does not occur what is pleasing to all. This is not concord; rather, when all get what they aspire to, then they are in concord. Concord, then, is a sort of civic love and is so called, and in fact it is about things to be acted upon and that are advantageous and pertain to a way of life; but these things belong to the civic [art].

Concord exists among decent people, ‘for these are both in concord with themselves and with one another, since they are, so to speak, on the same [bases]’ (1167b5-6); for the intentions of such people stand still and abide and do not flow back and forth like a strait. ‘And they wish both things that are just and advantageous, and they aspire to these in common. But it is not possible for base people to be in concord except for a short [while]’ (1167b8-10), just as they are not able to be firm friends, since they aspire to a larger share and each seeks to have more than the other in what is advantageous. For in toils and in

expenditures on behalf of one another they always seek to have the
 lesser; and because each believes that he deserves to toil little but be
 benefited much, he scrutinizes the other, weighing the expenditures
 exactly and preventing [the other] from profiting as much as he
 wishes from the things that are advantageous, on the grounds that
 those things are great but [the other] has had the luxury of slight
 toils. Therefore, as they do not watch out for what is in common but
 rather each [watches out for] his own, they very quickly break up; for
 they tear apart what unites them, which is what is common and the
 concord, and when what unites them has been dissolved they cannot
 [remain] united. Thus, they end up at strife, since they demand back
 from one another the loving things [that they did], whereas they
 themselves do not wish to do what is just. Hence it is not possible for
 there to be concord among base people but rather among decent
 people only.

<On benefaction. Chapter 8>

One must inquire about this: in return for what do benefactors love
 those who are helped [by them] more than they are loved by them;
 and in fact 'this is inquired into since it is something that occurs
 contrary to reason' (1167b18-19). Now, most people say that benefac-
 tors love more for the reason that money-lenders too love those to
 whom they have made a loan but are not loved by those who are in
 debt to them; for those who have lent wish the survival of those who
 are in debt and help them in every way so that their money may
 return to them, while those who are in debt do not do the same for
 those to whom they are in debt; for they might wish that they [the
 money-lenders] did not exist, on the grounds that in this way they
 will fare better once the loan has been dissolved. They say that in the
 same way in the case of these, too, benefactors wish that those who
 have been helped [by them] survive, on the grounds that in this way
 they will recover the recompense, while those who have been helped
 do not greatly love the survival of their benefactors; for rendering in
 return is not of such concern to human beings as getting back is.

This, then, seems to most people to be the reason, and they have
 been induced to believe these things because they look to the foolish
 and evil people among human beings and, as Epicharmus says, they
 observe things from an evil point of view. Such a thing seems human,
 'for most people are unmindful and aspire to be helped rather than to
 help others; but the cause would seem to be more natural and not
 similar to that concerning those who have made a loan' (1167b27-30).
 For there is a feeling of love between benefactors and those who are
 helped, but there is no feeling of love between those to whom a loan
 is made and money-lenders; for the one who has made a loan does not

love the one who is in debt but rather he wishes that [the other] survive in this respect only: for the sake of the return and so that he may get back his loan. 'But those who have helped love and feel affection for those who have been helped' (1167b31-2) even if they are neither useful nor able to become so. This happens also in the case of craftsmen, 'for everyone likes his own work more than he would be liked by the work if it became animate' (1167b34-5); and this happens above all with poets, 'for they greatly like their own poems and cherish them like children' (1168a1-3). Such seems also to be the case with benefactors, for those who are helped by them are in this respect works of theirs and for this reason they like them more than the works like them. The cause of this is that to exist is choiceworthy and lovable to everyone; we exist in the proper sense when we exist actively; we exist actively in living and doing; and one who does a thing exists actively in his work. For housebuilding is the idea of housebuilding, which exists actively in the [realized] house, and that very house, as house, just is the craftsman actively [realized] as craftsman. Similarly, everyone who is active is actively his work. If, then, it is natural to aspire to exist, and existing consists in doing, and the work just is the person who is actively doing it, it is evident that insofar as one seeks one's own existence, to this extent he seeks also that the work exist; one naturally loves oneself and wishes to exist; consequently, one naturally loves one's own work.

Since one above all loves oneself, each person loves above all his own work, and he will above all love the one who is benefited insofar as he [the beneficiary] is a work of his – and therefore too more than [he will love] his benefactor; for the greatest feeling of love is that with which each person loves himself. Further, because the benefactor becomes better than himself by providing benefactions, providing benefactions is a good for him and therefore too he enjoys the one who is helped, because he observes in him his own good. But the one who is helped does not become better than himself by being helped, nor does he have any good in his benefactor; for one is able to become better from the things he himself does, for human good is in being active, as has been said in what precedes. Therefore, if something in the benefactor is pleasing to the one who is helped, it is not his own good but his advantage; but advantage is not so pleasing and lovable as the good, for the good is the goal of advantage, and on account of the good both advantage and the pleasing are lovable. Consequently, the benefactor loves the one who is helped more than he is loved by him.

Further, the activity and the expectation and the recollection of the good are pleasing, activity being of what is present and occurring, expectation of what is to come, and recollection of what has passed. But the good is more pleasing when present than when it is to come

or has passed; and the one who has been benefited is a present good of the one who has benefited him, for the good which the benefactor observes in the one who has been helped abides and is long-lasting, while the good of the one who has been helped does not abide (for in fact it was useful and has passed [out of existence] simultaneously with its use), nor is it in the proper sense a good. Therefore too even if both were present, the good of the benefactor would be more pleasing; and even if both had passed, the recollection of the one who was benefited would be more pleasing than that of benefactor,²⁵ insofar as the recollection of a good thing is most pleasing, while that of a useful thing is not at all or less so. For if the expectation of useful things is the reverse and is more pleasing than the memory of past goods, it appears, then, that for these reasons too the benefactor loves the one who has been helped more than he is loved by him.²⁶

Further, a feeling of love resembles an activity, and being loved a [passive] undergoing; loving, then, is more appropriate to those who are active in respect to loving [deeds] – obviously, the benefactors – than to those who undergo them. Further, we cherish, and love more, things that have been acquired by toil than those that have been easily accomplished; hence too those who have acquired their own money love it more than those who have inherited it. Being helped is effortless, but helping is difficult, and being helped resides in the one who is benefited, while helping resides in the benefactor; therefore, too, the one who is benefited is loved more than the benefactor. For this reason, also, mothers are more child-loving, because they bear them with toil, than children are mother-loving, since they did nothing in order to be born; and mothers know better that their children are from them than the children do that they [their mothers] brought them to life.

These things would seem to be proper to benefactors, for in fact not only do they do something toilsome on behalf of those who are helped, but they also know better that they are providing benefactions than the others know that they are being benefited by them. For in fact it is possible that one who helps does not himself provide a benefaction from his own household but rather does so while assisting another [who provides it], and therefore is not himself the benefactor; or that he himself provides the benefaction from his own household but not for the sake of him who is helped but rather for his own sake and on account of the useful. These things cause the one who is helped not to recognize very reliably the one who benefits him. Nothing, however, prevents the benefactor from recognizing the one who is helped, because he recognizes exactly that he himself is truly a benefactor. For these reasons the one who helps loves the one who is helped more than he is loved by him.

<On self-love. Chapter 9>

So much for these matters. This too must be inquired into, whether one should love oneself most or someone else. For loving oneself most seems not to be [a feature] of good men, and therefore those who like themselves most are reproached and stigmatized as being self-loving in a shameful [way]. Further, [they are reproached too] because a base man seems to do everything for his own sake, and the more so insofar as he is the more base. Complaints are laid against him for this reason: that he seeks nothing more than his private [interests] and does everything for the sake of himself. But the decent man does everything on account of what is noble, and the more insofar as he is better and more decent; and he gives up his own things on account of his friend and so that he may enable others to get what they need.

For these reasons, then, it seems that one should not love oneself most of all. But the facts are discrepant with these points, and not unreasonably. For they say that one should love most the one who is most a friend; and the one who observes all the loving [qualities] concerning the one who is loved is most a friend. Wishing good things for a friend for his sake, even if no one will know this, and seeking above all to live together and to suffer and rejoice together, are loving [qualities], and all these things one bestows upon oneself; and from the [qualities] in regard to onself have been derived as well those in regard to one's friends, as has been said in the 4th chapter.²⁷ All the proverbs too testify to these things: for when people describe close friends they say 'one soul'; furthermore, they refer 'the things of friends are in common' to this [i.e., the identity between friends], and 'amity is equality', and 'the knee is closer to the shin'. For if what is in common, equality, and what is closest are love, what could be more lovable to each person than himself? A person, consequently, is most a friend to himself, and if one should love most the one who is most a friend, one should most love oneself.

Since, then, both arguments seem thus to be true, the question is understandably raised as to which [argument] one should follow. When we have drawn distinctions and defined [our terms], we shall find to what extent and in what way each is true; for if we should understand what the meaning of 'self-loving' intends in each of the arguments, what is being sought would become clear. The first argument calls 'self-loving' not those who simply love themselves, but rather those who seek to bestow upon themselves the greater [amount], not in what is good and in virtue but rather in money and honours and bodily pleasures; 'for most people desire these things and have striven for them on the grounds that they are best, which is why they are also much fought over. Those who are greedy for these things, indeed, gratify their appetites, and their emotions generally, and the

irrational [part] of the soul, and most people are of this sort' (1168b17-21). This is also why they have acquired the label ['self-loving']; for names are given to things that occur for the most part, while things that are rare are hardly named, and in fact some of these things are not even recognized. Those who are base and who bestow upon themselves the things that seem good are many, while worthy people are rare; therefore people stigmatize the majority, who are base, as self-loving.²⁸ Complaints are justly laid, indeed, against those who are self-loving in this way. 30

It is not unclear that most people call 'self-loving' those who are base in their appetites, 'for if someone always strives most of all to do just or moderate things himself, or any other such things in accord with the virtues, and if in general he always acquires what is noble for himself' (1168b25-7), no one will call him 'self-loving' or find fault with him. 35

The first argument, then, names 'self-loving' a person who loves himself in a base way, and it is true for this reason, for one should not love oneself in this way. But the second [argument] says that a worthy person who acquires both virtue and the good for himself most loves himself. And he would seem more plausibly to be self-loving, for he gratifies himself [properly speaking]; for he renders to the most authoritative [part] of himself, the reflective, the things that are noblest and especially good: one who favours the most authoritative [part] of himself most favours himself. And in fact just as the most authoritative [part] of a city and the best of its citizens are above all the city, so too the most authoritative of the things that are in a human being is above all the human being. Therefore one who feels affection for and favours this [part] is most self-loving, since a person is called self-controlled or without self-control not by virtue of simply controlling or being controlled but rather because the mind either rules the emotions or is ruled; thus, when the mind is in control a person is said to be himself in control, but when the emotions are in control he is said not to be in control but rather to be himself controlled. Hence it is evident that each person himself is above all his reflective [part], and he who feels affection for his reflective [part] and in every way favours it would plausibly be called self-loving 'of a different kind from the one who is reproached, and different to the extent that living in accord with reason is [different] from [living] in accord with emotion' (1169a4-5) and the desire for the good is [different] from a base appetite. 40 201,1 5 10 15

Since, then, everyone praises and approves worthy and decent people, and all people should be decent (for in fact if all people compete and strain to do the noblest things, all good things will come both to all in common and to each individually), it is evident that a good person should be self-loving. For in fact he will both benefit himself

20 by doing noble things and also move others to equal [actions]. But the wicked man should not be, for in loving and favouring himself he will harm both himself and those near him, since he follows base emotions.

25 Since with worthy people²⁹ what one does and what it is appropriate to do are the same thing, for in fact every mind³⁰ chooses what is best for itself, and they obey and follow the mind; but with base people what they should do and what they do are discrepant – for this reason too the latter should not be self-loving, while it is appropriate that the former love themselves most.

In this way, then, the true argument has been determined. But one must solve also the first argument, by which it seemed that a good person was not self-loving because he is unconcerned about his own goods and seeks those of his friends and country, in behalf of which
 30 he even dies, if need be. Now, that a worthy person is like this is true. However, one must not say on this account that he is not most self-loving; he appears, indeed, to be self-loving on account of these very things. For in fact he gives up small things in exchange for great, and in throwing away the small things he acquires the greatest of goods for himself; for to his friends and country he imparts money
 35 and honours and the like, but to himself what is good and noble and fine and patriotic and the like, than which all the former things are less. And when he dies in behalf of his friends and city and gives up his own life, he profits more than he has given up; for he chooses to
 202,1 enjoy intensely for a short [while]³¹ a good and praiseworthy pleasure rather than [to enjoy] a long one slightly; and he believes that it is better for him that his life, though short, be full of great accomplishments than that he have lived long but not be so praiseworthy, and better to have performed one noble and great action than many small ones; for the former is more noble than the latter. And he sometimes
 5 gives up worthy actions to his friend, and though it is possible for him to perform them himself, he defers to him [his friend] in love of honour; and in so doing he bestows the greater good on himself, for becoming the cause of something noble for his friend is more noble than performing it himself. For these reasons, then, he seems plausibly to be a worthy person in choosing what is noble ahead of all other things and seeking more in things that are good and worthy. It is
 10 evident, consequently, that a worthy person loves himself most and allots to himself each time the greater [part] of what is noble. 'In this way, then, one should be self-loving, as has been said, but one ought not be so in the manner of most people' (1169b1-2). As to how one should love oneself most, then, let this much have been said.

**<That a flourishing person will need worthy
friends. Chapter 10>**

It is debated also in the case of flourishing [or: happy (*eudaimôn*)]³² 15
people whether they will have need of friends or not; for they say that
those who are happy (*makarios*) and self-sufficient have no need, for
since they are self-sufficient and have all good things, how would they
need others? For in fact friends need friends and reap through them
things that they are not able to acquire by themselves, and indeed a
friend is another self. Since flourishing people suffice unto them-
selves, they have no need of friends, wherefore they say, 'when fortune 20
grants amply, what need is there of friends?' [Euripides *Orestes* 667].

For these reasons, then, it is thought that those who are flourishing
do not have need of friends. But according to a different argument it
is thought to be odd that, 'though they attribute all good things to one
who is flourishing, they do not assign him friends' (1169b8-9), which
among external goods is thought to be the greatest, in particular 25
because doing benefactions is necessary for flourishing and the no-
blest and most praiseworthy benefaction is that toward friends. Thus,
flourishing people do need friends, since there is need to do as a
benefaction the best benefaction; for it is most appropriate to a friend
to help and be helped, and it is more noble to do a benefaction for
friends than for strangers and unknown people and those who are not
at all related either by way of character or government. 30

For these reasons, then, it appears that a flourishing person needs
friends, and on this account it is investigated as well whether there
is more need of friends in good fortune than in misfortune. For both
one who is unfortunate needs friends who may help him and rectify
his fortune, and one who is fortunate, so that he may be able to do
benefactions. Further, this too is odd, to think that a solitary person
who lives for himself alone is happy, for flourishing is a choiceworthy 35
thing, but no one would choose to be solitary, for no one wishes to
have all good things by himself: for a human being is a civic being and
by nature desires to live with others. These things pertain to the
flourishing person, too, and he wishes to live together [with others],
for he too has the things that are by nature good. If it is necessary 203,1
that the flourishing person live together [with others], it is evident
that it is with the best and most appropriate of human beings; but
these are friends and decent people, with whom it is better and more
pleasing to spend the day together than with strangers and those who
happen along. 'The flourishing person, consequently, needs friends'
(1169b22).

One must solve the first arguments, on account of which it is 5
thought that flourishing people do not need friends, and one must say
what they mean and how they are true. We say, then, 'that most

people think that those who are useful are friends' (1169b23-4) and that they are liked not on account of the good but rather on account of utility, and further that those on account of pleasure [are friends]. But a flourishing person does not need these: not the useful, because
 10 he has all good things, nor the pleasing, because his life is pleasing to him and he does not need pleasure from outside. 'Because he does not need friends of this sort it is thought that he does not need friends' (1169b27-8) – those who are truly friends, who are loved on account of their virtue and the good. But this is not true, and it is obvious from the following: for as was said in the beginning, flourishing is an activity; it is evident that an activity happens [in the present] and
 15 has its being in happening, and not that it has happened [in the past] and already exists, like a possession [i.e., something one previously acquired]. Flourishing arises, then, in [the process of] living, and to do worthy [deeds] is to flourish.³³ Since such an activity is pleasing to a worthy person both because it is good and pleasing in itself, as was said in the beginning, and because it is proper to him, to contemplate such activity is, consequently, the most pleasing thing to a flourishing
 20 person. But we are more able to contemplate the things of those near us than our own things, and their actions than ours. A flourishing person, consequently, will best contemplate the actions of his friend, and will be most pleased by them since they are good.

If it is necessary that a flourishing person enjoy good pleasure, it is evident that a flourishing person has need of such friends, 'since
 25 he chooses to contemplate decent and proper actions' (1170a2-3), such as are those of a friend who is good. Further, all people think that the life of a flourishing person is most pleasing; the life of a flourishing person is to be active in accord with virtue; to be active continually is easy with others but difficult by oneself; hence, a solitary life is a difficult thing;³⁴ but what is easy is more pleasing than what is
 30 annoying; and what is more pleasing is proper to a happy person. At the same time, his activity will be more continuous,³⁵ since it is pleasing, and this – being active continually in accord with virtue – is proper to a happy person. Again, this will make his pleasure greater, for the worthy person insofar as he is worthy is pleased by actions in accord with virtue, 'but he is annoyed at those that come from vice, just as a musical person is pleased by fine melodies but is
 35 pained by base ones' (1170a9-11). Not only will a worthy person be active more continually in respect to an existing habitual condition as a result of living together with worthy people, but he will also acquire that [habitual condition] which does not exist [in him], or will be better in respect to those he has; for there may arise an increase of virtue from 'living together with good people, as Theognis too says' (1170a12-13; cf. Theognis v. 35 West). Consequently, a flourishing person needs friends.

Further, it will be obvious to those who look into the argument in a more naturalistic way, as follows: for let us inquire not on the basis of the things that belong to a flourishing person individually but on the basis of those that do so to all in common. To live, then, is by nature pleasing to all animals. But living is defined as being the power of sensation in irrational [animals], and in humans the power of sensation or thinking; and a power exists on account of an activity and is the authoritative thing in an activity. If, accordingly, being able to sense or think is living, this very sensing or thinking actively is much more so; consequently, sensing or thinking actively is living itself. Living is both pleasing in itself and good, above all because living is a determinate thing, 'and what is determinate is of the nature of the good' (1170a20-1), as it seemed also to the Pythagoreans; for in fact they used to class the determinate in the column of the good. Then too, [living is good] because all things aspire to live, and what all things aspire to is good in itself and pleasing. I call 'life' not that which is wicked and full of myriad misfortunes, for such [lives] are indefinite, just like the things that happen to this [kind of life]. But these things will be discussed in what we shall say concerning pleasure.

Since, then, living is good in itself and pleasing, and one enjoys and is pleased by seeing something good and pleasing in oneself, we consequently enjoy and are pleased by sensing that we are living. For in fact we sense that we are living, just as when we see we sense that we are seeing, and when we hear [we sense] that we are hearing, and when we walk [we sense] that we are walking; and when we think and sense, we know that we are thinking and sensing. This thinking and sensing is the being of those who think and sense; consequently, we think that we are, and altogether there is some power in us by which we know that we are active and living. But if living is good, and one's being aware that one has a good thing is pleasing in itself, then knowing that we are living is pleasing. Since, then, things that are good by nature are also pleasing,³⁶ a worthy person will be pleased by living, and he above all others insofar as his life is more choice-worthy and more pleasing and happy. He is pleased by knowing that he is living; living is thinking; consequently, the worthy person is pleased by knowing that he is thinking.

A worthy person is [disposed] toward his friend as he is toward himself, 'for a friend is another self' (1170b6-7); so it is evident that just as his own being and living are a choiceworthy and pleasing thing for him, so too he seeks the being of his friend, that is, that his friend think; for being and living are thinking. Just as he enjoys knowing that he is thinking, so knowing that his friend is thinking is pleasing to him and choiceworthy. But knowing that his friend is thinking is actively [knowing] at just that time when he knows the very things that he [his friend] is thinking, not simply [the fact] that he is

35 thinking; and this would occur in living with one another and sharing arguments and thought. For this is the way human beings are said to live together; for being in the same [place] is not living together, as 'grazing in the same [place] is in the case of cattle' (1170b13-14). Consequently, being together with his friends is choiceworthy and pleasing to a worthy person. 'But he must have what is choiceworthy to him' (1170b17); if not, he will be in need in respect to this part, and this is opposed to flourishing. 'Consequently, a flourishing person will
40 have need of worthy friends' (1170b18-19).

205,1 **<On the number of friends. Chapter 11>**

Since a flourishing person has need of friends, one must inquire whether he should make as many friends as possible; or just as has been said well and fittingly in the case of hospitality, that one should be neither guestless nor many-guested [cf. Hesiod *Works and Days*
5 715], so too in the case of friends it is reasonable that one be neither friendless nor many-friended. We say this, then, that since love is differentiated in three ways and one is on account of the useful, one on account of pleasure, and one for the sake of the good and virtue, [first of all] there would be need for few friends on account of the useful or of pleasure. This is especially so for [friends] on account of the useful, because one can satisfy [only] a few people in the things they
10 want one to help them with, and attending to many is toilsome, above all if they happen to be bothersome sorts and seek to be attended to excessively. It is also so for [friends] on account of pleasure, because one's life has need of little pleasure and relaxation, like condiment in a feast. But a flourishing person will have need of more [friends] who are worthy and who love on account of virtue and the good. Yet, there
15 will be a measure to these, too, for just as there is a measure to a city and 'a city could arise neither out of ten human beings nor out of a hundred thousand' (1170b31-2) (for such a community would no longer be a city), so one's friends too should be limited and there should be a measure to them. In the case of a city, the amount of the population appropriate to a city is not defined nor the number
20 [exactly] specified; rather, when the number that exceeds and that which falls short of the [proper] measure of a city are defined, we say that the amounts in between are the [proper] measure of a city. For example, neither thousands nor hundreds of thousands [of people] would be a city, but rather what is in between. So too in the case of friends, it is not possible to posit a defined number, but rather it would be as many as the people with whom it one is able to live together. 'For this was thought to be the most loving [activity]' (1171a2). For it
25 is evident that it is not possible to live together with and distribute oneself among very many people.

One should also spend the day together with one's friends, but if they are very many, this is most difficult. Indeed, one should also suffer and rejoice with them intimately, and this too is difficult if one should deal with many friends; for since they are many, some enjoy while others are irked at the same thing, and a friend should distribute himself among both [groups]; and this is difficult. Perhaps it is well, then, not to seek to be the most many-friended person by far, but rather to accept as many friends as we are able to live together with, spend the day with, and suffer and rejoice with. 30

For this reason, it is not possible to deal with many people in this way, nor is it possible to be a person of many friends³⁷ in regard to erotic love. For erotic [love] is an excess of love, and for this reason it is able to arise [only] in relation to one person. In a like way too in the case of love in accord with virtue, it is not possible to love many people intensely and to maintain all the loving [acts] concerning them, but it is possible to deal with a few in this way. The facts too testify to these arguments, for people do not have many friends in accord with comradely love; rather, the most celebrated comradely loves are said to occur between two people. 35

'Those who are many-friended and converse with all people in an intimate way' (1171a15-16), and seem to render what they should to each of their [fellow] citizens both in deeds and in words, are friends to no one in the exact and true love, but rather may be called friends in what is called civic love. Among these, some are ingratiating, doing every favour for those who associate with them; they were discussed earlier. Others are decent and socialize with regard to the truth and the good. They too are called friends on account of the similarity to [true] love, and they, being in between the ingratiating and the churlish, are praiseworthy, whereas both [the others] are blameworthy, as was discriminated in the eighth chapter of the fourth book. One may, then, find many friends of this sort; but as for friends properly speaking one should be content to find even a few. 206,1 5 10

**<Whether there is more need of friends in good fortune
or in misfortune, and that living together is the most
distinctive deed in loves both of worthy and of
base people. Chapter 12>**

Since both flourishing and unfortunate people need friends, one must inquire which will need friends more. For the unfortunate need assistance from their friends, while the flourishing need people with whom they will live and whom they will help, for they wish to help and it is necessary to them for their flourishing. There is a way in which an unfortunate person has need of friends more than a worthy person; but in another way, the one who is faring well has more [need]: 15

the former on account of what is necessary, the latter on account of
 20 what is noble. For friends are a more necessary thing to an unfortunate person than to a flourishing one, but a more noble thing to a flourishing person than to one who is faring poorly. For this reason, in misfortune one needs not so much worthy friends as beneficial and useful ones, while in good fortune one does not [need] useful ones at all but rather good ones only. For flourishing people seek decent
 25 people and wish rather 'to do benefactions for these and spend time with these. For the very presence of friends is pleasing, even in good fortune,³⁸ for those who are suffering are relieved when their friends suffer' (1171a27-30) with them. Hence one might raise the question: on account of what are people relieved by seeing their friends suffering with them? For [pain] too is thought, like a weight that is divided,
 30 to be lightened [when it is divided] among friends. But it is not so: rather, one's pleasure in the presence of friends, and seeing them suffering with one, which is pleasing, makes the pain less, since pleasure drives out pain.

Whether, then, people are relieved for these reasons or for some other, let the investigation be dismissed for the present. But that people who are suffering become better on account of the presence of friends is evident. But it seems that they do not themselves purely
 35 enjoy those of their friends who are suffering [with them], nor is such a pleasure an unmixed thing for them, but rather they also are pained in part. For in itself, seeing one's friends is pleasing, above all for those who are unfortunate, and they get a certain assistance toward not suffering; 'for a friend is a consoling thing', both when he is seen and when he is talking, 'if he is tactful' (1171b2-3), since he knows his
 207,1 friend's character, and the things he enjoys and by which he is pained, and he is easily able to console him. In this way, then, the presence of friends is pleasing. But to perceive one's friend suffering at one's own misfortunes makes the company of friends in that case painful; for everyone believes that it is painful to be the cause of pain to
 5 friends. Therefore 'those who are manly in nature are wary' (1171b6-7) of their friends suffering together with them, and unless the consolation is great and is for the greatest misfortunes, while the pain which [their friends] suffer with them is small, they do not tolerate sharing their evils with friends; and in general they do not welcome
 10 people who lament with them, because they themselves are not given to lamentation but rather are noble-minded in respect to painful things. But women and those men who are womanish enjoy those who moan, and 'love them as friends and people who suffer with them' (1171b11). But one should imitate not these but rather the masculine ones, for in all things it is appropriate to pursue the things that are better.

In this way, then, friends help those who are unfortunate. But in

good fortune the presence of friends is pleasing in two ways: both 15
 because passing time with one's friends is most pleasing, insofar as
 they are friends, and because they watch them enjoying their own
 goods, which is evidence of the greatest good will. Since, then, by
 sharing our misfortunes with friends we pain them, while by giving
 them a share in our flourishing we cheer them, it would seem that
 one should invite them eagerly to good fortune but hesitate in doing
 so to misfortune. For to do a benefaction is noble, but one should give 20
 [friends] as little a share of one's evils as possible. This is why the
 tragedian says, 'enough that I am unfortunate',³⁹ for one should not
 infect one's friends with one's own evils. But one should invite one's
 friends to suffer with one when, by having taken a little trouble, they
 are going to benefit greatly those who are suffering. However, it is
 fitting for friends themselves, when they are without misfortunes, to
 do the reverse in respect to those [immersed] in misfortunes: for they 25
 should go uninvited and eager to those who are unfortunate, for it is
 the part of a friend to help, and especially those in need who have not
 yet thought it right [to invite them] (for this is both more noble and
 more pleasing to both: both the one who gives and the one who
 receives); whereas [they should] go to [those enjoying] good fortune,
 yes, but [they should be] eager to cooperate and help their friends' 30
 good fortune, but be more hesitant in regard to sharing in their
 well-being. 'For being eager to be benefited is not noble' (1171b25).
 But perhaps people should not reject those who are eager <and>
 driven to benefit their friends, and shake off their benefaction, so that
 they may not seem to be unpleasant toward their [overeager] friends;
 for this sometimes happens. 35

Now, it is evident from what has been said that it is most choice-
 worthy for friends to live with one another. And just as it is most
 gratifying to those who love erotically to see one another, and they
 choose rather to be together with one another in respect to this sense
 [i.e., sight] than in respect to the other [senses] (since through this
 sense their passion both occurs in the beginning and forms), so too
 living together is for friends the most choiceworthy of all the other 40
 loving [acts]. For living together is an association and the most
 complete of associations, and love has its being in association. For
 love is an association, in particular because perceiving one's own
 things is most choiceworthy, as was said previously, and one is 208,1
 [disposed] toward a friend as toward oneself; thus, perceiving one's
 friend would be most choiceworthy of all. One may perceive one's
 friend actively by being and living and spending time together with
 him; thus friends reasonably aspire to live together with one another. 5
 Therefore, too, each person wishes to live and spend time with his
 friends in [accord with] what he believes to be the [distinctively]
 human activity and that for the sake of which he chooses to live and

- what he believes to be the human way of life. Some people think that friends should drink together, some that they should play dice together, some that they should hunt together and exercise together, because these things seem to them to be valuable, and [they believe]
- 10 that one should have friends who are partners in these things. Others philosophize together, and others share in other activities and ways of life with their friends, and in general each person wishes to spend the day together with his friend in what he likes most of the things in life. For in wishing to live together with their friends they do those things and share those things that are pleasing to both of them, for in this way it is possible to live together.
- 15 'The love of base people, accordingly, is wicked' (1172a8-9) and they share base things with one another and their love does not stand fast, for they are unstable. They even become worse than themselves, because they become assimilated to one another and exhort one another to base things. But the love of decent people is decent and firm, continually increasing with their association, and they seem to
- 20 become even better through their good activities, as they correct one another; for they register from one another the things that are good for each, on account of which they love one another. This is why a certain poet says, 'goodly things from the goodly'⁴⁰ [Theognis 35]; and⁴¹ we reap good things from the good, but base things from the
- 25 base. 'Concerning love, then, let this much have been said; the next thing would be to discuss pleasure' (1172a14-15).

Notes

1. i.e., essence has more 'being' than do attributes.
2. So says Aristotle 1155b15-16, but in fact they are not discussed in the *Nicomachean Ethics*.
3. Reading the sentence as declarative rather than (with h) interrogative; the particle *ê* introduces an affirmative comment.
4. Chapter headings from here to the end of Book 9 are missing in the MSS, and are supplied from Heinsius' edition.
5. Adopting Heylbut's suggestion (in the critical apparatus) of *ephelkesthai* for *ephelketai* in the text, which gives 'and he attracts many'.
6. 'Acknowledge that' rather than 'agree to', which would normally take future infinitive; friendship is not contractual.
7. Normally, the Aristotelians do not apply the noun *philos*, 'friend', to the relationship between husband and wife or father and son; but because the concrete noun is a handy way of referring to any pair of people between whom *philia* or 'love' obtains, it is occasionally employed loosely, as here, in this wider sense.
8. Heylbut's *tôi* is evidently a misprint for *tôn*.
9. The commentator has squeamishly added this clause to Aristotle's statement.
10. Deleting the raised stop after *enteuthen* in Heylbut's text.
11. Reading *ê* instead of Heylbut's *êi*.
12. That is, members of the same 'tribe' or 'deme', subordinate civic associations within the polis.
13. The OCT adopts the alternate reading *homopathês*, 'similar in experience'.
14. This looks like a mistake for 'what has been made'.
15. The expression 'useful love' is suspicious, as it is not employed elsewhere in the commentary.
16. The bracketed words are missing in D and supplied by Heylbut from h; I am inclined to add the word *philôn*, translating 'while the other loves on account of utility' rather than 'is so'; beloveds do not reciprocate the erotic passion (*eraô*) of the lover, but they may love (*phileô*) him. Alternatively, read *philôn* in place of *erôn*, and translate 'when the one loves on account of pleasure, while the other does so on account of utility'.
17. Deleting the raised stop after *hapasi*.
18. Retaining the reading of D and deleting the supplement (supplied from h?) *kata to deon* before *gignomena*. With the supplement, the translation would be: 'and should observe what accords with what is meet concerning all'. This gives adequate sense, but is unnecessary: the commentator is indicating how one determines what to do, namely, by careful observation of specific cases; he is not repeating a truism.
19. Deleting the comma after *philountos*.
20. Retaining the reading of D and omitting h's supplement, *to de ponêron* before *oude dikaion*. With the supplement, one must translate 'for the lovable is

good, while what is evil is not even just'; the first clause is inconsequential and the second vapid.

21. Deleting *te kai* before *oikeioteron* and *on* following it, which Heylbut adopts (from h?); with the additions, the translation would be: 'since it is especially more appropriate'. The commentator is having his little joke here: he has lifted *oikeioteron* from Aristotle 1165b20, but expanded on Aristotle's *ousia*, 'property', by adding the word *oikia*, 'household'; the jingle on 'property' and 'appropriate' captures the pun, though the terms have been shifted around.

22. The pun on *hexis*, 'habitual condition', and *tôn ekhontôn*, 'those who have it', is less apparent in the etymological connection between 'habit' and 'have'.

23. Retaining *periekhei* with D, rather than *parekhei*, 'affords', which Heylbut adopts from h.

24. Reading *auta* with D, rather than *autêi* with h, which Heylbut adopts; the latter would translate, 'and help virtue itself'.

25. Retaining the reading of D and h. Heylbut, following Mullach, reverses the order, and reads 'the recollection of the benefactor would be more pleasing than that of the one who was benefited'; the genitives, however, are clearly objective, like 'of a good' in the following clause, and the one who is benefited is the good of the benefactor.

26. The thought is that the benefactor can look forward to being recompensed.

27. Actually, the 5th chapter. The number '4th' appears in h, and is printed by Heylbut; D has a lacuna.

28. Omitting *onomazousi*, with h and Heylbut.

29. Reading *tois spoudaïois* with D, rather than *tôi spoudaïôi*, 'a worthy person', with h, followed by Heylbut; the plural is picked up in 'they obey and follow', and corresponds to *tois phaulois*, 'base people', in line 25.

30. Heylbut prints in brackets Heinsius' supplements, which give: 'for in fact every <good man is his mind, and the> mind chooses what is best for itself', etc. But the supplements are to be rejected: the commentator is not so obtuse as to say in a single breath that a person both is and obeys his mind, nor has he maintained that a good person, who gratifies his reflective part, is on that account more to be equated with his mind than a bad person; the authoritative part in everyone is above all that person, irrespective of whether it is obeyed. In addition to the logical problems, the language is wrong, e.g. 'man' (*anêr*) instead of 'human being' (*anthrôpos*), and the unadorned equation of a person – even a good person – with his mind, without a qualifier such as *malista* ('above all').

31. Heylbut, following h (?), inserts *khronon*, 'a short <time>'; but the supplement is unnecessary.

32. The term *eudaimôn* is commonly translated as 'happy', but it clearly carries, in Aristotle, a connotation of good fortune or prosperity; the term 'flourishing' best captures, I think, this double sense.

33. The supplements that Heylbut adopts from h may be translated: 'Flourishing consists, then, in living and doing, <for to live according to virtue and to do> worthy [deeds] is to flourish'. But *men oun* ('then') summarizes the previous idea and marks the transition to a new argument; an explanatory clause with *gar* ('for') is cumbersome, and the mention of virtue distracts from the emphasis on activity as such. D's text is thus preferable, although perhaps one should insert the definite article *to* before *prattein*, 'doing'.

34. Reading *khalepon* with D; Heylbut, following h, reads *khalepos*, 'difficult' instead of 'a difficult thing'.

35. Correcting *suekhestera* in Heylbut, a typographical error for *sunekhestera*.

36. Inserting *esti* 'are' after 'pleasing'. Heylbut, following h, reads: 'Since, then,

things that are good by nature and pleasing <are also good and pleasing to a worthy person>, a worthy person will be pleased by living', etc. The insertion is otiose, since the commentator says that a worthy person will be pleased above all others; moreover, it is senseless to insist that he has a capacity already defined as pertaining to human beings as such.

37. Reading *philôn* with D; Heylbut, following h, prints *philon*: 'it is not possible to be a friend of many'.

38. Aristotle's text reads 'both in good fortune and in misfortune', which makes sense of the following clause.

39. Fragment *76 in Richard Kannicht and Bruno Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1981).

40. Accenting *áp*; the accent is omitted in Heylbut.

41. In place of D's *kai*, 'and', Heylbut adopts h's *kai gar*, 'for in fact'.

This page intentionally left blank

English-Greek Glossary

ability: *dunamis*
abound: *euporeô*
absence: *apousia*
account: *logos*
action: *ergon, praxis*
actively: *energeîai*
activity: *energeia*
adept: *deinos*
adoption (give for): *hupopoieô*
advantage: *sumpheron*
advantageous (be): *sumpherô*
affection: *agapê*
affluent (be): *euporeô*
age (of the same): *hêlix*
agreement: *homologia, diomologia*
alien: *allotrios*
ambiguous: *amphilogos*
amity: *philotês*
analogous: *analogon*
analogy: *homoiôma*
animal: *zôion*
animate: *empsychos*
appearance: *eidos*
appetite: *epithumia*
appropriate: *oikeios*
appropriate (be): *prosêkô*
argument: *logos*
aristocracy: *aristokratia*
assign: *apodidômi*
assimilated (be): *homoioomai*
assistance: *epikouria*
association: *koinônia*
attribute: *sumbebêkos*
authoritative: *kurios*
authority: *arkhê*
authority (have): *exousiazô*

base: *phaulos*
base form: *phaulotês*
beginning: *arkhê*
believe: *hêgeomai, nomizô, pisteuô*
beloved: *erômenos*
benefaction: *euergesia*

benefactions (confer): *euergeteô*
benefactor: *euergetês*
beneficial: *ôphelimos*
benefit: *ôpheleia, ophelos*
benefit (v.): *ôpheleô*
best: *aristos*
blame: *aitiaomai*
blood: *haima*
bodily: *sômatikos*
body: *sôma*
bond: *sundesmos*
break up: *dialuomai*
brother: *adelphos*
business: *emporía*

cause: *aition*
cause (be a): *aitios*
change (v.): *metaballô*
chapter: *kephalaion*
character: *êthos, tropos*
character-based: *êthikos*
cherish: *stergô*
choiceworthy: *hairetos*
choose: *haireomai, proaireomai*
churlish: *duskolos*
churlishness: *duskolia*
cithara-player: *kitharôidos*
citizen: *politês*
city: *polis*
civic: *politikos*
class (v.): *tattô*
collective: *koinos*
commercial: *agoraios*
common: *koinos*
commonality: *koinônia*
community: *sunoikia*
companion: *sunêthês*
company: *sunousia*
complete: *teleios*
comrade: *hetairois*
comradely: *hetairikos*
concern (of): *epimelês*
concerned about (be): *phrontizô*

concerned for (be): *epimeleomai*
 concord: *homonoia*
 concord (be in): *homonoieō*
 condition: *tukhê*
 consensus: *homodoxia*
 consent: *suntithemai*
 consist: *sunistamai*
 consolation: *paramuthia*
 console: *paramutheomai*
 contemplate: *theōreō*
 content (be): *agapaō*
 continuous: *sunekhês*
 contract: *sunallagma*, *sunthêkê*
 contrary to reason: *paralogos*
 control (v.): *kurieuo*
 control, control (be in): *krateō*
 correct: *orthos*
 correct (v.): *diorthoō*, *epanorthoō*
 corruption: *phthora*
 country: *patris*
 courageous: *andreios*
 currency: *nomisma*

danger: *kindunos*
 dear: *philos*
 debt: *khreos*, *opheilêma*
 debt (be in): *opheilō*
 deceive: *apataō*
 decency: *epieikeia*
 decent: *epieikês*
 deception: *apatê*
 decide: *proaireomai*
 decision: *proairesis*
 deed: *ergon*
 deficiency: *elleipsis*
 define: *horizō*, *horizomai*
 definition: *horismos*, *logos*
 desire (v.): *epithumeō*, *oregomai*
 desire: *orexis*
 determinate: *hōrismenos*
 die: *apothnêskō*
 difference: *diaphora*
 different: *diaphoros*
 discordant (be): *apâidō*
 discrepant (be): *diaphōneō*
 discuss: *dierkhomai*
 disposed (be): *diakeimai*
 dissimilar: *anomoios*
 dissimilar in kind: *anomoioeidês*
 dissolution: *dialusis*
 dissolve: *dialuō*, *dialuomai*, *luō*
 divide: *merizō*

do a favour: *kharizomai*
 eager: *prothumos*
 eager (be): *prothumeomai*
 education: *paideia*
 effort: *spoudê*
 emotion: *pathos*
 emotional: *pathêtikos*
 end: *telos*
 endure: *hupomeno*, *paramenō*
 enjoy: *apolauō*, *hêdomai*, *khairō*
 equal: *isos*
 equal (be): *exisazō*
 equal in number: *isarithmōs*
 equality: *isotês*
 equalize: *epanisoō*, *isazō*
 erotic: *erôtikos*
 err: *hamartanō*, *diamartanō*
 erroneous: *hêmartêmenos*
 escape notice: *lanthanō*
 essence: *ousia*
 establish: *tattō*
 evidence: *tekmêrion*
 evil: *kakos*
 example: *paradeigma*
 exceed: *hyperballō*
 excess: *hyperbolê*
 exchange: *amoibê*
 exist: *hyperarkhō*
 expectation: *elpis*, *prosdokia*
 fact: *ergon*, *pragma*
 fair: *epieikês*
 familiarity: *sunêtheia*
 family: *genos*
 favour: *eupatheia*, *kharis*
 favour (v.): *kharizomai*
 fee: *timê*, *misthos*
 feel: *paskhō*
 feel affection: *agapaō*
 feeling of love in return: *antiphilêsis*
 feeling of love: *philêsis*
 fine: *kalos*, *khrestos*
 fitting (be): *harmozō*
 flourishing: *eudaimôn*, *makarios*
 flourishing (n.): *eudaimonia*
 foolish: *agnômôn*
 force: *bia*
 forgetfulness: *lêthê*
 form: *skhêma*
 fortunate (be): *eutukheō*
 fortune: *daimôn*, *tukhê*

frankness: *parrhêsia*
 fraud: *kakourgia*
 friend: *philos*
 friendless: *aphilos*
 friends (having many): *poluphilia*
 friendship: *philia*
 function: *ergon*

gap: *diastêma*
 genus (of like): *homogenês*
 give: *didômi*
 give a share: *metadidômi*
 giving (n.): *dosis*
 goal: *telos*
 god: *theos*
 good: *agathos*, *epieikês*
 good fortune: *eutukhia*
 good will: *eunoia*
 good will (feel): *eunoeô*
 good will (having): *eunous*
 government: *politeia*
 gratify: *kharizomai*
 gratifying: *agapêtos*
 gratitude: *kharis*
 greedy: *pleonektês*

habitual condition: *hexis*
 happen to be: *tunkhanô*
 happy: *eudaimôn*; *makarios*
 harm: *blabê*
 harmony: *harmonia*
 hate: *miseô*
 hierarchical: *huperokhikos*
 honour: *timê*, *timiotês*
 hope: *elpis*
 hospitality: *xenia*
 house: *oikêsis*, *oikia*
 human being: *anthrôpos*
 humane: *philanthrôpos*

illiberal: *aneleutherios*
 image: *eikôn*
 impious: *anosiourgos*
 impulse: *hormê*
 inanimate: *apsukhos*
 incidental(ly): *kata sumbebêkos*
 incomplete: *atelês*
 incorrigible: *aniatos*
 indefinite: *aioristos*
 individual: *idios*
 inexperience: *apeiria*
 intend: *boulomai*

intention: *boulêma*
 interval: *diastasis*
 investigate: *zêteô*
 irrational: *alogos*

just: *dikaiois*
 justness: *dikaioisunê*

kind: *eidos*
 kind (of like): *homogenês*
 kind (of the same): *homoeidês*
 king: *basileus*
 kingship: *basileia*
 kinship: *genetê*
 knowledge: *epistêmê*

larger share: *pleonexia*
 law: *nomos*
 law-suit: *dikê*
 laziness: *argia*
 lazy: *argos*
 leisure: *skholê*
 liberal: *eleutherios*
 life: *bios*
 like: *homoios*
 like (v.): *agapaô*
 like-mindedness: *homognômosunê*
 likely: *eikos*
 likeness: *homoioîma*
 limit: *horizô*
 live (v.): *bioô*, *zô*
 live together: *suzô*
 loan: *daneion*
 location: *topos*
 lovable: *philêtos*
 love (n.): *philia*
 love (v.): *phileô*
 love (feeling of): *philêsis*
 love erotically: *eraô*
 love in return: *antiphileô*
 love of honour: *philotimia*
 lover: *erastês*
 lover of flatterers: *philokolax*
 lover of honour: *philotimos*
 loving: *philikos*, *philos*
 loving of friends: *philophilos*

many-friended: *poluphilos*
 many-guested: *poluxeinos*
 masculine: *andrikos*
 master: *despotês*
 material: *hulê*

mean: *mesos*
 meaning: *sêmasia*
 measure: *metron*
 measure (v.): *metreô*
 memory: *mneia*
 middle: *mesos*
 mind: *dianoia, nous*
 mind (be of one): *homognômoneô*
 misfortune: *atukhia, sumphora*
 moderate (adj.): *metrios, sôphrôn*
 moderation: *sôphrosunê*
 monarchy: *monarkhia*
 money: *argurion, khrêmata*
 money-grubber: *dôrodôkos*
 money-lender: *daneistês*
 mother-loving: *philomêtôr*
 motion: *kinêsis*
 move (v.): *kineô*

 natural: *phusikos*
 naturally: *phusêi*
 nature: *phusis*
 nature (be of a; be by): *pephuka*
 necessary: *anankaios, deon*
 necessity: *anankê*
 need (in): *endeês*
 neediness: *endeia*
 noble: *gennaïos, kalos*
 not know, not recognize: *agnoeô*
 number: *arithmos*

 office: *arkhê*
 oligarchy: *oligarkhia*
 opinion: *doxa*
 opposed: *enantios*
 opposite: *antixous, enantios*
 oppositeness: *enantiotês*
 order, orient (v.): *tattô*
 owe: *opheilô*
 own (adj.): *oikeios*

 pain: *lupê*
 part: *meros*
 partner: *koinônos*
 passion: *erôs*
 passionate (be): *eraô*
 pay: *didômi*
 perceive: *aisthanomai*
 philosophize: *philosophêô*
 philosophize together: *sumphilosophêô*
 philosophy: *philosophia*
 physical: *phusikos*

plausible: *eikos*
 pleased, pleasing: *hêdus*
 pleased (be): *hêdomai*
 pleasure: *hêdonê*
 pleasure-lover: *philêdês*
 pleasure-loving: *philêdonos*
 poor: *penês*
 possession: *ktêma*
 power (position of): *dunasteia, exousia*
 power: *dunamis*
 praise (v.): *epaineô*
 presence: *parousia*
 price: *timê*
 professor: *sophistês*
 profit: *kerdos*
 profit (v.): *kerdainô*
 profitable: *lusitelês*
 promise: *epangelia, huposkheis*
 promise (v.): *epangellô*
 proper: *oikeios*
 property: *ousia*
 proportion: *analogia*
 proportional (be): *analogeô*
 proportionally: *analogon, analogôs*
 prosper: *eudaimoneô*
 prosperity: *eudaimonia*
 prosperous: *eudaimôn*
 proverb: *paroimia*
 public: *koinos*
 puzzle: *aporia*

quality of character: *tropos*
 question, raise a: *aporeô*

rational: *logikos*
 rationale, reason, reasoning: *logos*
 reason (v.): *logizomai*
 reason (n.): *logismos*
 reason (cause): *aitia*
 reasoning: *logistikos, logos*
 recollection: *mnêmê*
 recompense (v.): *ameibomai*
 reconcile: *dialuô*
 rectify: *epanorthoô*
 regret: *metameleia*
 rejoice in: *khairô*
 relation: *skheis*
 resources: *euporia*
 rotation: *diadokhê*
 rule: *arkhê*

sameness: *tautotês*

satisfactory: *hikanos*
 satisfy: *arkeô*
 search (n.): *zêtêsis*
 seek: *epizêteô*, *zêteô*
 self-controlled: *enkratês*
 self-love: *philautia*
 self-loving: *philautos*
 self-sufficient: *autarkês*
 sensation, sense, sensibility: *aisthêsis*
 serious (be), seriously (take): *spoudazô*
 seriousness: *spoudê*
 shameful: *aiskhros*
 share (v.): *koinônêô*
 sharing: *koinotês*
 sign: *sêmeion*
 similar: *homoios*
 similar in character: *homoêthês*
 similarity: *homoiotês*
 simply: *haplôs*
 soul: *psukhê*
 standard: *kanôn*
 strife: *stasis*
 strive: *spoudazô*
 suffer: *lupeomai*, *paskhō*
 suffice: *arkeô*
 sufficient: *hikanos*, *arkios*
 superiority: *huperokhê*
 survival: *sôtêria*
 survive: *sôzomai*
 sustenance: *trophê*

terrible: *deinos*
 think: *dianoemai*, *dokeô*, *noeô*, *oimai*
 think right, think worthy: *axioô*
 thinking: *noêsis*, *theôria*
 thought: *dianoia*, *theôrêma*
 thought (of, pertaining to): *theôrêtikos*
 time: *khronos*
 timocracy: *timokratia*
 tool: *organon*
 transform: *alloioô*

true: *alêthês*, *alêthinος*
 true (be): *alêtheuô*
 trust (v.): *pisteuô*
 trust (n.): *pistis*
 truth: *alêtheia*
 tyranny: *turannis*
 tyrant: *turannos*

ugly: *aiskhros*
 undergo: *paskhō*
 unfortunate: *dustukhês*
 unfortunate (be): *atukheô*, *dustukheô*
 unknown: *agnôs*
 unnoticed (go): *lanthanô*
 unpleasant: *aêdês*
 use: *khêsis*
 utility: *khreia*

valuation: *timêma*
 value: *axia*
 vice: *kakia*
 virtue: *aretê*
 voluntary: *hekousios*

want: *boulomai*
 weak: *asthenês*
 weakness: *astheneia*
 wealth: *ploutos*
 well-being: *eupatheia*
 wicked: *mokhthêros*
 wickedness: *mokhthêria*
 wise: *sophos*
 wish (v.): *boulomai*
 wish (n.): *boulêsis*
 womanish: *gunaikôdês*
 word: *logos*
 worth (n.): *axia*, *axiôma*
 worth, worthy of (adj.): *axios*
 worthy: *spoudaios*
 wrong (v.): *adikeô*

Greek-English Index

- adelphos*, brother, 177,2
adikeô, wrong, 169,19
aédês, unpleasant, 207,34
agapaô, feel affection, 171,16; 188,18;
 be content, like, 198,8
agapê, affection, 171,15
agapêtos, gratifying, 207,37
agathos, good, 163,10
agnoeô, not recognize, not know,
 175,20; 196,16
agnômôn, foolish, 197,38
agnôs, unknown, 195,20
agoraïos, commercial, 172,25
aïskhros, ugly, shameful, 176,12-13;
 184,14
aïsthanomai, sense, perceive, 204,4;
 207,3
aïsthêsis, sensation, sensibility,
 167,7; 181,28; sense, 207,38
aitia, reason (cause), 171,23
aition, cause, 166,31-2
aitiaomai, blame, 191,33
aitios, (be) a cause, 180,4
alêtheia, truth, 169,12
alêthês, true, 163,7
alêtheuô, be true, 200,19
alêthinos, true, 172,22
alloioô, transform, 192,15
alogos, irrational, 193,28
ameibomai, reciprocate, recompense,
 183,10; 188,9
amoibê, exchange, recompense,
 184,24; 184,34
amphilogos, ambiguous, 183,37
analogeô, be proportional, 177,6
analogia, proportion, 187,6
analogon, proportionally, analogous,
 173,4; 182,18
analogôs, proportionally, 183,3
anankaïos, necessary, 163,9
anankê, necessity, 165,39
andreios, courageous, 196,5
andrikos, masculine, 207,12
aneleutherios, illiberal, 172,26
aniatos, incorrigible, 192,4
anomoioeidês, dissimilar in kind,
 187,5
anomoios, dissimilar, 173,15
anosourgōs, impious, 194,4
anthrōpos, human being, 163,27
antiphileô, love in return, 165,32
antiphilêsis, feeling of love in return,
 166,12
antixous, opposite, 164,34
aoristos, indefinite, 204,11
apâidô, be discordant, 169,11
apataô, deceive, 191,29
apatê, deception, 191,30
apeiria, inexperience, 163,20
aphilos, friendless, 205,5
apodidômi, assign, render, 179,18;
 180,10; pay, in return, provide,
 184,11; 190,31-2
apolauô, enjoy, profit from, 185,19;
 197,17
aporeô, raise a question, 200,17
aporia, puzzle, 184,24
apothnêskô, die, 201,30
apousia, absence, 170,21
apsukhos, inanimate, 165,31
aretê, virtue, 163,4
argia, laziness, 195,7
argos, lazy, 196,1
argurion, money, 188,21
aristokratia, aristocracy, 178,6
aristos, best, 168,5
arithmos, number, 205,1
arkeô, suffice, satisfy, 178,14; 188,17
arkhê, office, beginning, 163,11;
 164,8; authority, 179,9
arkhō, rule, 173,21
arkios, sufficient, 188,19
astheneia, weakness, 163,22
asthenês, weak, 179,30
atelês, incomplete, 166,16
atukheô, be unfortunate, 202,33

- atukhia**, misfortune, 202,32
autarkês, self-sufficient, 194,24
axia, worth, desert, 173,38; 178,27;
 value, 185,38
axiôma, worth, 190,27
axioô, think worthy, expect, 175,14;
 176,13-14; think right, 185,13
axios, worth, worthy, 174,16; 183,20;
 deserve, 197,15

basileia, kingship, 178,5-6
basileus, king, 178,13
bia, force, 184,11
bioô, live, 202,3
bios, life, way of life, 163,9; 208,7
blabê, harm, 196,25
boulêma, intention, 197,9
boulêsis, wish, 166,12
boulomai, wish, want, 165,32; 179,9;
 intend, 200,19-20

daimôn, fortune, 202,21
daneion, loan, 190,8
daneistês, money-lender, 197,28
deinos, adept, terrible, 169,12; 177,13
deon, needful, meet, 197,13; 191,20;
 right, necessary, 200,17; 205,29
despotês, master, 179,11
diadokhê, rotation, 196,29
diakeimai, be disposed, 192,27
dialuô, dissolve, sunder, 166,32;
 169,3; reconcile, 189,18
dialuomai, dissolve, break up,
 191,18; 191,26
dialusis, dissolution, 187,21
diamartanô, err, 163,20
dianoemai, think, 204,33
dianoia, mind, thought, 194,26;
 204,34
diaphônêô, be discrepant, 200,5
diaphora, difference, 178,21
diaphoros, different, 179,14
diastêma, gap, 174,9-10
diastasis, interval, 192,20
didômi, give, pay, 173,33; 188,21;
 enable, 200,3
dierkhomai, discuss, 163,3
dikaïos, just, 164,13
dikaïosunê, justness, 164,9
dikê, law-suit, 183,39
diomologia, agreement, 188,8

diorthoô, correct, right, 208,20;
 190,40; be decided, 196,21
dokeô, seem, think, 164,15; 174,37;
 seem right, be decided, 190,40;
 196,21
dôrodôkos, money-grubber, 185,34
dosis, giving, 187,12
doxa, opinion, 175,9
dunamis, power, ability, 179,22;
 185,11
dunasteia, position of power, 163,11
duskolia, churlishness, 163,4
duskolos, churlish, 171,36
dustukheô, be unfortunate, 207,22
dustukhês, unfortunate, 163,17

eidos, kind, appearance, 164,23;
 195,35
eikos, plausible, reasonable, 168,6;
 176,15; likely, 191,15
eikôn, image, 179,6
eleutherios, liberal, 172,24
elleipsis, deficiency, 183,4
elpis, hope, expectation, 167,1; 198,38
emporía, business, 185,14
empukhos, animate, 180,35
enantios, opposite, opposed, 164,26;
 174,25
enantiotês, oppositeness, 164,25
endeês, in need, 170,32
endeia, neediness, 185,24
energeia, activity, 170,13
energeiai, actively, 170,5
enkratês, self-controlled, 201,7
epainêô, praise, 163,14
epangelia, promise, 188,23
epangellô, promise, 187,18
epanisoô, equalize, 185,34
epanorthoô, correct, rectify, 192,7;
 202,33
epanorthôsis, correction, 192,5
epieikeia, decency, 196,4
epieikês, decent, fair, 166,1; 173,33;
 good, 192,18
epikouria, assistance, 184,39
epimeleomai, be concerned for,
 179,36
epimelês, of concern, 197,36
epistêmê, knowledge, 196,17
epithumeô, desire, 194,6
epithumia, appetite, 200,26

epizêteô, inquire into, seek, 197,27;
200,1
eraô, be passionate, love erotically,
164,31; 172,10
erastês, lover, 168,31
ergon, deed, function, 163,23; 173,27;
action, fact, 188,37; 200,5
erômenos, beloved, 168,31
erôs, passion, 207,39
erôtikos, erotic, 167,11
êthikos, character-based, 183,25
êthos, character, 165,3
eudaimôn, prosperous, flourishing,
happy, 163,15; 202,16
eudaimoneô, prosper, 203,17
eudaimonia, prosperity, flourishing
(n.), 163,12; 202,26
euergesia, benefaction, 163,14
euergeteô, confer benefactions, 163,13
euergêtês, benefactor, 182,7
eunoeô, feel good will, 166,5
eunoia, good will, 195,18
eunous, having good will, 165,40
eupatheia, favour, well-being,
175,5-6; 207,31
euporeô, be affluent, abound,
187,10-11
euporia, resources, 174,10-11
eutukheô, be fortunate, 202,34
eutukhia, good fortune, 202,32
exisazô, be equal, 173,3
exousia, position of power, 171,33
exousiazô, have authority, 179,30

genetê, kinship, 182,14
gennaios, noble, noble-minded,
194,26; 207,10
genos, family, 182,4
gunaikôdês, womanish, 207,11

haima, blood, 181,35
haireomai, choose, 163,10
hairetos, choiceworthy, by election,
171,1-2; 196,29
hamartanô, err, 175,38
haplôs, simply, 165,19
harmonia, harmony, 164,35
harmozô, be fitting, 179,18
hêdomai, be pleased, enjoy, 166,30-1;
202,1
hêdonê, pleasure, 164,6

hêdus, pleasing, pleased, 165,15;
192,25
hêgeomai, believe, 173,3
hekousios, voluntary, 189,15
hêlix, of the same age, 181,37
hêmartêmenos, erroneous, 179,13
hetairikos, comradely, 170,38
hetairos, comrade, 177,2
hexis, habitual condition, 170,12
hikanos, sufficient, satisfactory,
165,11; 188,4
homodoxia, consensus, 196,15
homoeidês, of the same kind, 169,27
homoêthês, similar in character,
180,19
homogenês, of like genus, of like
kind, 164,2; 191,12
homognômoneô, be of one mind,
193,27
homognômosunê, like-mindedness,
196,21
homoîôma, likeness, analogue,
168,22; 179,1
homoioomai, be assimilated, 170,11
homoios, similar, like, 164,10; 164,27
homoiotês, similarity, 164,25
homologia, agreement, 181,7
homonoieô, be in concord, 164,14
homonoia, concord, 164,10
horismos, definition, 193,14
horizô, define, limit, 177,3; 205,17
horizomai, set, define, 188,15; 193,12
hormê, impulse, 195,23
hulê, material, 165,3
huparkhê, be, pertain, exist, 168,18;
172,33; 182,19
hyperballô, exceed, 184,37
hyperbolê, excess, 172,10
hyperokhê, superiority, 173,8
hyperokhikos, hierarchical, 179,34-5
hupomenô, endure, 172,29
hupopoieô, give for adoption, 175,19

idios, individual, private, 182,27;
199,37; distinctive, 206,12
isazô, be equal, equalize, 183,3; 187,6
isarithmôs, equal in number, 166,10
isos, equal, 171,38
isotês, equality, 169,22

kakia, vice, 203,34
kakos, evil, 207,9

- kakourgia**, fraud, 191,35
kalos, noble, beautiful, fine, 164,20;
 164,35; 203,34
kanôn, standard, 193,1
kephalaion, chapter, 163,2
kerdainô, profit, 201,38
kerdos, profit, 185,14-15
khairô, enjoy, rejoice in, 164,7
kharris, favour, gratitude, 189,36;
 196,9
kharizomai, gratify, do a favour,
 168,30; 188,38-189,1; favour, 201,1
khreia, need, utility, 163,12; 172,6
khremata, money, 177,9
khreos, debt, 184,1
khresis, usefulness, use, 191,10-11;
 199,2
khrestos, fine, 201,36
khronos, time, 167,2
kindunos, danger, 184,33
kineô, move, 171,17
kinêsis, motion, 171,21
kitharôidos, cithara-player, 188,1
koinôneô, share, 176,36
koinônia, association, commonality,
 176,34; 177,1
koinônos, partner, 208,10
koinos, common, collective, 170,3;
 178,16; public, 193,23
koinotês, sharing, 191,8
krateô, control, be in control, 201,7;
 201,9
ktêma, possession, 203,16
kurieuô, control, 179,20
kurios, authoritative, authorized,
 185,5; 188,12
lanthanô, go unnoticed, escape
 notice, 165,41; 184,12
lêthê, forgetfulness, 170,22
logikos, rational, 193,28
logismos, reason, 167,14
logistikos, reasoning, 193,29
logizomai, reason, 171,16
logos, reasoning, argument, 163,20;
 164,29; definition, rationale,
 171,24; 174,6; account, reason,
 174,18; 192,13; idea, word, 198,16;
 206,2
luô, dissolve, 174,20
lupê, pain, 206,32
lupeomai, suffer, 206,27
lusitelês, profitable, 163,19
makarios, flourishing, happy, 170,34;
 202,16
merizô, divide, 206,29
meros, part, 177,15
mesos, middle, mean, 169,7; 176,28
metaballô, change, 179,2
metameleia, regret, 195,3
metreô, measure, 184,34
metrios, moderate, 174,17
metron, measure, 184,22
miseô, hate, 194,9
misthos, fee, wage, 188,15; 188,19
mneia, memory, 192,28
mnêmê, recollection, 198,38
mokhthêria, wickedness, 192,5
mokhthêros, wicked, 165,5
monarkhia, monarchy, 178,11
noeô, think, 163,25
noêsis, thinking, 204,2
nomisma, currency, 187,12
nomizô, believe, 189,22
nomos, law, 180,38
nous, mind, 201,8
oikeios, related, own, 164,4; 171,27;
 appropriate, proper, 178,8; 190,35
oikeiotês, relationship, 181,14
oikêsis, house, 179,29
oikia, household, house, 179,5; 198,17
oimai, think, 163,17-18
oligarkhia, oligarchy, 178,26
opheilô, owe, be in debt, 183,37;
 197,29
ôpheleia, benefit, 167,1
opheilêma, debt, 183,37
ôpheleô, benefit, 180,29
ôphelimos, beneficial, 166,36
ophelos, benefit, 163,12
oregomai, desire, 175,7
orexis, desire, 176,28
organon, tool, 180,28
orthos, correct, right, 163,20; 194,1
ousia, essence, property, 165,8; 192,7
paideia, education, 180,5
paradeigma, example, 179,5
paralogos, contrary to reason, 197,26
paramenô, endure, 166,31
paramuthia, consolation, 207,7

paroimia, proverb, 168,9
parousia, presence, 195,36
parrhêsia, frankness, 191,8
paskhō, suffer, feel, undergo, 169,22;
 193,6; 199,11
pathêtikos, emotional, 193,29
pathos, emotion, undergoing, 165,3;
 199,9-10
patris, country, 201,30
penês, poor, 163,17
pephuka, be of a nature, be by
 nature, 165,13-14; 172,11
phaulos, base, slight, 169,5; 188,25
phaulotês, base form, 178,24
philanthrôpos, humane, 164,3
philautia, self-love, 199,31
philautos, self-loving, 199,35
philédês, pleasure-lover, 169,31
philêdonos, pleasure-loving, 169,31
phileô, love, 163,26
philêsis, feeling of love, 165,29
philêtos, lovable, 165,13
philia, love, friendship, 163,2; 170,23
philikos, loving, 164,15
philokolax, lover of flatterers, 174,36
philomêtôr, mother-loving, 199,13
philophilos, loving of friends, 164,20
philos (n.), friend, 163,10
philos (adj.), dear, loving, 164,5;
 164,12
philosophêô, philosophize, 169,12
philosophia, philosophy, 188,34
philotês, amity, 171,29
philotimia, love of honour, 174,35
philotimos, lover of honour, 174,38
phrontizô, be concerned about, 164,9
phthora, corruption, 178,10
phusêi, naturally, 198,22
phusikos, physical, natural, 164,29;
 186,8; naturalistic, 203,39
phusis, nature, 163,26
pisteuô, trust, believe, 165,11; 168,12
pistis, trust, 184,1
pleonektês, greedy, 200,25-6
pleonexia, larger share, 197,12
ploutos, wealth, 179,22
polis, city, 164,7
politeia, government, 177,17
politês, citizen, 164,13
politikos, civic, 176,31
poluphilia, having many friends,
 164,21

poluphilos, many-friended, 205,5
poluxeinos, many-guested, 205,4
pragma, affair, fact, 178,30; 205,37-8
praxis, action, 163,21
proaireomai, decide, choose, 171,13;
 184,7
proairesis, decision, 171,13
prosdokia, expectation, 199,6
prosêkô, be appropriate, be related,
 170,36-7; 202,30
prothumeomai, be eager, 183,7
prothumos, eager, 207,27
psukhê, soul, 180,28

sêmasia, meaning, 200,19
sêmeion, sign, 165,11
skhêma, form, 179,7
skhesis, relation, 181,24
skholê, leisure, 194,27
sôma, body, 180,28
sômatikos, bodily, 200,23
sophos, wise, 174,15
sôphrôn, moderate, 193,15
sôphrosunê, moderation, 193,15
sôtêria, survival, 197,30
sôzomai, survive, 193,37
spoudaios, worthy, 163,7
spoudazô, strive, be earnest, 164,12;
 170,39; take seriously, 186,9
spoudê, seriousness, effort, 184,10;
 192,6
stasis, strife, 164,11
stergô, cherish, 163, 5
sumbebêkos, attribute, 165,8
sumbebêkos, kata, incidental(ly),
 166,27
sumpherô, be advantageous, 164,34
sumpheron, advantage, 177,16
sumphilosophêô, philosophize
 together, 208,10-11
sumphora, misfortune, 204,11
sunallagma, contract, 183,38
sundesmos, bond, 182,31
sunekhês, continuous, 203,30
sunêthês, companion, 178,29
sunistamai, arise, consist, 167,4;
 175,14; form, 207,39
sunoikia, community, 205,17
sunousia, company, 177,29
sunthêkê, contract, 181,7
suntithemai, consent, 189,8
suzô, live together, 166,38

tattô, order, class, 165,18; 173,2;
 orient, establish, 177,30; 188,9
tautotês, sameness, 181,33
tekmêrion, evidence, 207,17
teleios, complete, 163,6
telos, end, goal, 165,18; 193,35
theôrêma, thought, 194,26
theôreô, observe, contemplate, 171,10
theôrêtikos, of thought, 194,12
theôria, thinking, 193,35
theos, god, 174,12
timê, honour, fee, 175,3; 188,35; price,
 189,13
timêma, valuation, 178,7
timiotês, honour, 175,9

timokratia, timocracy, 178,6
topos, location, 170,18
tropos, quality of character, way,
 168,8; 168,32; character, 207,1
tukhê, condition, fortune, 163,18
turannis, tyranny, 178,11
turannos, tyrant, 178,12

xenia, hospitality, 205,3

zêteô, seek, investigate, 164,10; 165,12
zêtêsis, search, 176,5
zô, live, 163,10
zôion, animal, 164,1

Index of Names

Agamemnon, 180,1
Epicharmus, 197,39
Euripides, 164,29-30; 197,2; [202,21]
Heraclitus, 164,34
Hesiod, 188,18; [205,4]
Homer, 179,8; 180,1
Lakedaimonians, 196,30
Persians, 179,10

Phoenician Women, 197,2
Plato, 169,38
Protagoras, 188,14
Pythagoreans, 204,8
Socrates, 169,38bis; 169,39
Theognis, 203,38; [208,23]
Zeus, 179,8; 190,33

MICHAEL OF EPHESUS

*On Aristotle
Nicomachean Ethics 9*

Translation

This page intentionally left blank

Textual Emendations

- 463,3 Reading *hêi* for *ên*
- 467,18 Reading *eis ho* <*ho*> *drasas* for *eis ho drasas*
- 467,18 Reading raised stop rather than comma after *pepoiêken*
- 467,20 Reading full stop rather than comma after *diatêrein*
- 467,21 Lacuna not indicated by Heylbut
- 468,17 Reading *zêtô* for *zêtôi*
- 469,14 Reading *kurion* for *kurios*
- 470,24 Reading *hupêretêton* for *hupêrêtêton*
- 471,16 Reading full stop in place of question mark
- 471,18 Reading full stop in place of question mark
- 476,17 Reading *phília* for *philían*
- 476,24-5 Deleting parentheses around *hosôi gar ... analêpsin*
- 477,27 Inserting *ou* before *doteon*
- 481,3 Inserting *hoper esti*
- 481,10 Reading *diamenein* for *dianemein*
- 482,21 Deleting *kai thelêmasi*
- 487,5 Putting raised stop after *ouk an eiê*; insert *philêsis*
- 487,5 Inserting *gar* after *to*
- 490,15 Reading *Lakedaimonious* for *Lakedaimoniois*
- 494,3 Lacuna not indicated by Heylbut
- 494,37 Inserting a comma after *telos ousan*
- 494,38 Reading full stop in place of raised stop
- 495,1 Deleting Heylbut's full stop
- 495,1f. Bracketing *to de sumphoron ... telos* and *sumpherontos* as glosses
- 495,12f. Bracketing *kai ... philêton* and *to hêdu ... kai* (dittography)
- 497,37 Reading <*to*> *tou zôgraphou* <*einai*>
- 498,1f. Reading *to tou euergetou einai* for *to tou euergetês einai*
- 502,17f. Bracketing only *huparkhei malista* rather than *tauta ... malista*
- 503,15 Inserting *kai* after *timais*
- 505,27 Deleting *therapeuei* (inserted by Heylbut)
- 507,34 Punctuating with full stop after *logizomenois*
- 509,8 Punctuating with full stop after *estin*, rather than comma

- 509,11 Punctuating with full stop after *eudaimôn* rather than comma
- 509,33 Reading *kreitton* for *kreittô*
- 511,2-8 Deleting parentheses
- 511,4 Reading ... *ho eudaimôn, tôi <de> energein <ou> hôste ...*
- 511,29 Reading *spoudaiôs* for *spoudaious*
- 511,38 Reading *legô* for *legôn*
- 512,12 Reading *energeiai* for *energeia*
- 513,1 Inserting Heylbut's conjecture (in app. crit.)
- 516,11 Inserting *hoper elegon* after *pepoiêken*
- 517,24 Reading raised stop after *estin*, and deleting comma after *zêi*
- 522,1 Reading *allêlôn* for *allêlois*
- 524,8 Reading *to lupoun* for *to philoun* and deleting *sunalgein*
- 524,10 Punctuating with full stop after *lelupêmenon*
- 524,35 Reading *lupês* for *aitias*
- 525,17 Reading *autôi* for *autou*
- 527,27 Punctuating with full stop after *diagei*
- 528,19 Lacuna after *philiaiautôn* not indicated by Heylbut
- 528,20 Reading *phaula* for *phaulai*

Michael of Ephesus' Exegesis of the
Ninth [Book] of the Ethics

461,1

That love is a part, not of justness as a whole, in the sense of lawfulness, but rather of [justness] by turns [e.g., in the exchange of goods], which was [defined as] distributive of the equal, is not altogether unclear. For such justness, as was shown in the fifth book of the present treatise [ch. 5], is distributive of equality, and love imparts equality to friends. For it is necessary that there be equality if love is to be preserved. For if in the amount that a poor man loves and honours a rich man, he receives in return, proportionally, that amount of what the rich man abounds in, the love is preserved, but if not, it is dissolved; and similarly in the case of other things, as we shall learn as we examine the texts. It is not unclear, then, that [love] is a part of justness by turns. 5

That love is not predicated as a genus of more particular things, but is rather [one] of those things that are called 'from one and to one', has been determined by Aristotle in the second [book] of the *Magna Moralia* (11, 1209a22-30).¹ Thus, if, in the present book, he sometimes speaks of species of love, he is using the name of 'species' (*eidos*) in a transferred sense. 15

That there are three parts or species (let them be called species) of love has been shown in the book preceding this one. For since there are three lovable on account of which we human beings love – the good, the pleasing, the useful – it is necessary that loves be three as well: for one who loves someone either loves him as good, for example as wise or temperate or courageous or just or an account of all these things; or as pleasing (a witty man and a girlfriend are of this sort); or as useful. He is called useful, by means of whom some good thing happens, and commercial people are above all friends on account of the useful. The good and the pleasing are lovable as ends, but the useful [is lovable] as contributing something to an end. [Aristotle] spoke, then, about these parts or species of love, and about love simply, in the book preceding this one – what it is and among what things and about what. *What it is*, [namely] that it is a virtue or is [connected] with virtue (for in fact love too is about actions and emotions, just as virtue also is: for there are loving actions, and loving is itself an emotion). *Among what things*, [namely] that it is in both similar things and dissimilar things (for the love that is primary and 20 462,1 5

properly [so-called] is among similars, for it among worthy and good men; for these love one another as good and worthy and similar; the remaining [loves], that on account of the useful and [that on account of] the pleasing, are among dissimilars). *About what*, [namely] that it is about the good and the pleasing and the useful. Having in that book said these things and many other things that are relevant to arguments concerning love, in this, the ninth book, he sets forth the remaining things [relevant] to [arguments] concerning love.

1163b32 In all the loves that are dissimilar in kind, proportionality equalizes and preserves the love, as has been said.

[Aristotle] recalls what was said and shown in the book preceding this one, for he showed that proportionality preserves loves that are dissimilar in kind. Loves similar in kind, as was said, are those of good men, and all the others are dissimilar in kind. For good men are similar and equal in number and power: for however many and whatever sorts of good things are in the one are also observed in the other. And therefore too they are in one another, as Basil the Great was in the Theologian [i.e., Gregory of Nazianzus] and the Theologian was in Basil the Great, and neither thinks it right to have more than the other, but rather what is equal. In such men, there is the love that is equality in all things.

The love of a father for a son or of a son for a father is not simply similar or equal, because neither is the father equal to the son (observe this in our case),² nor the latter to the father. Proportionality, therefore, preserves the love of these, for however much the father exceeds the son, by so much the love of the son for the father should exceed that of the father for the son, so that the equal according to geometrical proportion preserves the love between them. But this is not in an equality of quantity, as has been shown at length in the fifth book (7, 1131b12), but rather in a similarity of ratios.

That there are not only loves for those who are of like kind but also toward those who are dissimilar has been shown in the book that precedes this one; for the base man loves the worthy man, although he is dissimilar, because of his own lack of virtue: he becomes a friend to the worthy man because he thinks that he acquires³ virtue from him. So too the poor man to the rich, for he is a friend on account of his lack of what the rich man abounds in. They love simply in respect to what each needs from the other. In all loves that are dissimilar in kind, then, proportionality preserves [them], as also in a civic association: for as that is preserved whenever the exchange is proportional, so to is love. For if a witty man will acquire something he wants in proportion to the pleasure with which⁴ he gladdened the one who

was pleased, the love abides with them; if not, it is dissolved. Similarly [in the case of] the love of a girlfriend for her lover.

5

***1164a1** Here a common measure, coin, has been provided.⁵

How coin is a measure has been discussed at length in the fifth book (8, 1133a19); let us speak of it succinctly here too. Let there be a house (call it 'a'), the product of a builder, and ten coins (call them 'b'), and a bed (call it 'c'), the product of a carpenter, worth one [coin]. Since they are all assessed in coin, let the house be worth five coins, and the bed one coin. By means of coin, then, we shall recognize how many beds are worth as much as a house. For since the house (a) is worth five coins, and this is half, obviously, of the ten coins (b), and the bed, in turn, is [worth] one coin, it is obvious that this is a tenth of the ten coins and – the house being [worth] five – a fifth of the coins [the house is worth]. Since, then, the bed is worth one coin, it is obvious that five beds are worth five coins. Five coins are half of the ten coins, and the house was half of the ten coins, and halves of the same thing are equal to each other. Consequently, five beds are equal to one house. This was found by ten coins having been set as the middle [term] of the house and the bed: thus, the builder will give a house and receive either five beds or five coins. In all such cases, when it is not known how much one product either exceeds or falls short in respect to the other, or if it neither falls short nor exceeds but they are equal, we use coin as a measure, as we [use] a cubit or a foot [as the measure] of how great a magnitude is. The kind of thing⁶ that is before us is also so in the case of a heap, [which is measured] by means of a bushel, and in the case of heavy things, [which are measured] by means of a hundredweight, and [in the case of quantities] in the number [by which they are multiples] of the unit. The love of these people too, then, endures when there is proportionality and the exchange is equal, and [so does that] of all others who exchange their own products with one another. If not, the [loves] are dissolved.

10

15

20

25

1164a3 In erotic [love], sometimes the lover lays a complaint.

30

Those who love on account of the useful (these were the carpenter and the weaver and the shoemaker and the builder, who requite fairly in proportion to [what they receive] and benefit each other, as was said) think it right, not unreasonably, that they be equally loved in return. For it is just that one who requites fairly things that are equal and similar to what he has been treated to, be loved as he loves. But if one person loves on account of one thing and the other on account of another, between which it is not possible that the equal according to proportion arise, it would be ridiculous to think that one should be

464,1

loved in return equally, as happens in the case of a lover and his girlfriend.⁷ For to these, the same thing is not lovable, as was the useful to those who have been discussed [above], but rather beauty is
 5 lovable to the lover, but money to the girlfriend. In these things, it is very difficult to capture equality according to proportion.

These are the things [Aristotle] is going to discuss in the [passages] before us; the [words] of his own text are: 'sometimes the lover lays a complaint, because he is not loved in return' equally, 'since he has nothing, perchance, that is lovable' (1164a3-4), that is, because he is
 10 neither useful nor otherwise pleasing. For he is not useful to the boyfriend or girlfriend if the money on account of which he was loved has failed him, nor is he pleasing if he has grown old. For it happens sometimes that, although their money is still preserved, they are displeasing to their boyfriends or girlfriends because of old age. Sometimes, then, as was said, the lover lays a complaint, and some-
 15 times it is the utterly corrupt boyfriend [who does so], because the lover, having promised, prior to the most wanton union, that he would do for him [the boyfriend] all that he wishes, fulfils none of those things. Thus there occur, on account of such things, complaints and a dissolution of the love: that is, because of the fact that money fails the lover, and sometimes too his prime of life, and beauty [fails] the
 20 boyfriend. For, [Aristotle] says, they did not love the others, as worthy men do, 'but rather the things that belong' (1164a10-11) to them: these things were beauty and money, which are not enduring, and when they fail it is necessary that the love too fail along with them.

The love of worthy men, which is on account of their virtue, is inalterable, because the virtue on account of which they are friends of one another is a most firm and most enduring thing. And as long as they are pleasing to one another they are friends, because each
 25 [day] their beauty of soul, which is what they are passionate for, flourishes anew and grows young again and becomes more youthful. And they are not only pleasing but also useful, because virtue is among the most useful things: for virtue is the most beautiful and most pleasing and most useful thing.

Having said that the loves on account of the pleasing and the useful are not enduring, [Aristotle] added, 'but the [love] of character [does endure], being [love] in itself' (1164a12). He calls the virtues 'character'; the [love] on account of character, being [love] in itself and
 30 properly so called, is enduring. The [words], 'being [love] in itself', may have been meant in the sense of 'on account of [the loves] themselves and not on account of their [properties]'.

'They fall out also when they get other things and not the things they desire' (1164a13-14). Some say that it was Alexander [the Great] who promised the cithara-player that the better he sang, the more he would give him, while others, looking to the magnificence of the king

and his readiness for benefaction, [say] that it was not Alexander, but rather someone else. For us, it is of no importance to learn who it was who promised. What [Aristotle] says in this [passage] is that when the cithara-player had sung very earnestly, and then sought to receive what had been agreed to, the one who had promised said, 'you have it all'. When the cithara-player asked again, 'How do I have it, if I have received nothing?', he who had promised replied, 'With the same words with which you gladdened me, I [gladdened] you: you have received just what you have given, and having amused the ear you have been gladdened in the ear'. 'They fall out also', says Aristotle, 'when they get other things and not the things they desire' (1164a13-14), as in the case of the cithara-player: if the cithara-player had wanted the pleasure of the ear, as the one who promised did, there would have been neither a complaint nor a falling out, but if the cithara-player [wants] profit, while the other [wants] amusement, and the one has his amusement, but he who played the cithara does not have his profit, then a complaint is understandably laid against the one who promised. For we all give what we have, paying mind to and having regard for those things that we want; for if someone wants a cloak, he has regard for the cloak he does not have and gives what he has, for example a coin or something else. Such, then, are the things that are discussed. In the text, in which [Aristotle says] one gives 'the same things' (1164a22),⁸ the [phrase] [he gives] 'the same things' is the same as: he gives 'what he has'.

'Whose part is it to establish the worth, his who confers first or his who receives first?' (1164a22-3). Not all exchanges occur similarly, but rather that of commercial people is upon specific [terms] and they give upon receiving, from hands to hands, while that of more liberal people is for a [certain] time – in accord with an agreement, yes, but not a specific [agreement]; for if this were the case, it would not differ from a commercial and illiberal exchange that takes place on the basis of an assessment involving definite numbers.

Such, then, being the second [kind of] exchange, [Aristotle] asks: whose part is it to establish the worth? For example, someone has given a coin or something else to someone, and from these things there has accrued to the one who borrowed some profit and dividend; what return dividend, he asks, should the one who lent establish and define, if the friendship is to endure? Should he who lent say, 'it is fitting for you, o debtor, to give me such an amount, since you were benefited that amount by my coins'? Or is it right that he who has borrowed look to the dividend that he enjoyed and establish the fair requital? He investigates this by looking to the things that are often said [by people] to one another [in such cases]. For it is often possible to hear debtors who have indeed come off well as a result of the debt [they incurred] say to those who have lent, that they have received

30 nothing great from them but rather small things, which they would have received, if they had wished, from any chance person on account of the smallness and cheapness of the loan; and that 'what in fact I have gained in addition from the loan is something trifling and altogether nothing'. Whereas those who have lent say in return that,
 35 the greatest simply, at all events the things that are greatest and necessary to themselves, and which they themselves could not have received from another, even if they had called in tens upon tens of
 466,1 thousands [of debts]. Having investigated this, then, he added as a kind of solution to the inquiry: 'for he who has conferred first seems to leave it to the other' (1164a23-4).

<The reading [at 465,13-14] is elliptical, and it is necessary to supply 'or his who receives first'; and the full [sense] would be of the sort: 'or it is his who receives first to establish it; for he who has
 5 conferred first seems to leave it to the other'.>⁹

[Aristotle] calls the debtor the one who has received first, for he receives earlier, and so next the one who has lent says that the one who has received first should establish it, which is what they say Protagoras the sophist in fact did; for as each of those who approached him said, 'o Protagoras, for how much [money] will you teach me?', he used to answer, 'stay with me and learn, and when you have learned I shall take however much you assess the things you have learned to
 10 be worth'. And he used to take as many coins as the one who had learned, that is, he who received first, assessed. For Protagoras used to give first, and he who learned received first, and he, the one who learned, used to establish the worth. Just as, then, Protagoras left it to the pupil to assess and establish the worth of what he had learned, so too in the case of loans and those things in general that are given
 15 for the benefit of the one who receives, he who confers first seems to leave it to him who has received first to assess the benefit and requite fairly in proportion.

'Among such, the [proverb], "to a man, his wage", is agreeable' (1164a26-7). [Aristotle] called 'such' [understood as masculine] either those who do not take before they teach or those who confer first or perhaps both. 'To a man, his wage' is from Hesiod; he says, 'his wage should be sufficient for a man' (*Works and Days* 370). What he means is something like this: a man should take the wage that is due and proportional to the work he has performed or to the action exacted of him. ([Aristotle] says, 'among such' [which may also be neuter]: he may mean [among] such works and actions as are agreeable to those who seek proportionality of good treatment.) But he did not say that it is agreeable to all, but rather to some, looking to the greed of
 20 commercial people; for such men most often seek to make out well from what they have done, rather than [seek] what is equal.

1164a27-8 Those who have taken money first, but then do none of the things they said.

Those who have taken first without a defined agreement, but then do not requite fairly in proportion to what they have been benefited, are not entirely subject to complaints; but a complaint is justly laid upon those who have measured and established the good treatment [that is due], and then have done none of the things they promised because of the excesses of their promises. Sophists do these things, for they affirm that, if they will receive thus much gold, they will teach many and great things, amazing and beyond wonder; but when they have received as much money as they sought, they teach no such thing, because they don't even know it. For such is the tribe of sophists, most ignorant, most mad for fame, most money-loving. They promise such things, because no one would eagerly have granted them even a penny if in fact they had wished to acknowledge what they knew how to teach. For all their experience or technique has been restricted to thirteen modes: homonymy, ambiguity, composition, division, pronunciation, figures of diction, and the remaining seven, and all these have been discussed by Aristotle in the *Sophistical Questions* (4, 165b22 ff.) and by me in the lectures on them written by me. But these men, because they do not fulfill what they have promised, are reasonably hauled to accounts. 30 35 467,1 5

'In cases in which there is not a contract for service' (he calls 'good treatment' a service which he who has given first has done for him who has received first) 'those who give first on account of themselves' (that is, those who on account of their own character and virtues and the fact that they are worthy confer first and give first), 'are beyond complaint' (1164a33-5) and none bring complaints against one another, neither those who received first nor those who gave first. For they do not confer first or receive first because they are looking to profit or some such thing, but rather only to what is noble. For love in accord with virtue performs and undergoes only what is noble and nothing else; and in the case of such love – I mean that of worthy people – it is not he who receives first and has come off well who measures and establishes the fair requital, but rather he who has acted and given first. For he who has come off well should fairly requite that to which the one who acted¹⁰ and did him well was looking;¹¹ the worthy man has done him well looking to being loved purely and unadulteratedly; thus [the one who came off well] should preserve his love for him [the one who acted] pure and unadulterated.¹² And if the one who confers first lacks something, but the one who took first abounds in it, eagerly ... the decision of the one who acted.¹³ 10 15 20

But also 'among those who have shared in philosophy' (1164b3).

25 The teacher and the tutor seem to be the measure of fair requital, for the benefaction and the good treatment on the part of him who has taught are not measured by money; for honour is not equal in weight to the noblest things of philosophy nor could it ever be, <but here too those who have learned should show honour toward one's tutors, and if they lack anything, support them, if they can, as quickly as possible>.¹⁴

1164b6 When the gift is not such a sort but rather on a certain condition.

30 The measure of [that kind of] giving that is on account of [the friends] themselves is, as has been said, the decision of the one who confers first. But when it is not such a sort [of giving], 'but rather on a certain condition', that is for the sake of repayment and fair requital in money (for this is [giving] by contract), let the fair requital, [Aristotle] says, be such as to seem to be according to value both to the one who confers and has done a service first, and to the one who received and was done a service first, and so that neither one says – not he who confers first that he received less than what was due nor he who was helped that he gave [back] more than what was appropriate.

35 468,1 If it does not happen to be according to value (cf. 1164b8): that is, [if] it is not possible to judge how much it is in value: for some of those who confer first and receive first are able, from some practice and experience, to discern what is in accord with value and tell it to each other, the one who offers [saying], 'I was not penalized, for I received what was in accord with the value', and similarly the one who has received 'I did not penalize [him], for I have given what was due and proportional'.

5 Some, then, both of those who help and those who are helped, are such types; but some are inexperienced and without a notion of what is in accord with value. Therefore, they bring complaints against one another, the one saying that he received less than what was due, the other that he has given more than the value. In the case of such people, [Aristotle] says, 'it is necessary that he who foreholds establish it [i.e., the return]' (1164b9).

10 Perhaps he calls the one who confers first 'he who foreholds' because he *holds* what he has given *before* giving it.¹⁵ He would establish it [the return] if, when he gave, he said, 'I give you these things; come tell me the [number of] coins [you will pay back], at so much interest'. Similarly, one who teaches would establish it if he should say, 'I have chosen and wished, in return for the pleasure that you are going to have from the things you are going to learn from me, to receive this much money'. And in particular, let the cithara-player say: 'I wish to receive this for the pleasure and amusement of the

cithara-playing'; and a courtesan, too, in accord with the same [principle]: 'I seek¹⁶ to receive, for the joy of my company, this much'. Or he may call 'he who foreholds' the one who wants and receives, rather than the one who confers first: he calls such a one 'foreholding' inasmuch as he was benefited *foremost*. For having been benefited and having profited first, he brings the fair requital to the one who confers; and [Aristotle] would be saying that he who has received first should establish and define the repayment, [saying], for example: 'I am going to grant you this much, since so much will be the amount I am going to profit from what is yours'. So too, indeed, the lover and he who is going to learn and he who will be amused by the cithara-player should establish the payment, [saying], for example: 'I am going to give you this much for what I shall learn' and 'this much for the amount I shall be amused'.

Such is the sense of what is being said, and this is what accords with the text. For if, [Aristotle] says, he who has given first receives, proportionally, as much as he who received first was benefited, he will have an equitable repayment; for example, if he has profited by twenty-four coins and should give eight to him who lent, he has made the requital equitable. For he should receive what is in accord with value also for the labour that he undertook and the expenditure that he spent; for if, having profited twenty-four [coins], he should give twelve to the one who has lent, he would surely be penalized. This occurs also in the case of the girlfriend and of one who has learned and of the cithara-player: if the girlfriend or cithara-player or teacher should receive in return as much as the pleasure that they got from her company, from his cithara-music, and from his learning, [respectively,] the repayment will be equitable. For it is thus, too, in the case of sales: for in these, the one who buys, rather than the one who sells, establishes the value of the commodity. For the one who sells always seeks more than the value, while the one who buys gives as much as he thinks the benefit from the commodity comes to.

1164b13-14 In some places there are laws that there may not be suits for voluntary contracts.

The [word] 'voluntary' is added, because there are also involuntary contracts, and what these are has been discussed in the fifth book of the present treatise (2, 1131a1-9). It is apparent from the statements that are before us that [Aristotle] was calling 'the one who foreholds' the one who wants and receives from him who has and offers. Having said that, in the case of those who set repayments not on account of themselves and their own character but rather on account of some benefit, he who foreholds and wants should establish the repayment, he confirms that this has been rightly established from the fact that

among certain people, laws are instituted that prescribe that he who confers not sue the one who foreholds, for example, that the one who lent [not sue] the one who borrowed, but rather that they like and approve whatever he who foreholds may give in return. For since he trusted when he gave, it is obvious that he has conferred and given first while rendering [the other] empowered¹⁷ to establish and define the repayment. Since he trusted him, accordingly, that he would set the repayment equitably when he conferred first, let him trust him when he says that he has made worthy return, and let him be reconciled with him without a juror. Rather, even if he should give nothing at all, neither the loan nor any return dividend, but says, 'I have given both the debt and the dividend of it', not even so let the one who has lent or has conferred first sue him, but rather let him believe him as though he had given. For let him trust now too in him, to whom he gave by virtue of trusting that he was decent and would not disavow [the loan], as being such a person. Such is the sense of what is being said; in regard to the text, 'for he thinks him more just to whom it has been left to establish it' (1164b15-16), the [word] 'thinks' is said in reference to the law. For the law or the lawgiver thinks it is more just that the one who foreholds establish it and not a juror, which we see happening at this time: for we hear many of those who confer first say to those who forehold, 'I give to you; you, knowing what is noble and best, measure in return what is in accord with worth; but in saying this I do not enjoin you to define and establish the repayment'.

30 ***1164b16-17** For most often those who have and those who wish to receive do not assess at an equal amount.

This too happens to come, for the most part, from usual matters. For those who have, for the most part say that the things they have are worth a lot of value, even if they are no great things. They do this looking to the straits of those who do not have and want to receive, and on this account they seek large repayments, such as are the thrice-cursed money-lenders among us: <for> they, on the basis of few coins and little time, demand back and take multiple interests. But even if, [Aristotle] says, those who have assess their own things at a lot, the recompense should be as much as those who have received establish, for they know the profit and the benefit that have issued from the loan. Since, indeed, those who borrow are in straits, they often believe that what they are receiving is great on account of their lack; but when they have received it and are doing business and are flourishing by some good fortune, the loans seem small and cheap to them, and on this account they put the recompenses small and cheap. Aristotle, correcting for this error, says that the one who has borrowed

and received should not assess at how much he thinks it is worth now, when he is flourishing, but rather at what he assessed it at before, when he happened to be in straits. For we assess differently when we have a thing and when we want it, and differently again when we are in need and lack greatly, and [when we lack only] slightly. 10

These things too raise a puzzle: whether we should obey our father in all things, and whether obeying one's father is recompense and repayment for what each of us has got from his father. He duly adds these things, then, since the philosopher's argument is about recompense and counter-recompense and repayment. What he is investigating is of this sort: since each of us, in fact, owes his own father (for the kind of thing we forehold and have received from him is being and living), should we obey all the things he may bid? And, if we should happen to be sick, [should we] eat and drink those things that our father prescribes, despising the doctors? And similarly, if we should have the authority and the position and the power to elect generals, shall we elect him whom our father prescribes, having dismissed the one who is capable of being general? Furthermore, [Aristotle] says, if two people petition, one of them being a friend, the other not a friend but a worthy and good person, to whom should we do the service¹⁸ and give, if we are not able to satisfy both: to the friend or to the worthy person? For it is not right to disregard a friend who petitions, and to drive away a worthy person is one of the most irrational of things. And should we compensate in return a benefactor who petitions or a comrade, when the comrade too is in need, when we are not able, here too, obviously, to render compensation in return to both? Having inquired about these things, he adds 15 20 25

1164b27-8 Are all such things, indeed, not easy to determine exactly, 30

saying what is in agreement with what was discussed in the first [book] of this treatise (1.1094b19-27). For it is not possible to adduce solutions that are defined and established [in the case] of things that are indefinite, for the things that occur are unstable and whirling and different at different times. For sometimes the same things appear bigger than and sometimes smaller than the same things, and at times noble and advantageous and at times base and disadvantageous, at times necessary and at times not such. Since the difference, then, is so great and of such a sort concerning such things, and now it is more noble to do a service for a friend than for a worthy person, but another time, on the contrary, for a worthy person rather than for a friend, it is not easy to define exactly and affirm definitively, for example that one should always do a service for one's friend and be unconcerned about a worthy person, or else help the worthy person 35 471,1 5

- and dismiss the friend. But rather one must adapt oneself to the times and the needs and the necessities. This, [Aristotle] says, is meanwhile obvious, that 'one should not pay everything in return to the same person' (1164b30), for example honour and money and similar things, but rather some things to one, some things to another: for example, to one who is childless and solitary, more honour, to one who has children and needs many things, more money. And one ought to help more one who has been more wronged, and less one who has [been wronged] less. But, if it should at times happen [that circumstances dictate otherwise] (for the things that befall are many and practically innumerable), one should give money to the solitary one, but not give it to the one who has children.
- 15 'And one should render in return benefactions for the most part rather¹⁹ than do a favour for a comrade' (1164b31-2), but sometimes one should do a favour for a comrade rather than render in return to a benefactor.²⁰ For if a comrade is being hauled to his death on account of money, one should favour him rather than a benefactor who is in no danger.²¹ So too a loan should be payed in return to one who has lent rather than a comrade be favoured, but this too is not always so.
- 20 For example, Polemarchus was captured by enemies; Antisthenes ransomed him with his own money. When Polemarchus had not yet paid the debt to Antisthenes, it happened that both Antisthenes and Polemarchus' father were captured by his enemies. Whom, then, will Polemarchus ransom off, if he can not [ransom] both: his own father
- 25 or Antisthenes, who ransomed him from his enemies? It is obvious that [he will ransom his father] rather than pay back the debt as a ransom for Antisthenes, for he must prefer in honour his own father, and not, indeed, Antisthenes who ransomed him or anyone else, such as a comrade or friend. For one should honour beyond all people and render return to him who is causative of our being, that is, our father.
- 30 These things, then, are what he says; the [phrase] 'or not to one who has been captured and demands back' (1164b35-1165a1) is something like this: 'If Antisthenes, who has ransomed him, demands back the debt, whether he was captured or not captured, should Polemarchus pay him back, despising his father?'

1165a2-3 As has been said, one should in general pay back the debt.

- 35 The [term] 'in general' has been selected in place of 'rather' or 'simply and for the most part' one should pay back the debt. If a giving surpasses in what is noble, that is if it is more noble and more necessary to do the giving to another and not to the one who has lent, or for the sake of another and not for the latter's sake, then one should
- 472,1 do the giving to the former and for the former's sake, and let go, for

the present, the lender to whom it is owed. 'For sometimes', [Aristotle] says, 'it is not at all equal', or rather, just, that the one who has taken the initiative and done a service first be recompensed: [for example] when he who has taken the initiative has done a benefaction knowing 5 that the person for whom he has performed the benefaction is a worthy person, while he himself, who has done the benefaction, happens to be wicked. For even if he has helped [the other], nevertheless there need not be a repayment to him, for it is not right to provide fuel for vice; rather, when the one who has lent is a liar and perjurer and unjust, while the one who has borrowed is a fine person, even if it happens that the fine person is wealthy while the wicked 10 one lacks, one should not lend in return, because, having received, he will deny it and swear that he has received nothing. For the base person has lent knowing that he will surely receive [back] the loan on account of the fairness of the one who borrowed, while the other, expecting, or rather knowing exactly, that he will not receive the loan, reasonably will not lend in return. No, not even on this account will [a loan] be agreed to with the senseless and base on the part of the 15 prudent. Whether, then, the one who lent is in truth evil or whether he seems so, one should not lend to him in return. For neither is the worth equal, but rather it is equitable for an evil person to lend to a decent one, but no one would think it right that the decent person do equal and the same things in regard to the wicked one. For it is advantageous that the evil person be in need rather than be wealthy and have tools for his viciousness.²²

As [Aristotle] said, 'many times, then, the arguments concerning 20 emotions and actions are similar' (1165a12-13).²³ He calls 'emotions' [episodes of] confidence and terror, desires and aversions, and 'actions' those things that arise from the desires and pains and confidence, for example when a person has killed himself because of grieving: grief is the emotion, having slain himself the action; and when a person, being pleased, has given to a poor man, although 25 previously he did not give: pleasure is the emotion, the giving is the action; and when a person, being angry, has struck someone and, being terrified, has thrown away his shield: anger and terror are the emotion, while the beating and the casting away of the shield are the action. Since emotions and actions are about people, for example anger is about a person who has angered [one], or rather about the one who has been responsible for the fact that the one who is angry has become angry, and grief is about the one who has caused grief and terror about terrifying things, and these things are indefinite, 30 the arguments concerning these things are also indefinite. For of terrifying things some are greatly terrifying, others are less so, some are slightly so, while others seem so but are not. Things being such, it is not possible to say definitively that one should be terrified of

things that are greatly terrifying, but should not be terrified of things that are not such. For one ought to despise some terrifying things, even if they are very much so, and die rather than be terrified [into doing certain things]. For one should die rather than deny God or tell to enemies where one's country lies and how it may be captured. But again, one should be terrified of some things that are slightly terrifying, whenever not being terrified brings shame, and in the case of some things withstand [terrifying things] for a long [time], while in the case of others for a short [time]. Similarly in the case of pleasing and grievous things, it is not possible to define exactly, that one should be angry or grieve so much. It has become obvious, then, that arguments concerning emotions and actions 'have what is definite in a way that is similar to the things about which they [the emotions and actions] are' (1165a13-14), for they are equally indefinite and difficult to grasp.

- 5 **1165a14-16** It is not unclear, then, that one should not give the same things to all, nor all things to one's father, just as not even to Zeus are [all things] sacrificed.

Just as, he says, not all things are sacrificed to Zeus (for there were some things which it did not seem right to the Greeks [i.e., pagans] to sacrifice to Zeus; for it seemed unholy to bring dogs and snakes and many other things as sacrifice to Zeus who, according to the Greeks, was the father of men and gods), so too one ought not to render in return all things to one's father. For neither shall we obey him if he summons us to denial of the living God, nor if he compels us to betray our country, but rather we shall render in return what it is obligatory to grant to a father: honour, care of his body, and every other assistance.

Neither should all things be rendered in return to one's father, then, nor should one grant the same things to all people. For it is not holy to grant the same things to children and adolescents and [adult] men and old men, or to worthy and base people, but rather to each of these what is appropriate. And he shows by an example what things one should grant to whom. For one should, he says, invite one's relatives to weddings, which in fact is what we see happen for the most part. One should also bring such people to the rites ('rites' are the transactions prior to the wedding),²⁴ and provide sustenance to our fathers as long as we live, because we owe them to that extent. For just as in the case of loans we owe up to that [moment] up to which we have the loan, so too we owe to our fathers as long as we exist, since we have from them, just as if it were a kind of loan, living and existing. And it is finer, he says, for us to support our parents, who are responsible for our existence, than our own selves, for our father

too is our god. We should put our god foremost and be concerned for his honour and care. People should honour their fathers, then, equal to God, except that one should not grant every honour to a father and mother, but rather that which is fitting to each; one ought not to grant to one's mother every honour that is fitting for one's father, nor again that [which is fitting] for one's mother to one's father, nor even that [which is fitting] for a wise man to one's father or one's mother. For it is both fitting and fine to accompany one's father to the bath house and wipe him off and do the other things that usually happen to those who are bathing, but for one's mother it would be unsuitable and not honourable. [So too it is fitting] to honour a wise man because he knows great and wonderful things, one's father because he is responsible for the fact that one is living, and an elder by rising and by the privilege of a seat. For if you happen to be sitting and see an elder man pass through, you ought to rise up, because he is more honourable (*kosmios*) than you. He is more honourable because he was made known to the world (*kosmos*) before you and has ordered and comported (*kosmeô*) himself according to the order in the world. For these are properly speaking elders, and not those who live in the manner of cattle and like Sardanapalus (1095b20-2).²⁵

Again, with respect to brothers and comrades ([Aristotle] calls 'comrades' those who have shared the same education and have philosophized together about the same things) – with respect to these, in fact, one should have frankness and sharing of all things. For if the things of true friends are in common, how are those of brothers not so? Thus, if all things are in common, one should be frank and should reproach and should correct both one's brother and one's comrade, if they err in some way; and if [one can] not, it is necessary to suffer together the recrimination for those things, since we are partners in all those things. And simply, [Aristotle] says, one should try to grant to all that which is appropriate, reasoning that this one is useful to me for this and I should honour and take care of [him] through a proportional repayment, while another is worthy and I should honour him with praises and rising [from my seat] and should escort him with reverence; and [that I should honour] each of the others in a way worthy of his character, his behaviour, his way of life, his works, his activities. Having said these things, [Aristotle] adds that judgement is easy in respect to what kinds of things one should present to which of one's kindred in regard to honour. He may call 'kindred' (*homogenês*) either fellow tribesmen (for all the Paeonians are kindred to the orator Demosthenes and the Colyttes to Aeschines)²⁶ or simply all those who are in one's town and fellow citizens. Of those who are different, or rather not kindred, judgement is difficult. But one should not, of course, give up because it is difficult, but rather one should try to judge what is appropriate to each of them.

1165a36-1166b1 There is a puzzle too [about] dissolving loves or not with regard to those who do not remain [the same].

Both dissolving friendships (*philia*) and not [doing so] seemed an evil to people then. For if friendship is a good thing (and in fact a friend is a good thing), and the casting away of a good thing is an evil, then the dissolution and casting away of friendship are an evil. Contrariwise, if forcing one who does not wish to love to be a friend is an evil, then for the friendship not to be dissolved is also an evil. 'There is', then, he says, 'a puzzle', whether they ought to dissolve the love and those who were formerly friends become unfriendly. For example, if one [party] cherishes the friendship [between them] and wishes to love, but the other does not wish to love, then should the one who likes and wishes shake it off and throw it away equally with the one who does not wish it, or ought he to like the other even though [the other] does not wish it? Having raised the question, he solves it by saying that in respect to those who love on account of the useful and the pleasing, there is nothing odd in their dissolving it when they no longer have those things on account of which they loved. For if a lover (*erastês*) loved his girlfriend on account of her beauty, but now she is ugly and has none of the things that please, it is not odd if the love (*philia*) is dissolved. Similarly, if his money, for the sake of which his girlfriend loved him, will fail the lover, or if both things fail both, the woman her beauty, the man his wealth, the love will certainly be dissolved, since the lovable things are absent. This will happen also, indeed, to those who love on account of the useful; but it is not odd that loves [or: friendships] on account of the pleasing and the useful are dissolved without complaint and without recrimination.

But the one who remains [loving] might cogently lay a complaint against that one who did not remain so, [that is], against one who felt affection on account either of the pleasing or the useful for the one who remained [loving], but concealed this and pretended to love on account of virtue and character, like Lysias the orator who, although he loved Phaedrus on account of his beauty, pretended that he loved him for being naturally fine and quick to learn. Accordingly, when Lysias deserted him and dissolved the love (*philia*) for Phaedrus, after his beauty had failed him, Phaedrus might justly have laid a complaint, since he [i.e., Lysias] loved him on account of his beauty, although he pretended to love him on account of his quickness to learn. Having said that 'one might lay a complaint' (1165b4) – obviously, the one who remains [loving] against the one who loves on account of the pleasing or the useful but pretends that he loves on account of character –, [Aristotle] determines when one should lay a complaint against oneself and when against him who did not remain [loving]. And he says: whenever 'one is mistaken, and supposes that he is loved

on account of character' (1165b8-9), although [the other] does none of the things that those do who love on account of character but rather the utter opposite, shamelessly touching body parts one ought not and in a manner one ought not, such as those usually do who pursue unlawful acts, or spending or embezzling his [resources] or taking them for himself, such as, again, those indeed do who love on account of the useful – whenever, then, one thinks, although he sees these things, that he is loved on account of his character, he might well accuse himself and not the one who loves him. For that one made it clear, on the basis of the deeds he did, that he loved not on account of character but rather the pleasing or the useful. But whenever [the other] loves on account of the pleasing or the useful, but commits none of the things that the abovementioned was doing, and dissolves the love after a long time and scarcely revealing through signs of any sort that he had loved on account of the pleasing and the useful, but may even have attempted to conceal [the nature of] his emotion, then one ought not to lay a complaint against oneself but rather against the other, on the grounds that he deceived and feigned that he loved him on account of his character but [really] loved him not on account of this but rather on account of the pleasing or the useful. For the former [lover] did not deceive, for that on account of which he loved was apparent by what he did, but the latter perseveres in deceiving and it is just to reproach him, and reproach him, [Aristotle] says, 'more than those who counterfeit coin, by as much as his viciousness concerns a more honourable thing' (1165b11-12). For insofar as love is more honourable than coin, by so much is viciousness concerning it worse than that concerning coin. And, obviously, it has been established that there necessarily follow differences and complaints against one another when [the parties] are not as they think [the other is], as in the case of the abovementioned: for the one thought that he was loved on account of his character, but the other loved him not on account of this but rather, as was said, on account of pleasure or money.

1165b13-14 If one accepts [a person] as good, but he then becomes wicked and appears so, should one still love him?

The [phrase] 'and appears' is the same as 'or appears'; what [Aristotle] is investigating is like this: if those who love one another were good men, and then it happened that one of them became base or did not, but seemed to have become base (for there are many who, although they are not such, for example base or worthy, seem to be this sort) – if, then, this shall happen, and the one who has become or seems to have become evil cherishes the love (*philia*), then does it seem right that the worthy one too still cherish the love which he had for him or

will he dissolve it? What he is investigating, then, is like this; he solves it by saying: 'or is it not possible?' (1165b14), that is, or is it impossible that a worthy man should be disposed in a friendly way toward the evil man? For no one loves what is evil or desires what is evil, but rather everyone craves the good and desires this and pursues this. For in fact even those who pursue and love what is evil treat and greet it not as evil but rather as good. One should not, accordingly, love what is evil. For one ought not to be evil-loving nor assimilate oneself to the base; but it is necessary to assimilate oneself [to it] if one lives with and spends time with an evil person. If the [saying] is true, moreover, that God always draws like to like, how is it possible that opposite things, vice and virtue, be friendly?²⁷

Having said that the one who still remains worthy ought not to love the one who has plunged from the worthy to baseness, [Aristotle] asks whether one ought to dissolve the love at once and simultaneously with his becoming base, or preserve it for a long [time] or any [time] at all. Having asked this, he replies by saying, or is it not the case that 'one should dissolve it at once' (1165b17-18), but rather attempt to correct [the other] and lead him away from worse things to better ones? And if he admits of correction, one should help him in regard to his character and his becoming good, such as he was previously, rather than in regard to money; for by as much as virtue is better than money, to that extent one should help him more in regard to the possession and recovery of it than in regard to his property and his money,²⁸ and because virtue is a thing more related to love than money is. If, then, he admits of correction, one should help him, but if he is incorrigible in his wickedness, one should dissolve it – after the [attempt at] help, obviously.

Having said that, if he is incorrigibly disposed, one should dissolve the friendship (*philia*), because encouragement of the dissolution is not improper, [Aristotle] added: 'the one who dissolves it would seem to be doing nothing odd; for he was not a friend' (1165b20-1) to the base man but rather to the worthy man, so that he is not casting away the one he used to love, nor is he rejecting the one to whom he used to be a friend, but rather he is fleeing one whom he did not use to love.

1165b23-4 But if the one remains [as he was], but the other becomes more decent and diverges greatly in virtue.

35 Having said that one should dissolve the friendship if one of the
477,1 friends has become base, he asks again, if both are decent, but one remains such as he was and the other progresses to the greatest [degree] of virtue and should become much more decent, then, with such progress, will the one who has progressed so greatly treat as a friend, as he did before, the one who has not progressed? And, having

asked it again, he replies to this too by saying that it is not possible for the one who has so driven ahead to the height of virtue to remain a friend to the one who remains somewhere below. And he confirms that it is impossible for those who differ so much to be friends from [the evidence of] the friendship between children: for if two children are friends, and then have become men, but the one should remain a child in his intellect, while the other is 'a most excellent sort' (1165b27), that is, the finest and best and pre-eminent, how could these be friends, since they neither enjoy the same things nor reject and hate the same things? 'For neither do these belong to them concerning one another' (1165b29), i.e., for neither is it possible that what seems pleasing or painful or in general lovable or hateful to the most excellent should seem such also to the one who is a child in intellect. But apart from when people love or hate and pursue and flee the same things, it is not possible for them to be together with one another and spend the day together and live together, and without living together it is impossible to be friends. If these things are so, it is impossible for those who differ so much to be friends.

So then, [Aristotle] says, they will not be friends: then, will the excellent man not be somewhat differently disposed toward the [one who is a] child in intellect, but rather be equally disposed toward him as he happens to be toward those who are similar to him [i.e., to the childish person who was his friend], but to whom he had never been a friend? And will he be utterly unmindful of the former acquaintance and friendship? [Aristotle] says in regard to this too that one should not utterly forget but rather one should remember that [earlier friendship]; and just as we think that it is better to do a favour for friends than for strangers and for irrational animals, so too 'one should grant something' to those who once had been friends on account of the former friendship – i.e., something of the sort one ought to give to one who is a child in intellect. But if the dissolution of the friendship has occurred not on account of an excess of virtue but rather on account of the magnitude of the other's vice and wickedness, one should [not]²⁹ give anything to the evil person; for one ought not to empower vice, as has been said (472,8), by providing it tools, but rather in every way purify it and render it ineffectual.

1166a1-2 The loving [acts (*philika*)] in regard to friends,³⁰ and the things by which the loves are defined, seem to have come from those in regard to ourselves.³¹

Having said 'the loving [acts]', [Aristotle] added, by way of clarifying what 'the loving [acts]' are, 'the things by which the loves are defined'. The [word] 'are defined' is the same thing as 'become recognized and perspicuous'. For whenever we see that someone wishes and is eager

35 that there accrue to some particular person as many things and the
 kinds of things as he wishes may be present or accrue to himself, we
 are confident that that one is a friend of this particular person. From
 478,1 what [else] is it obvious that Achilles was a friend to Patroclus, than
 from the fact that Achilles wished that Patroclus have as many and
 the kinds of things that he [himself] had? One who wishes, then, and
 strives for good things for the sake of another and for the sake of that
 person's comfort and preservation – we are confident that one who
 5 wishes these things, then, is a friend of that person to whom he wishes
 that these things be present and accrue. But one who wishes and
 rejoices that a particular person exist and live and prosper on condi-
 tion that he indulge together with him and take pleasure together
 and profit together from goods that are present or to come, we do not
 call a friend but rather a flatterer and a money-lover and a glutton
 and any other such thing.

10 It is mothers, [Aristotle] says, who above all experience wishing
 that [another] live for his own sake, for they love that their children
 exist and live and prosper on their own account and for their own
 sake, although they benefit them [the mothers] not at all. But [Aris-
 totle] says that 'of friends too, those who have had a falling out'
 (1166a6), even though they neither live together nor spend the day
 together and are not together with one another on account of a
 difference and a falling out that has occurred – these too, although
 15 they are so disposed, wish for one another that they live and be well
 and spend time nicely. For this is true friendship and those are really
 friends who wish for one another good things for their sakes, even if
 they are not with one another. For both Achilles wished that good
 things be present to Patroclus for Patroclus' sake, and Patroclus
 [wished them to be present] to Achilles for Achilles' sake.

20 Having said this, [Aristotle] says: some people say that that one is
 a friend 'who wishes and does good things or what seem good things
 for the sake of that one' (1166a3-4) whom he says he loves. The one
 who 'does good things' is the same as the one who does and takes
 trouble over everything so that goods that belong [to him] may be
 available, and those that are absent may accrue, to his friend. Some
 25 say that such people are friends and define friendship by such things,
 while others say that a friend is one who spends time together with
 the one who is loved and is together with him and 'chooses that the
 same things' (1166a7) be present to him as to himself – these latter
 too, obviously, meaning by 'the same things' [the same] as those [good]
 things that have been mentioned. Others, [Aristotle] says, say that
 'one who suffers and rejoices with one' (1166a7-8) is a friend. Suffering
 and rejoicing with, in addition to those things mentioned, pertain
 30 above all to mothers. Everyone, then, defines love by all these things
 or some or one of them, and each of these things 'pertains to one who

is decent' (1166a10), that is, to one who does good things for the sake of his friend: wishing that he live, even if he is not going to be benefited in any way from him; suffering and rejoicing together; wishing to spend time together and spend the day together – all these things pertain to the decent man in regard to himself. For the decent man, being dear [or a friend] to himself above all (for not simply every man loves himself, but rather one who nurtures the reasoning [part] in himself with the things with which it is of a nature to be nurtured) – loving himself, then, the decent man also does good things for his own sake, and takes pleasure together with himself when he does fine things, and suffers [with himself] if somehow he should happen to do something that is not due.

That only the worthy man is dear to himself and only he loves himself, and no one among base men is dear to himself but rather inimical and hostile, one may be confident of from the following: all we human beings, when we wish to show that we love this particular person greatly, say that he and I are one soul, as Gregory the Great in *Theology* [i.e. Gregory of Nazianzus] said in his funeral oration (*Orations* 43.20) for Basil the Great, 'one soul in two bodies'. If, then, they are properly friends whose souls are one by virtue of wanting the same things and wishing and doing the same things and not differing over anything, and the parts of the soul are the reasoning and the irrational, then the soul will be one and not of many parts whenever reason and the emotions agree and are not at war with one another. Whoever's soul is such happens to be dear [or a friend] to himself and might reasonably be said to love himself; the soul of a worthy man alone is such; hence, the worthy man alone is dear [or a friend] to himself. It is inferred as follows: the soul of the worthy man is one; those whose souls are one are friends; consequently, the worthy man alone is a friend to himself, for in this one alone are the parts of the soul well disposed because they are not at strife or at war with one another. If, then, he in whom the parts of the soul agree is a friend of himself, then those in whom [the parts] of the soul are at strife, and this part desires and pursues these things while the other those things – those people do not love themselves. Base people are such sorts, so that base people do not love themselves nor are they friends to themselves, for they fight against themselves. This is obvious in the case of those without self-control, for they simultaneously do one of the things that are in accord with pleasure and regret it and revile themselves. The base man is similarly disposed in the case of the other vices as well, for he is forever at strife with himself and opposing himself.

Each of the things that has been mentioned, as was said, pertains to the decent man. The rest, [Aristotle] says, in the respect in which they suppose that they are decent, love one another and wish good

things for their friend for his sake and all the other things that have been mentioned. And the worthy man is the measure and standard of all of them; for we count as friends those who love [us] just as the worthy man [loves] himself. The worthy man, then, is the measure of love. We also call 'gentle' a man who is angry not as it chances but rather as a worthy man is; the worthy man, then, is the measure of the gentle and of gentleness. And we label 'courageous' a man who is terrified or not terrified when he ought and as he ought to be: the worthy man, then, is also the measure of the courageous and of courage. In the case of all other things too we make virtue and the worthy man the measure; for just as the [standard] cubit is the measure of all cubits, because it remains the same and does not change toward the greater or the lesser, and the bushel and the other measures, if they changed, would not be measures, so too the worthy man is the measure of the others, because he remains the same and always craves and desires the same things 'with all his soul' (1166a14), that is with all the parts of his soul. For it is not the case that reason wants some things, while the irrational [part] desires others, as in the case of people without self-control, but rather [both desire] the same things, and [such a man] wants for himself and does good things.

Loving himself, the worthy man wants good things for himself, for no friend (I mean one who is truly a friend) wants base things for his friend but rather good things; thus, the worthy man also, being a friend to himself, wishes good things to be present to himself, and acts so that existing [goods] are present and those not existing will be present. 'For it is the part of a good man to work at good things' (1166a15-16), that is to be active and act, and be active not for the sake of the irrational [part] but rather 'for his own sake' (1166a16), i.e. for the sake of the reasonable [part]. For the reasoning [part] is, for each of us, our being and essence, and not the irrational [part] (for the irrational [part] has the position of slave for those who live in accord with nature) and he [i.e., the worthy man] wants, [Aristotle] says, the understanding and reasoning [part] of ourselves to live. For he indicated this by the [phrase], 'and he wants himself to live, and especially that with which he understands' (1166a17-19): 'and he wants that with which he understands to live' is the same as 'and he wants to do things that are advantageous to the understanding [part]'. For what does not live in accord with nature, but rather is swamped and debased with immoderate emotions, is carried off 'to the sea of dissimilarity'³² and in a certain way to lifelessness and not being. The worthy man wishes to be and to live, i.e., to do good, because to him being is good, that is, because to him being is in doing good things. Consequently, he wishes to live and to be, i.e., to effect

good things; to a worthy man, then, being is good, because for good things both to be effected and done is good.

1166a19-21 Each man wishes good things for himself, but no one would choose, [on condition of] having become another person, that that thing which has come into being have everything.

If the true human being and the divine [part] of the things that are in us is the intellectual soul, as [Aristotle] himself says in the tenth, [that is,] the next book – for he says in that [book] in these words: ‘For each of us would seem to be this: it is absurd, accordingly, if one will choose not his own life but rather that of some other’ (10.7, 1178a2-4), meaning by ‘some other’ the irrational part of the soul; and again later: ‘for what is to each thing its own is by nature the best and most pleasing to each; and to a human being, then, it is a life according to the mind, since a human being is this especially’ (10.7, 1178a5-7) – if, then, each human being, as we are saying, wishes good things for himself, <and it is the worthy man who is, properly speaking, a human being and not one like Sardanapalus, then the worthy man wishes good things for himself>³³ and things that are really good. For one who wishes that wealth be present to him, and things that pertain to luxury and the immoderate comfort of the body, does not wish these things for himself, but rather for his irrational [part], ‘the many-headed beast’ [cf. Plato *Republic* 9.588C5]; but one who pursues action and understanding pursues his own goods, and this is the greatest and best of goods, [namely], to be what one is, <which is>³⁴ that the reasoning [part] of ourselves is preserved pure and unbiased. For those who live in an emotional way are not what they are, i.e., intellectual souls, but rather they are that to which they minister, some [kind of] irrational wolves, boars and asses and suchlike animals. The worthy man, accordingly, wishes this good to be present to himself, I mean, indeed, to be what he is. For who would choose to have all good things, on condition of becoming someone else, for example a beast or a bird or Sardanapalus? No one would choose it, because, with each thing, it is best and greatest that its own species and self-sameness subsist and exist and remain³⁵ and survive, and it is impossible, when a change takes place from the human species to another species, for the goods of a worthy man to subsist for him.

But if one should concede this [to an opponent] and say that it is possible that [the goods] will follow to that species into which the change of the human species has taken place, [then] the worthy man’s goods will follow, but not strictly and as goods: because a human being’s goods are not also goods for a horse, just as neither are things that are good for a horse goods for a human being. [Aristotle] indi-

20 cated this with [the words], ‘for the god even now has the good, but as being whatever he is’ (1166a21-2), i.e., as being a god; but if he should become, from the nature that he has, some other thing, he will not have the good that he has now, or even if someone should give it [to him] to have, it will not be present to him as a good. That the same things are not goods to all but rather some to some and others to others, is obvious to everyone. For it is good for a horse to be hoofed, but it is not good for a human being; contrariwise, it is good for a human being to be multi-digitated and five-fingered, but the worst thing for a horse. And simply, the same things do not happen to be good for all, but rather these are for this one, and those for that.

25 Having said that each person is his thinking [part], [Aristotle] added ‘or especially this’ (1166a23), because the irrational [part] of us too completes and greatly contributes to the composition of what is called among the Peripatetics an ‘individually qualified’.³⁶ These men call an ‘individually qualified’ the individual person who consists of particular properties, such as Socrates or Plato: the aggregate of the particular properties of Socrates would never occur in the case of
30 any other person. They call a human being in general a ‘commonly qualified’.

Such a man wishes to spend time together with himself, for he does it pleasurably. For the worthy man, when he turns toward himself and sees a light that is steady and pure, having been kindled by his virtues, and the gleam that shines from his [various] knowledges,
35 exults and glories, and his recollection of the things that have been done by him and his expectations of things to come delight and gladden him, and detach him from trepidation and sympathy concerning things outside, and persuade him to consort with himself and persist in the contemplation of the things that are. He suffers with himself, if he has not done something that it is meet to do, and he
482,1 takes pleasure together with and rejoices with himself when he effects fine things, ‘for it is wholly so’ (1166a28), that is, for always and at all times the good is pleasing to him, and the base is painful. And he is, to state it simply, unregretful, for no one who does fine things ends in regret; therefore, since he always does fine things, he is unregretful. And if he does not always [do so], but sometimes also does
5 something base, he would do the most moderate [of base things] and things that practically did not seem base.

In regard to himself, then, each of these things pertains to the decent man, meaning by ‘each’ taking pleasure together with and suffering with himself, expecting good things and enjoying the things that have been done. If each of these things pertains to the decent man in regard to himself, and he is, and is disposed, in regard to his
10 friend as he is in regard to himself (for the one who loves is [himself] another loved one), it is obvious that he will wish also to spend time

together with his friend and take pleasure together with him and grieve together with him. For one must understand this in addition.

1166a33-4 Let [the topic of] whether there is or is not love in regard to oneself be dismissed.

It was said a little earlier in the present book that it is possible for there to be love in regard to oneself, and one ought not to say the same things again. 'It would seem', [Aristotle] says (1166a34), that love in regard to oneself exists not in the respect that the one who loves himself is one, but rather in the respect that [he is] two, meaning by 'two' the rational [part] of ourselves, which is what we properly are, and the irrational. For the human species and the human being are, properly speaking, the rational part of the soul and not the irrational. Whenever, accordingly, these [parts] are not at strife and do not differ, but rather the irrational follows the motions³⁷ of the mind and they are one by agreement (for by essence and by nature they happen to be two), there exists love [or: friendship] in regard to oneself, in the respect that such a man is two or insofar as he is more than two. For such a thing is what [Aristotle] calls 'potentially': if you should divide the soul, love in regard to oneself will exist, in the respect that the reasoning and the irrational [parts] are two; and if [you divide it] not into two but into three [parts], reason and temper and appetite, love in regard to oneself will exist not in the respect that [it is] two, but rather in the respect that it is more than two, that is, in the respect that it is three.

Another reading too is adduced, being this: 'it would seem that love exists in this way, in the respect that he is not two' (1166a34-35),³⁸ meaning the same thing on this reading too: for even if the rational and the irrational [parts] are two, in any case love then exists in regard to oneself when these are one.

This is so [i.e., there is love or friendship for oneself], in fact, also because an exceeding love [on the part] of one who loves in regard to a friend is similar to that in regard to oneself, the loving one. For one who loves someone as he does himself loves exceedingly.

'What has been said seems to pertain also to the many' (1166b2). He calls 'what has been said' the fact that the worthy man wishes to live and to survive, to spend time together, take pleasure together, and grieve together with himself, and that he is disposed toward his friend as he is toward himself. These things, then, he says also seem 'to pertain to the many'. He calls 'the many' those who live in accord with sensation and who fatten the rabble within them, the many-headed creature, as Plato says [*Republic* 9.589B1], [that is,] their appetite, and the lion-like [part, that is,] their temper, and subject their reason to their passions and accustom it to be a slave instead of

5 to rule, by virtue of its having been shackled by deceptions deriving from the senses. And look at Aristotle's exactness, how he did not speak simply thus, [saying] that the things that pertain to the worthy man pertain also to the many, but rather with the addition of the [word] 'seem', as if he said: these things do not truly pertain to them [the many] at all, but [only] by a kind of seeming and appearance. For
 10 not every thing that appears or seems so is true; for to the many, wealth and courage seem more choiceworthy and better things than wisdom and prudence, but this is not so. Also, the sun seems to be a foot in size, although it is many times larger than the earth. The many seem, then, to love themselves and to wish that both they themselves and their friends live and to spend time together with themselves and their friends, but this is not true: for this pertains not to themselves
 15 but rather to their irrational [part]. For what they help and nurture and fatten they seem also to be. They strive that the irrational [part] in themselves should fare well: hence they think that a human being is his irrational [part] and not his reason. For if they had supposed that the human species was its reason, they would have striven that this rule and be master and to nurture it by contemplation of the things that are.

20 Having said that 'what has been said seems to pertain also to the many' (1166b2), [Aristotle] added the reason for their seeming to pertain, saying, 'Do they, then, share in these things in the respect that they are agreeable to themselves and suppose that they are decent people?' (1166b3-4). What he means would be something like this: it is obvious that a man who craves some things and wants other things is not pleasing to himself, but one who desires the same things
 25 and wishes and wants the same things is agreeable to himself. Such are the many: for they are agreeable to themselves on account of craving the same things and wanting the same things. For in fact we see this happening also in the case of different people: for as many as desire the same things and want and wish the same things are agreeable to one another, but they are disagreeable and differ whenever one craves these things and wishes these things, but the other
 30 [wishes and craves] other things and not the same things.

Since worthy people are agreeable to themselves, the many suppose that they [themselves] are worthy people [too], because they are pleasing to themselves, but they err in two ways. First, they are not pleasing to themselves (for a human being is not his irrational [part], for which they do agreeable things, but rather his reason), and next
 35 because they [i.e., the propositions] are not truly convertible: for a worthy man is agreeable to himself because he does things that are agreeable to his reason; but it is not also the case that one who seems to be agreeable to himself is worthy. Worthy people are agreeable to themselves because in fact things that are really good belong to them,

while base people are agreeable to themselves not by virtue of truly having good things but rather by virtue of thinking they have them, although they do not have them. 484,1

[Aristotle] calls 'base' not those who are impious and in every way most evil but rather those who, on account of their ignorance of the really good things, are brought to a fondness for bad things as though they were good, and as a result of this are confident that they are good people.

What [Aristotle] wishes to say may be this. For the [phrase], 'share in' good things 'in the respect that', may either indicate this, [namely] that insofar as they [i.e., the many] think that they are good people they also suppose that they share in good things, meaning by 'good things' loving both themselves and their friends, and wishing to be together with and taking pleasure together with and grieving together with themselves – either he may mean this by the [phrase], 'share in' the good things 'in the respect that', or else that they seem so to those who look at them. For those who observe them think that they happen to be in possession of the goods that have been mentioned. 5 10

1166b5-6 Since these things pertain to no one of those who are altogether base and impious.

If loving both themselves and their friends, and spending time together and taking pleasure together and grieving together with and being agreeable to themselves do not in fact pertain to those who have been mentioned [i.e., the altogether base], although they seem to, then to those who are base and impious (these are those who spill the blood of their brothers and relatives and pillage temples and wed in unlawful weddings and defile themselves with strange and most shameful pleasures) – to these, the goods that have been mentioned do not [even] seem to pertain. For those who wish to undo themselves and are in utter unpleasantness and are never agreeable to themselves or wish the same things, but rather, in the manner of the Euripus,³⁹ shift from these things to those, since they are not satisfied by any of the things that they do – how could they believe that to exist and live is good, or how could they love themselves or others? For those who flee themselves (a sign of this is that they do not wish to live or that they even do away with themselves) – how would those who, then, flee themselves seem to love themselves or indeed others, or be together with themselves or spend time together and spend the day together with others? 15 20 25

Having said that to base people (and it has been remarked which people he calls base, among which he numbers also those without self-control) there seem to pertain the things that have been men-

- tioned, [Aristotle] added 'but almost not even to the base' (1166b6-7), having appended 'almost' on account of people without self-control. For the goods that have been mentioned seem to pertain to other base people, but to those without self-control they do not [even] seem to pertain; thus, [they seem to pertain] almost to all, but not simply to all. But why do they not seem to pertain to those without self-control? Because, although they wish the good things of human beings, which are in fact properly good, they are manifestly seduced toward the pleasures of an animal, [namely], those that derive from sex.

485,1 **1166b13-14** wicked people seek those with whom to spend the day together.

- They do not seek spending the day together as worthy people do but rather, wishing to do away with themselves but not doing this on account of cowardice, they seek to find some [other] people, but not friends. For it was said that they are friends neither with themselves nor with others, but rather they seek to encounter someone who wishes to pass time together with them, so that, by consorting together, they may be in oblivion of their own impious deeds. For when they are by themselves they recall such things, for they do not have any other things to recall, and by their recollection they are filled with darkness and turbulence and much unpleasantness, and they are greatly disgusted and disturbed and filled with distress, but are relieved by pastimes with others. Having nothing, accordingly, that is lovable (for what or what kind of pleasing or good or useful thing belongs to such people?), neither do they experience a loving [feeling] for themselves, that is, neither do they think it worth while to love themselves and spend time together with themselves; for no one wishes to spend time together with someone whom he hates, but these people hate themselves. Thus, they do not wish either to be together with themselves or to spend time together with themselves, nor even to rejoice together with or suffer with themselves, because rejoicing together and grieving together [with oneself] is [characteristic] of those to whom being likeminded belongs, and to whom the same thing seems fine and pleasing or neither fine nor pleasing, and in general to whom the same thing is agreeable; but those for whom this is not so have neither rejoicing nor suffering together [with themselves].

- For in the case of worthy people, since the reasoning [part] of ourselves rules and is master, and the irrational is ruled and mastered, and it agrees with reason and no strife occurs between them, the things which the reasoning [part] enjoys and with which it is satisfied the irrational [part] is [satisfied] as well, and the things with which reason is not satisfied, the irrational [part] too shakes off. And on account of this worthy people rejoice together with and grieve

together with themselves; for it was said that those things in which the rational [part] rejoices or grieves, the irrational [part] takes pleasure and grieves together in as well. But in the case of base people, since their soul is at strife and the irrational [part] rather is master, while their reason is mastered, and these people's pleasing things are displeasing to reason, and their irrational [part] is dissatisfied with the things with which their reason is satisfied, how is it possible for those who are disposed in this way to rejoice together with themselves? For rejoicing together is not possible in a deed and about a deed or action in which reason grieves but the irrational [part] rejoices. Consequently, reason and the irrational pull the wretched man, the one this way, the other that, [thus] tearing him apart and making him many instead of one. He is both pleased and grieves simultaneously at differing or rather opposite desires and appetites, because when the one is pleased, for example the irrational [part], then the reason grieves, and vice versa.

If it is not possible, [Aristotle] says, to be pleased and grieve at the same time, at any rate after a short [time] 'he grieves because he was pleased' (1166b23) and because those things have been pleasing to him, which, having been pleased by for a short [time], he soon regrets. If indeed, as we say, an evil man goes wretchedly and altogether miserably, then one should flee wickedness not at a walk but very swiftly.

1166b30 Good will resembles love, but it is not in fact love.

For one speaking about love it is consequent to inquire also about good will, which seems to be love (*philia*): whether it is love, as it seems, or is not love, but some [element] of love. It is, as will appear, not love, but the principle [or: source] of love. A principle [or: source] is not the same thing as that of which it is the principle. [Aristotle] says that good will 'resembles love', but is not it. For love is spoken of in regard to those for whom there is loving and being loved in return, and in regard to those who know that they love one another, and in regard to those who are acquainted; but good will arises also in regard to those who do not love in return and in regard to those who are unknown (cf. 8.2, 1155b27-1156a5). For, if we have frequently heard about someone, whom we have never seen, that he is good at warlike things or that he is artistic or worthy or that he is adept at ruling the city, we come to have good will toward him although he does not know that we entertain good will toward him. And in fact, as Aristotle says in other [places; cf. *Magna Moralia* 2.12, 1212a5], some of the people who are in Greece and who have never seen Darius were well disposed toward Darius, although Darius did not know this, Darius being in Persia and spending time with Per-

sians. If, then, we usually call friends those who are acquainted with one another and love [one another] in return and are not ignorant that they [each] love and are loved in return, but good will occurs also in regard to those who do not know and are unknown [to the other], good will can not be love.

***1166b32-3** But neither is it affection (*philêsis*, i.e., a feeling of love); for it does not have tension or desire.

He calls 'tension' an eager willing and impulse and wish in regard to love. That is why, having said, 'for it does not have tension', he added, 'or desire'. For of desire, appetite is one [kind], temper another, and willing yet another. Appetite is a desire for pleasing things, which is present in all things that have sensation, for things that perceive crave and desire pleasing things; temper is a desire to avenge oneself upon someone because he has slighted one; willing is a desire for good things that occurs accompanied by judgement and deliberation, and this occurs in human beings only. For temper is both in human beings and in other things that have sensation – not in all things that have sensation, such as worms and mosquitoes, but rather in the more complete ones.

Neither is good will, then, love, nor is affection, which is indeed a road to love. For affection [or: a feeling of love] is something analogous to warming or whitening: for as warming and whitening are to warmth and whiteness, and as healing is to health, so too is affection to love; and as whitening is between the black and the white, so affection is a mean between good will and love. Since, then, affection is eager, and thus likewise fast and slow, as both healing and whitening are, but good will is not fast, as neither is sickness or blackness,⁴⁰ good will can not be affection.

Now, the [phrase] 'for it does not have tension' is the same as 'for there is no extension and road whence and whither', as [in the case of] whitening. If, then, affection [(being a process) involves] whence and whither, but good will is not such, it can not be [affection];⁴¹ [for]⁴² the [phrase] 'for it does not have tension or desire' is equal to 'for there is no tension and extension and, simply, motion', as is [the nature of] desire.

Affection (*philêsis*) also aspires to love (*philia*) and to becoming a friend to him, in regard to whom the affection [or: feeling of love] exists; for everyone who has affection strives to become a friend to the one toward whom he has the affection. But one who has good will does not wish to become a friend to all people toward whom he has good will. For those [who are partisans] of the blue colour⁴³ have good will toward the blue [team], but do not at all wish to become a friend to

the charioteer; thus, these men have no affection in regard to the charioteer.

‘And affection occurs with acquaintance’ (1166b34); for, having passed a long time together with one another and having acquired a knowledge of their character and one another’s virtue, they thus aspire to love, and aspiring to love is affection.

15

Good will is not the principle [or: source] of all love but rather of worthy [love], for good will is [a function] of character and virtue, but not of the useful or the pleasing. Also, affection [or: a feeling of love] always occurs together with acquaintance, but good will occurs both together with acquaintance and apart from acquaintance, ‘and of a sudden’ (1166b35), that is, all at once and very quickly. For someone sees someone who is worthy or hears about a worthy person and simultaneously with the seeing and hearing comes to have good will toward him; this is not always so, but for the most part. For we do not always come to have good will toward worthy people whom we see or about whom we hear, but rather for the most part. If, then, good will arises all at once and practically instantaneously, but all affection arises with time, good will can not be affection.

20

***1166b35-1166a1** Such as happens also concerning contestants, for people come to have good will toward them.

25

[Aristotle] would seem to be saying these things too in relation to the fact that good will is not affection (*philêsis*). But he does not say this, but rather that good will is not love (*philia*). For it is part of love to share in doing things with one’s friend and cooperate for the acquisition and attainment of good things and for the avoidance of evils, which is not so in the case of good will. For those who have good will toward contestants (athletes and discus-throwers and such are contestants) – those, then, who have good will toward these wish that they, toward whom they have good will, should win, but do not wish to contend together or throw the discus together with them. If, then, friends wish to share in doing things, but those who have good will do not wish to share in doing things, those who have good will are not friends. The syllogism is in the second figure.⁴⁴ But if those who have good will are not friends, neither is good will love [or: friendship].

30

35

Again, one should syllogize in the same figure: those who have good will cherish superficially; friends do not cherish superficially; those who have good will are not friends, nor, consequently, is good will love. We say that firm love is that of worthy people, for of this love good will is also the principle [or: source], as Aristotle will say as he proceeds.

488,1 **1167a3-4** It [i.e., good will] seems to be the principle [or: source] of love, just as pleasure by way of sight is [the principle] of loving passionately.

Having discussed what good will is not – having said that it is neither love nor affection – now [Aristotle] says what it is, that it is the principle and cause of love – an efficient principle rather than a final or material or indeed a formal one. It is a principle, accordingly, just as the sight of beauty accompanied by pleasure is the principle [or: source] of passionate love. For just as no one loves passionately who has neither seen nor been pleased [by another], so too people do not become friends who have not come to have good will [toward one another].

Having said ‘who has not previously been pleased by [another’s] form’ (1167a4-5) and beauty, [Aristotle] added ‘but one who enjoys [another’s] form does not, nonetheless, love passionately’ (1167a5-6). What he means would be something like this: just as one who enjoys a form that is present is not a lover nor is said to love passionately, but rather one who longs for the beauty both when it is present and when it is absent, and forever wishes that it be present and yearns for the presence of it, so too it is not those who only want good things for certain people who are both said to be and are friends, but rather those who want and wish to share in doing things with them for the acquisition and possession of good things.

This, then, is what he means, but as for the wording, to begin with, the [phrase] ‘but one who enjoys [another’s] form does not, nonetheless, love passionately’ is the same as ‘but one who enjoys [another’s] beauty does not of necessity love passionately’, for enjoying beauty is wider than loving passionately. And ‘not, nonetheless’ is the same as ‘of necessity’. Similarly, the phrase ‘those who have good will do not, nonetheless, love’ (1167a8) is equal to ‘it is not the case that those who have good will are already also friends’, for those who are friends also have good will, but those who have good will are not of necessity also friends. For since good will is the principle [or: source] of love, and love is the end, it is necessary that to those to whom the end, [that is,] love, belongs, there belong also the principle, [that is,] good will. But it is not, indeed, necessary that to those to whom the principle is present there be present also the end.

It has been said that those who have good will wish good things for those toward whom they happen to have good will, but they do not wish to share in doing and be troubled and disturbed in order that good things accrue to them, although friends wish to work together and suffer together with one another. This is why one may say, applying a metaphor, that it [i.e., good will] is the principle of love,⁴⁵ just as one who says that the heart is a fountain [cf. Plato *Timaeus*

70B] is uttering a metaphor, and similarly one who says that a shield is the winebowl of Ares and a winebowl the shield of Dionysus [cf. *Poetics* 21, 1457b20; *Rhetoric* 3.4, 1407a16-17; 3.11, 1412b35]; <so too one who says that good will is the principle [or: source] of love has spoken metaphorically. He has uttered a metaphor because, just as the heart is not the same thing as a fountain nor a winebowl [the same] as a shield>,⁴⁶ so too character, which is the principle [or: source] of love, is not the same thing as good will. For love occurs on account of character, and this is the principle of love, and good will follows upon character. By a metaphor, then, good will might be called love. 30

If they spend time with one another and become like in character, one who has good will and the one toward whom he has good will become friends. For affection [or: a feeling of love] is nothing other than consorting together and spending time together and dwelling together, and good will, when it endures over time, becomes love, that is, those who have good will, when they endure over time, become friends of those toward whom they have good will. 489,1

1167a14-15 One who has been done a service grants good will in return for the things he has been treated to, [thus] doing what is just. 5

Having shown that good will is not love, he separates it also from fair requital. For good will seems to be fair requital, not to him [i.e., Aristotle], but to the many, and fair requital to be good will, in turn, and not a few people call those who requite fairly people who have good will. This is why Aristotle too, instead of saying ...,⁴⁷ [says] 'grants good will in return for the things he has been treated to'. One who, indeed, gives in return and requites fairly him who has done him well would not be called [merely] one who had good will, for those who have good will wish that those toward whom they have good will be well off and fare well, but they do not, in fact, also do them well; thus, he can not be said [merely] to have good will, because he [actually] does the person well. And he is just, because granting what is equal is just. 10

Having separated, accordingly, good will from fair requital, he separates it also from love on account of the useful. One who wishes that someone fare well while expecting some benefit and comfort from his faring well does not have good will toward the other but rather toward himself; or rather, he does not have good will toward the other but is rather a friend to himself (for such is love on account of the useful, as has been said many times), just as neither is one who takes care of someone for the sake of some use and the attainment of some good properly speaking a friend. For one must, in the words, 'just as 20

neither is he a friend' (1167a17-18), understand in addition 'properly speaking', so that the whole [phrase] would be like this: 'just as neither is he properly speaking a friend'.

25 Having said these things, he adds: 'in general, good will arises on account of virtue and fairness' (1167a18-19); and if it is on account of these, it is obvious that neither is fair requital good will nor is wishing that someone fare well for the sake of [some] use and of being helped by him. It has been shown that neither is true love good will, nor again affection; it remains, consequently, that the principle [or: source] of love, as one may state it by applying a metaphor, is good will.

1167a22-3 Concord too is a loving [relation]; therefore it is not consensus.

30 Concord too is love on account of things that are advantageous, just as is [love] on account of the useful. Love on account of things that are advantageous differs from love on account of the useful, because that on account of the useful arises both for small things and for large things and toward commercial people and toward artisans, but concord arises for the sake of great things and things that are advantageous to the whole city, or whole cities, or Greeks as a whole, or whole
490,1 nations. For the concord of the Greeks when Xerxes marched against them was for the sake of what was advantageous to all the Greeks in common. Concord, then, is a loving [relation], and because it is loving it is not consensus, for there is no necessity that those who are of like opinion be already friends as well. For it is possible that those who
5 are enemies or who do not know one another also are of like opinion concerning the same thing. For what prevents, [in the case of] both me and my enemy or someone I do not know, that he too hold the same opinion as the opinion I hold concerning the sun – for example, it may be, that it is larger than the earth – and similarly in the case of the other heavenly [phenomena]? But it is not possible for us to be likeminded if we are not friends and do not know one another. Thus,
10 when people choose and do what has seemed right to [them] all, then it is our custom to say that they are likeminded; and concord exists, as was said, concerning things that ought to be done – not small things but rather those that have magnitude – and concerning things that can pertain to both [parties] who are likeminded. For if they can pertain to some, but cannot to others, it is not possible for them to be in concord.

15 For if it seems right to all those who are in the city that offices be virtues,⁴⁸ or that the Lacedaemonians ally themselves,⁴⁹ then the city is in concord; but if it is agreeable to some and not to others, it is at odds and at strife. And, indeed, if it seems right to the whole city that Pittacus rule, and Pittacus too wishes it, then the city is in concord

with Pittacus and he with the city; but if the city does not agree that
 Pittacus rule, or if it does agree but Pittacus does not wish to rule, 20
 there is not thus agreement and concord. When there are two, and
 each of them wishes to rule apart from the other, they are at strife,
 as in *The Phoenician Women*. *The Phoenician Women* is a play of
 Euripides, and the plot of the play is obvious to those who have
 encountered it.

That, then, would be the sense of what is said by Aristotle; but that
 of the text, ‘for being in concord is not that each intend the same thing 25
 whatsoever, but rather what is in the same’ (1167a34-5), is something
 like this: concord is not that two or more people think the same thing,
 whatever it is they are thinking, whether an office is the thing they
 are thinking about or a possession or honour or whatever it may be,
 concerning which two or more people have in mind that it belong to
 each [separately] and not to all together. Concord, then, is not that 30
 Eteocles intend to rule apart from Polyneices or Polyneices apart from
 Eteocles; rather, concord is being in concord as well about what is in
 the same, that is, that both have the same thing in mind concerning
 the same thing and that what one wishes and wants the other too
 chooses and approves. For example, if someone wants to rule and you
 too want that this same person rule, you are in concord, but if he 35
 wants it, but you do not wish it, this is not concord but strife.

1167b2-3 Concord appears to be civic love, as indeed is said.

Having said that concord is being likeminded concerning what is
 advantageous either to people themselves or to the whole city, [Arist- 491,1
 totle] says that concord is a civic thing and not consensus, that is, it
 belongs to the civic and not to any of the other sciences, for example
 natural or mathematical or any other whatever. It is something civic,
 because it concerns things that are advantageous and that pertain to
 living. Concord is observed in decent people, and not in base people, 5
 for it would be amazing if base people could be in concord with regard
 to others and with others, since they are not in concord in regard to
 themselves even for a short [time], but are always at strife. For
 worthy people, since they always choose the same things and effect
 and do the same things – just things, obviously, and advantageous
 ones – and their wishes remain fixed and inalterable, consequently 10
 welcome concord. But it is not possible for base people, as has been
 said, to be in concord except for a short while, just as ‘to be friends,
 too’ (1167b10): for their love is for a short [time]. For since they desire
 a larger share and to have more of the beneficial things, but less in
 labours and hardships, as [Aristotle] said in the fifth book when
 speaking about the unjust man (5.1, 1129b6-8; 5.6, 1134a33-4), they
 are continually at strife and differ [with one another]. For since each 15

of the base men wishes, he says, to acquire for himself and to take for himself more in beneficial things and less in harmful things, he tests his neighbour and drags him to accounts, as though he [the neighbour] were deserving of these things, that is, of less in beneficial things and those that are advantageous, but of more in harmful things; and they draw apart from one another, since what is common does not remain common because each draws [it] to himself and appropriates it. Because of these things, then, they separate and draw apart, and because they compel [the other] to do just things, although they themselves do not do them. For how would I be persuaded to do just things when you do not do them, or would you do them when I do not do them? For it is necessary that he who compels me to do just things in regard to him first do these things in regard to me, and similarly, indeed, that I first be just in regard to him, if I compel him to do just things in regard to me.

1167b17-18 Benefactors seem to love those who have been done a service [by them] more than those who have been helped [love] those who have done them good.

30 [Aristotle] discusses all the things that usually happen [in regard] to all the [kinds of] loves, including the fact that those who have done a service and helped someone seem to love those who have been done a service and been helped more than those who have been helped [love] those who have helped them. And since what occurs is paradoxical, he seeks a reason; and it truly seems an odd thing that those who have been helped do not love more. Having posited this, he first says

35 the things that seem [to be the case] to the majority concerning this, by which he is not satisfied, and then adds the things that satisfy him.

492,1 The majority say, in fact, that those who have been done a service and been helped owe and in a certain way are accountable, and [a debt] is owed to those who have done the service. On this [basis] too those who have done a service love more, and those who have been helped less: for just as in the case of loans, those who owe do not wish that those who have lent exist, but those who have lent, in addition

5 to wishing that their debtors live, are also concerned for their preservation, so that they may receive [back] the loan; so too [it is the case]⁵⁰ that those who have done a service, analogously to those who have lent, wish that those who have been done a service [by them] exist, since they are also like debtors, on the grounds that they will garner their gratitude. But to those who have been helped, rendering gratitude in return is neither of concern nor desirable, and on this [basis]

10 they neither wish nor are concerned that their benefactors live. How could they be said to love those for whom they are not concerned nor is it important to them whether they live and exist or do not live?

Epicharmus mentioned such a reason for the fact that those who have been helped do not love those who have done them a service, saying that the many observe [things] from an evil [point of view]. The [word] 'observe'⁵¹ is the same as 'see', and 'evil ones' [the same] as 'ungrateful ones', 'unmindful ones'. The [remark] of Epicharmus is something like this: the many say these things in regard to a solution of the inquiry, since they look to the wickedness of those who have been helped; for since they have regard [only] for what is done on the part of ungrateful people, they simply judge thus against all those who have been helped. 15

1167b27 It seems like a human [trait], for the many are unmindful.

Having said what the many say about why benefactors seem to love more those who have been helped by them, [Aristotle] puts after this his own opinion about these things; but he reported very unclearly what he wishes [to say] on account of succinctness. What he means would be something like this. 'It seems like a human [trait]', that is, what happens is characteristic of the unconcern of human beings for the investigation and pursuit and discrimination of things that are simply good. For very few are those who have wished to moderate their emotions by the virtues and put themselves in order, and establish when and how much it is appropriate to be moved, and who have striven to live according to the mind, the mind being what a human being especially is, as he says in the next book (10.7, 1178a7). Such people being very few, it remains that the rest are base and on this account also senseless; for a senseless person is base and unfriendly in regard to his benefactor, since worthy people love their benefactors as [they do] themselves, and they are eager to requite fairly and more. For doing more good to [others] rather than being helped more is the part of virtue, just as wishing to be helped more <rather than to help [others] more>⁵² is the part of vice. Since, accordingly, they do not wish to help [others], for this reason neither do they love [them]. 20 25 30

***1167b28-30** It would seem that the cause is a more natural one, and not similar to that concerning lenders. 35

The many, attempting to explain the reason for the fact that benefactors love more those who have been done a service by them, and taking benefactors analogously to lenders, and those who have been helped to debtors, were adducing [this as the reason].⁵³ Just as those who have lent, then, love their debtors and are concerned for their preservation, but those who owe do not wish those to whom they owe to 493,1

- 5 exist and live, so too those who have been helped, being like debtors, do not wish their benefactors to exist, not to say feel affection for them and requite them fairly. Not approving this explanation, Aristotle says that the cause of this is more natural, and what happens is not similar to the [case] concerning those who lend and borrow. 'For there is no affection' (1167b30) on the part of lenders toward their debtors (what affection [or: a feeling of love] is has been discussed), but rather a willing of someone's surviving so that they may garner their money. For one who wishes that someone exist and survive, say Socrates, not for the sake of Socrates himself but rather on account of his own need or benefit, does not love Socrates nor is he a friend of Socrates, for the reasons that were mentioned earlier. This is not, indeed, similar to the [case] concerning lenders but rather is more characteristic of the nature of human beings. For just as all people by nature desire to know, as was said in the *Metaphysics* (1.1, 980a21), and just as by nature they aspire to be and to live, so all people by their very nature love and cherish their own products and their own actions and their own works; for example, fathers [love] their children, and poets and tragedians their works and plays, and orators their speeches and craftsmen their individual crafted things. Just as in the case of these, then, it is necessary that it happen too in the case of those who have done a service and those who have been done a service; for one who has been done a service is like the product of the one who has done the service. Thus, the benefactor naturally loves the one who has been done a service by him as his own product; for the one who has been done a service and has been helped is like the product of the one who has done him the service and helped him. Again, everyone naturally likes his own product; indeed,⁵⁴ one would be liked by one's own product if it became animate; thus benefactors naturally like those who have been done a service by them as they do their own products, even if they are not now useful nor are going to become so later.

1168a5-6 The cause of this is that to be is choiceworthy and lovable to all.

The cause of the fact that each person naturally loves his own product is that to be and to live are choiceworthy and lovable to all. We are not [what we are] by virtue of being able to become [so] but rather by virtue of already being [so] actually: just as we do not call an infant an orator but rather the one who has the art and is able to be active [in it], and [we call] a statue not the bronze, simply, but rather that which has been formed in the form of a statue, so too what we call (whether it be) a human being in fact⁵⁵ or a lion in fact or a horse in fact is not the one that is not yet, but is able to become [so], but rather the one that already is [so] and is living and active or able to be active.

Having said 'we are, indeed, actually' (1168a6), in clarifying what 'actually' is, he added, 'by living and doing'; ... when⁵⁶ we say that this person potentially lives and is active or able to be active. The syllogism is like this: when we say that one who lives and is active or able
5 to be active is a human being, the one who lives and is active is actually so; consequently, he *is* by actually being; if, then, actually to be is choiceworthy and lovable to all, and the product of, say, Socrates is nothing other than Socrates himself actually, then his product is lovable to Socrates, because the being of Socrates, who has produced
10 [the product], is his very product. That the product is the person himself who has actually produced [it] is not altogether unclear, for this image⁵⁷ is the painter, actually. For an art is potentially its crafted things: for the housebuilding [art] is nothing other than a house [together with] stones and, consequently, this house is the housebuilding [art] together with stones, and the housebuilding [art], or indeed the builder, as builder and not as human being, is in the
15 house itself. If, accordingly, the housebuilding [art] is a house together with stones, and the housebuilding [art] or builder are the same thing, then the house and the builder are the same thing, and the house is, consequently, the builder himself, actually.

Thus, the one who was helped and was done a service or who has been helped and was done a service is the one who has done the service himself. Consequently, the being and activity of the one who has done a service is in the one who has been done a service. Being
20 is lovable; consequently, the one who has been done a service is lovable to the one who has done a service. But the one who has done a service is not loved by the one who has been done a service, because the being of the one who has been helped is not in the one who has helped him; for nothing has come into being from the one who has been helped to the one who has helped him, nor is there anything of him in the other.

At the same time, the one who has done a service also has 'something fine in accord with his action' (1068a10): the one who has
25 helped the other has done a fine deed, and the one who has been helped, in the respect that he has been helped, is himself such a deed; and he remains the product of the one who has himself helped him (but in the one who has helped him there is nothing fine that is [a product] of the one who has been helped); thus, having helped him, he rejoices when he sees his own product, and he loves it. But the one who has been helped, since he sees nothing that is his own in the one who has helped him, neither rejoices nor loves.

Having said, 'the one who has been helped has nothing fine in the one who has helped him' (1168a11), which is the same thing as 'of the
30 one who has been helped nothing fine is reflected in the one who has helped him', [Aristotle] added 'but if indeed [he has]' (1168a12), then

it is [something] advantageous but not fine: for that which is advantageous for the one who has been helped is in the one who helps him. But what is advantageous is less pleasing, for the good is more pleasing and more lovable than what is advantageous. For the useful
 35 is advantageous, and that is useful through which something good comes to be. The good, accordingly, is an end, but the advantageous is among the things that are for an end. We like health more, since it is an end,⁵⁸ than blood-letting and purging, which occur on account of health.⁵⁹ Consequently, the good, as an end,⁶⁰ is more lovable than
 495,1 the advantageous [the advantageous is among the things that are for an end], through which [advantageous thing] something good comes to be.⁶¹ Since, then, in the one who has been helped there is something good of the one who has helped him, but in the one who has helped the other there is something advantageous of the one who has been
 5 helped; and, as has been said, we like good things more than advantageous things; it happens naturally, consequently, that a benefactor likes the one who has been done a service by him more than the one who has been done a service likes him who has done him the service.

1168a13-14 The activity of what is present, the expectation of what is going to be, and the recollection of what has occurred, are pleasing.

10 This too is preparatory of [the question] why those who have done a service love those who have been done a service more than those who have been helped do their benefactors. The course of the argument would be something like this: if the pleasant is lovable [and the more pleasant is more lovable], then surely [the pleasant is lovable and]⁶² the more pleasant is more lovable. The activity of what is present, the recollection of what has occurred, and the expectation of what is going
 15 to be, are pleasing, for one is pleased either by effecting fine things or by recollecting those fine things that one has done or by expecting to obtain some good thing. Things that are present are by nature more pleasing, and they please and gladden more than things that are gone or going to be; and one who has helped [another] is, as [Aristotle] will show, like something that has past, but he who has been helped is like the present and still remains. Consequently, the one who has
 20 been helped is more lovable, since he is present and remains, but the one who has helped him is less so, since he has past and no longer is. If, accordingly, what is present is more pleasing than what is going to be, and the one who has been done a service is analogous to what is present, and the one who has done a service to what has past, then the one who has been done a service is more pleasing than the one who has done a service. But if more pleasing, then also more lovable.

What [Aristotle] means to say, to be concise, is this: he puts first

the most essential [part] of the argument, saying ‘most pleasing is what is in accord with activity’ (1168a14-15), that is, what is present: for things that have past and are going to be are pleasing, but not most pleasing; what is present, which he called in accord with activity, is most pleasing. The pleasing thing that has been intensified is most pleasing, as the whitest thing is white that has been intensified. Having said that that which is in accord with activity is most pleasing, he added, ‘and lovable <similarly>’ (1168a15), or rather more lovable, for what is present, being more pleasing than what has passed, is also more lovable. But if⁶³ what is present is more lovable than what is gone by, and the fine product of the one who has helped someone remains and is present, and this is the very one who has been helped, but the useful thing of the one who has been helped is gone, then the one who has helped [the other] appears naturally more loving than the one who has been helped, because, as was said, we naturally love things that are present more than those that are going to be and are gone. 25 30 35

But how does the product of the one who has helped [the other] remain, while the experience of the one who has been helped is gone? It is because that which is of the one who has been helped, which is the useful, is of the things for an end, but the fine, which is of the one who has helped, is an end; and in the case of deeds, when things that are for an end are gone, the end supervenes. For massages and blood-lettings and potions that have occurred for the sake of health do not remain, nor do they exist when the one who has been sick has been healed, but health is the end. As in the case of these things, then, so too in the case of deeds: for when someone has received something from someone, for example when one who is hungry has eaten bread and has recovered, having digested it in his hunger, the bread too – the useful thing – is gone, but the strength that has accrued to him who has eaten remains; or when someone has borrowed money and has done business and, his business having been prosperous, he has become wealthy from being impoverished, both his affluence, which is the end, and the wealthy man himself remain, but the thing that was of use in regard to it [the wealth] is gone. It is obvious from the things we see: for whenever those who want a loan go to the lenders, they believe that the loan is both much and great, but when it happens to them that they become wealthy because of it, they belittle it and think that the loan is both something cheap and stomped down, and altogether [think of it] as non-existent and as having contributed nothing to their affluence. Therefore, the one who lent loves, because the wealth for which he is responsible remains, but the one who borrowed does not love for the reasons which we mentioned. 496,1 5 10 15

1168a17-18 The recollection of fine things is pleasing, but that of useful things not very much so.

One can understand the present text both as simply having been thus stated [with a view] to a determination of the difference, by which the fine and useful things that are past differ from the fine and useful things that are going to be; and one can also understand it as the solution of a question that can be raised in regard to the present matters. In accord with the former [reading], one might say that the recollection of fine things is more pleasing, and that of useful things less; in the case of what is going to be, on the contrary, that of useful things is more pleasing, but that of fine things less. For since fine things are ends, but useful things are among those things that are for ends, and it is impossible that ends come into being apart from things that are for ends, money is more pleasing to us in the case of things that are going to be, since by means of it we are going to get fine things. In the case of what is past, the end – what is fine – has occurred and is not going to occur, and because it has occurred there is no need for things that are for that [end]; thus, neither is the recollection of such things pleasing, or if it is, it is nevertheless less so, at all events, than the end [itself]. For the recollection of a victory that has occurred is more pleasing than that of the things that were of use toward it.

Either one must account for the present words in this way, or one must say that he added these as a solution of a puzzle that can be adduced in regard to what has been said. For one might say: ‘How is it, Aristotle, that that in accord with activity is most pleasing and the most pleasing is more lovable, and therefore the one who has been helped is loved as being in accord with a present activity? For if the benefactor were doing a service now and were now effecting the benefaction in regard to the one who has been helped, what is said would contain something understandable. But since he is not effecting, but rather was effecting it and has helped [him], how is it possible to say that he loves more on account of this, [that is,] because he is effecting it?’ In regard to this objection, I think, [Aristotle] added these [words], effectively saying that even if someone did not posit that the benefactor was acting and effecting concerning the one who was done a service, but rather had acted and effected, in this way too it happens that the one who has helped [the other] naturally loves more than the one who has been helped. For if the recollection of fine things is more pleasing and more lovable than the recollection of useful things, and he has acted and done useful things, upon which fine things followed, which fine things indeed both remain and exist, then there is recollection of both. But the one who has helped [the other recollects] ends, or rather the fine things that have supervened

(for he also sees these things because these too are present and preserved); but the one who has been helped [recollects] not these things but rather the useful things. For the one who borrowed
 15
 recollects only the loan, but not the fine things that accrued to him from the loan; and thus it is inferred that the benefactor naturally loves more, and the one who has been helped less. That there is practically no recollection at all of the fine things that have accrued is obvious from the fact that they are sullen when they recollect that they borrowed and that they are now flourishing and faring well for
 20
 this reason.

1168a19-20 And affection resembles a doing, but being loved [resembles] undergoing.

If we love exceeding and, as it were, ruling more than being exceeded and being ruled, and to help and do a service is to exceed, but to be helped is to be exceeded, then we naturally love doing a service and helping, and doing a service is [the same as] the very one who is being done a service. The benefactor, therefore, naturally loves the one who
 25
 has been done a service more than the one who has been done a service loves the one who has done the service; for to be done a service is to be exceeded, and to be exceeded is somewhat stinging and unlovable; consequently, to be exceeded is unlovable. The being exceeded of the one who is exceeded is seen [as being] in the excess of the one who
 30
 exceeds; thus, the one who exceeds is unlovable and thus, too, the benefactor as the one who exceeds. Again, to do a service is to exceed, to exceed is lovable, [hence] doing a service is lovable. The excess of the benefactor and his being, qua exceeding and qua benefactor, is seen in the one who is exceeded and has been done a service. Consequently, the one who has been done a service is lovable and it
 35
 is natural that the one who has helped should love more than the one who has been helped.

That the benefactor and his activity are in the one who has been done a service is quite obvious, for just as [the being]⁶⁴ of a painter, qua painter, and his activity are seen in the image, and similarly [the activity] of the one who has healed in the one who has been healed,
 498,1
 so too the being of the benefactor⁶⁵ qua benefactor and his activity are in the one who has been helped.

This is the sense of what is being said, but one must also run through the text. Affection, [Aristotle] says, and loving resemble a doing, and a doing is in the one who does, just as an undergoing is in the one who undergoes. If, accordingly, affection resembles a doing,
 5
 and a doing is in the one who does, and the one who does is the one who does a service and not the one who is done a service, then affection and loving are in the one who does a service and not in the one who

is done a service. One should know that a doing and an undergoing are one in substratum, like a going up and a going down, but differ in definition; these things were discussed at length in the *Course on Nature* [cf. *On Generation and Corruption* 1.6, 322b13-22]. Since, then, affection, like a doing, is in the one who does and does a service, 'loving and loving [feelings]' (1168a21) follow naturally for those who exceed, in the action according to which they exceed, by virtue of the fact that those who exceed, that is, the benefactors, love more.

[Aristotle] called a benefaction and good treatment an 'action'; and the [phrase], 'for those who exceed in the action' would be the same thing as 'for those who exceed in that in accord with which they help someone'. For it is possible that the one who exceeds in that in accord with which he helps someone is exceeded in accord with another thing, as the king Alexander exceeded his own tutor, Aristotle, in techniques of generalship and in wealth, but was very much exceeded in the sciences. 'Loving' and 'loving [feelings]' are in parallel.

1168a21-2 Further, all people cherish things that have been done more effortfully.

That those things are more lovable, and we love them more, of which the possession is effortful than those which accrue to us easily and effortlessly, [Aristotle] has made obvious on the basis of money and things that are done the most. For those who have effortlessly received money from their parents or friends or from wherever, most easily give it away and quickly grant it to those who lack or need it; and some of them do so to chance people and those to whom they ought not. But those who have acquired it (these are those who have collected it with labour and hardship) cherish it and attempt to retain it as much as possible, since they know the difficulty of its acquisition.

If, indeed, we cherish and love what is effortful and hard to procure, and doing a service occurs on the basis of things hard to procure (for the present argument is most fitting in the case of those who have acquired things laboriously and do a service), and helping someone and doing a service are, therefore, difficult and so more lovable, too; and if doing a service and benefaction are, as was said, [the same as] the very one who has been done a service; then the one who has been done a service is more lovable, and the benefactor less.

The [points] of the argument can be preserved also in the case of all those who simply do a service, and not in the case of those only who have acquired something by sweat and do a service. For conferring first is simply more stinging than receiving is: what stings in the giving up [of it] is lovable, for the kind of thing, the absence of which is painful, is lovable.

[Aristotle] establishes this kind of thing also from [the case of]

parents, saying that mothers are more child-loving than fathers, because giving birth is more effortful. For if the joy is similar for both, both in intercourse and in the emission of the seed, nevertheless in the time after the conception up to the birth the [doings] of the mother turn out to be effortful and difficult. Therefore, 'mothers are more child-loving' (1168a25) than fathers on account of this. As mothers are toward their children, so are benefactors toward the things that are given by them to those who have been done a service, and those who have been done a service are in a certain way the gifts which they received from those who have done them a service. Thus, too, they are more loved. 10

Having said that mothers are more child-loving than fathers because their giving birth is more effortful, [Aristotle] says that she is more child-loving also because she knows better than the father that the child is hers. It is possible to say this also about a benefactor: for the one who has given knows better that it is his than the one who has received. For the one who has been treated well may perhaps suppose that what he received is not [the property] of the one who has treated him well, but rather that he [i.e., the benefactor] received it from someone else in order to give it to those who need it. Accordingly, the [phrase], 'this too would seem to be relevant also to benefactors' (1168a26-7), is something like this: 'it is fitting to say that [which has been said] of mothers also in the case of benefactors'. For just as giving birth is more effortful than copulation, so too helping someone [is more effortful] than being helped; and just as mothers know better that the children are theirs, so too benefactors know better than those who have been done a service that they are doing a service from their own [resources] and not from foreign ones. 20 25

Now, one must say that thus, too, it is possible to see in the present matter three things in proportion to three: for mother, pregnancy, and children are three things, and benefactor, possession, and the one who has been done a service are another three things, and the benefactor is analogous to the mother, possession of money to pregnancy, and the one who has been done a service to the children. Thus, as mothers love their children more because of what is effortful in pregnancy, so too the benefactor [loves more] the one who has been done a service because he has acquired with labour what he has given to the one who has been done the service. One must take the one who has been done a service too as analogous to the father and one must say: as the father feels less affection for his children than the mother, because they were born to him through pleasure, so too the one who has been done a service loves his benefactor less, because he received the benefaction effortlessly and with pleasure. 30 35

500,1 **1168a28-9** The question is raised, too, whether one should love oneself most or someone else.

Since human beings sometimes praise those who love themselves and sometimes blame them, should one approve of those who praise self-loving or those who blame it? For both those who praise it and
 5 those who blame it seem to say things that are reasonable and likewise unreasonable. And [Aristotle] says first what those who blame those who are self-loving say. 'For they reproach' (1168a29), he says, those who like themselves, and they insultingly apply the name of self-love to them as though it were shameful and disgraceful. For they call [people] self-loving in quarrels and fights and contentions, as though 'self-loving' were the same thing as 'most shameful' and 'most evil'.

10 Having said that they think that those who are self-loving are base, he infers this by syllogizing effectively as follows: one who is self-loving does everything for the sake of himself, one who does things for the sake of himself is base, consequently one who is self-loving is base. And he indicated the major premise, the one that says 'one who does everything for the sake of himself [is base]', by this: a base person seems to do everything for the sake of himself, and the more wicked
 15 and evil he is, the more he does things for the sake of himself. It being necessary to say, 'one who does everything for the sake of himself is base', [Aristotle] did not speak thus, but rather [said] that a base person does everything for the sake of himself, construing the proposition as being convertible, i.e., that one who does everything for the sake of himself is base, and a base person does everything for the sake of himself. Now, one must say as follows: a base person does every-
 20 thing for the sake of himself, one who does everything for the sake of himself is self-loving, consequently one who is base is self-loving.

He indicated the major premise according to the foregoing inference through the above-mentioned text, but he has not posited the minor [premise]. He says that 'they lay a complaint, indeed, against' the one who is self-loving 'because he does nothing from himself' (1168a32-3), that is, nothing beyond himself. For a wicked person does nothing beyond his own wickedness but rather things that are
 25 characteristic of his own wickedness. It is possible that 'he does nothing from himself' was said as being equal to 'he does nothing that does not contribute to the increase of his own advantage or to the gratification and comfort and indulgence of his individual body'. And the base person, as was said, or rather the self-loving person does everything for the sake of himself, and on account of doing everything
 30 for the sake of himself people apply the name of self-love against him as something insulting.

But all that a decent person does he does on account of what is

noble, 'and the better he is' (1168a33-4) the more he will do noble things, and he will do noble things more for the sake of his friend than for the sake of himself: for example, he will rather go to court on account of a friend's salvation and will rather put up with disturbances and labours and loss of money for the sake of his friend and the sake of his country than for the sake of his own benefit.

35

Having said, 'and for the sake of friends' (1168a34),⁶⁶ Aristotle added, 'and he disregards that of himself'. 'Disregards' is the same thing as 'overlooks' and 'despises': he passes over and rejects his own advantage for the sake of his friend's benefit.

501,1

1168a35-1168b1 The facts are discrepant with these arguments, not unreasonably.

Facts and actions do not agree with the arguments that say that 'one who does everything for the sake of himself [is base]', and likewise [do not agree] with the arguments that say that 'one who does nothing for the sake of himself is good'. For one who does nothing for the sake of himself is base rather, and not worthy. For if one, having looked at [the matter], should see what fact of nature⁶⁷ a human being is, one who does everything for the sake of the true human being <would appear worthy>⁶⁸ and not base. But now the many, because they do not know who the true human being is, decide thoughtlessly, calling the one who does all things for the sake of himself base. For one who knows that the mind inside us is the true and properly so called human being, and knowing this does all the things that he knows nurture it and strives to preserve it unvitiated – such a one is both truly self-loving and worthy and good and not base. Thus this fact – I mean, now, doing those things that lift our mind and rouse it to soar up – is discrepant with the argument that says that one should not do everything for the sake of oneself.

5

10

15

One, then, who does everything for the sake of the true human being is truly self-loving; but on this account, he is good. But one who thinks that a human being is his body together with the irrational part of the soul, and strives to minister to this by means of boundless desires for wealth and immoderate luxuries – such a one is not even self-loving, for he does not love himself but rather the rabble and the many-headed hydra inside him, [i.e.,] appetite. Thus, the facts and, further, the actions of those who are truly and properly self-loving do not agree with the arguments which say that one who does everything for the sake of himself is base, but rather harmonize with the opposite arguments which say that one who does everything for the sake of himself is good.

20

25

***1168b2-3** A friend is one who most wishes good things for the one for whom he wishes them [for the other's sake].

That a friend is one who wishes good things to belong to him, whom he says he loves, and for the sake of that one and not for the sake of profiting together with him and [for the sake] of the very goods of the one is who loved, has been said previously many times, and it is not
 30 necessary to go on at length even further about this. Having said what the things are on account of which human beings blame those who are self-loving and think that self-love is a shameful thing, [Aristotle] now tells both to what and toward what kinds of things people look who posit self-love to be among the praiseworthy things. What he
 502,1 says, to be concise, is this: for those who call self-love something fine and praiseworthy say that if, in fact, we most call that one a friend and praise him and term him truly a friend, who feels affection for his friend as for himself, and if feeling affection for one's friend equally as for oneself is evidence of true love, then loving oneself is good and
 5 not base. For if loving oneself were base, then loving one's friend as oneself would also be base and blameworthy, and the argument would be <such>⁶⁹ by hypothesis in accord with the so-called conversion with negation: if loving oneself is base, loving one's friend like oneself too is base; but in fact loving one's friend like oneself is not base; consequently, neither is loving oneself base. Self-love, accordingly, is
 10 not shameful, but rather self-hate is.

This is what [Aristotle] wishes to say; what is in accord with the text is as follows: that person is a friend who wishes good things for his friend, even if no one knows his wish; for a true friend chooses and wants that his friend do well, and does not deem it important that
 15 people know that he wishes this.

Having said that one who wishes good things for his friend for his sake is a friend, [Aristotle] <added>⁷⁰ that these things pertain above all in regard to oneself, meaning by 'these things' wishing good things for the sake of that one; these things indeed pertain above all in regard to oneself.⁷¹ What he says is: all people wish above all good things for themselves and for the sake of themselves, and all the remaining
 20 things by which a friend is defined they wish above all to pertain to themselves. 'The remaining things' are indicated from adages, which will be mentioned shortly. The [sentence], 'for it has been said that all loving [feelings] extend from oneself and toward others' (1168b5-6) is such as this: the [several] loves (for these he called 'loving [feelings]') extend toward others, whenever people love their friends as they love themselves, and whenever they wish that those things
 25 belong to them [i.e., their friends] for which they strive also that they be present to themselves. Whenever, then, the [description] 'as one loves himself' extends also to another and one loves that one too in

the same way, the one who is thus disposed is a true friend and all the adages that are about friends concur and agree with these arguments. For the [adage] ‘the things of friends are in common’ is the same thing as ‘those are truly friends who wish for the ones who are loved by them what they wish also for themselves’. Even clearer than these are ‘friends are those whose soul is one’ and ‘love is equality’. Similarly too, ‘the knee is closer to the shin’ (1186b8): for the knee always consorts with the tip of the shin and is together with it in a friendly way. If, indeed, we judge true love from the things that we wish for ourselves, we ought to love ourselves and be self-loving. But if this is not the case, self-love is a shameful thing.

1168b10-12 The question is reasonably raised, which one should believe, since both have what is plausible.

Having posited both of the arguments – those which say that loving oneself is good, and those that say that self-love is a shameful thing – [Aristotle] says that since both have a certain persuasiveness, ones ought one to trust, those that conclude that one should love oneself, or those that say to the contrary that one ought not to love oneself? And, having asked, he replies saying that one must ‘divide’ (1168b12) these, that is, one must divide the name of self-love, which both [sides] advance, into the things that are signified [by it] (for ‘self-love’ is not a simple thing but rather equivocal, like ‘dog’),⁷² and, dividing it, one should say that both [sides] speak rightly – both those who affirm loving ourselves and those who [affirm] not loving [ourselves].

One must, then, divide it and say that self-loving is twofold, as has been said: [on the one hand,] liking and ministering to the rabble in us, [i.e.,] to irrationality – I mean, indeed, to appetite – and lording it⁷³ over the true human being, [i.e.,] the mind in us; and on account of this irrationality – [i.e.,] appetite, obviously – we strive to have more in money and honours [and]⁷⁴ bodily pleasures. For there is no one – there is no one who, having sensation alone held before him and living in accord with that, does not enjoy and exult in these things, and [considers them]⁷⁵ as the best things and finest and most appropriate to ourselves. This, then, is one of the signifieds of self-love, which indeed is base and shameful; and such a self-loving person, who is not even, properly speaking, self-loving, is really most evil and most shameful. For a human being is not sensation, which this person loves, but rather mind, which he has utterly blinded and debased; and such a one is called self-loving by the many who believe that a human being is the animal [part] of us, which indeed is that which is [composed] of body and actuality: this actuality is the irrational and inseparable life of the body, being also destroyed together with it.⁷⁶

25 But another signified of self-love is loving what is really the human being, which is the understanding [part] within us. Such a self-loving person is not shameful but rather most noble, because he loves the truly human being. It is no secret, [Aristotle] says, that many people usually call 'self-loving' greedy and licentious people and those who
 30 honour the mind within us, which is the true human being. For one can not see anyone among the many calling 'self-loving' one who strives to be just or temperate <or courageous>⁷⁷ or liberal, nor indeed blaming him as self-loving, although such a person is self-loving in truth, since he loves that part of his soul in accord with which a human being is a human being, and he grants himself, or rather his mind [the finest things].

504,1 For [Aristotle] called this [i.e., the mind] the 'most authoritative' [part] of oneself, [and he called] 'the finest and most good things' (1168b29-30), the things which are finest and most goodly good – the virtues and [various] knowledges. Having said that a worthy person favours the most authoritative [part] of himself and obeys it in everything and does whatever that prescribes (he does only those things with which the reasoning part of the soul is satisfied), but he
 5 rejects the desires and appetites of the irrational part of the soul, [Aristotle] added, [by way of] clarifying what the most authoritative [part] of us, which the worthy person favours, is: 'just as a city seems to be its most authoritative [part]' (1168b31-2), so too a human being, properly speaking, is the most authoritative [part] in us. For just as
 10 a city is, properly speaking, neither its walls nor its houses nor simply those who dwell in it, as was said and shown in the *Politics* (3.6, 1278b10), but rather a city is the ruling and reigning [part] – for example, among those who live in a kingdom, a city is its king, among those who live in a democracy, it is the people, and among those who live in an oligarchy, it is the wealthy, and among those who live in an aristocracy, it is the best, but it is the tyrant among those who live in a tyranny – so too the part of the soul in us that is of a nature to rule,
 15 which is the rational and understanding [part] of us, is the human being properly so called. And, indeed, a self-loving person properly so called, as was said, is one who loves this and favours this, that is, who acts and does what is pleasing to this.

And we call a human being self-controlled and without self-control if his mind rules and controls his appetite or if [in turn] his mind is ruled and controlled by it, according as each person is one [or the
 20 other] of these. For the mind of Socrates is properly Socrates, and similarly that of Plato is Plato, and likewise of all other people. And we say that this human being has done this action whenever he acts with reason; but when he acts although reason has not decided, we

do not say that the human being has acted but rather his temper or his desire.

Having said these things, [Aristotle] concludes by saying that it is not unclear that the mind is the human being (for the [phrase] ‘each person is above all this’ (1169a2) is indicative of this), and that a decent or rather worthy person likes this above all. For he likes and treats well his temper and his appetite to the extent that they contribute to the preservation of the body; nor is this unclear to those who live in accord with nature. Therefore he might be properly called ‘self-loving’, since he is other than the self-loving one who is reproached, and differs from him to the extent that one living in accord with reason differs from one who lives in an emotional way. That such a person lives in accord with reason is obvious, for he always desires either what is truly good or what seems to be advantageous; for he desires that which seems to be advantageous in regard to the noblest things, even if it is not noble in truth. For not everything that seems advantageous is already simply noble, too, but rather it is so when and to the extent that it contributes toward the noblest things.

1169a6-8 All people approve those who strive surpassingly concerning noble actions. 505,1

Why we do not reproach but rather approve those who are really self-loving, [Aristotle] states by way of these [arguments], effectively saying that we do not approve such people simply because they are self-loving, but rather we honour and praise them because they strive concerning noble actions. Having said this, showing in what he adds next what kind of person he was in his life and what kind of passionate love for every virtue this pre-eminent philosopher had, he says, ‘if all competed for what is noble’ (1169a8-9), that is, if all strove and contended; for ‘to contend’ is ‘to compete’. If all people, then, contended and struggled to beat one another concerning the performance of the noblest things and the best of actions, ‘and if they strained’ (1169a9), that is, were eager and strove, to effect things that were in accord with virtue, then the due and greatest of goods would exist both in common and for all, and separately for each person, and nothing evil would be conducted by us. He calls ‘the greatest of goods’ the virtues and [various] knowledges and the most worthy of the arts. And what is said is similar to a prayer, as if he said as follows: would that all people strove concerning the possession of the noblest things and ran toward the [kind of possession] that brings the virtues and knowledges; for if we were like this, everything base and corrupting of the soul would be gone, and the noblest things would be present both among all people and in common, and individually to each person.

And it is obvious from these [points] too that a good person ought

to be self-loving. For if a true friend wishes good things for him whose friend he is and acts and does all things so that the finest things will be present to his friend, obviously a good man, since he loves himself, will also do all those things by which fine things will be present to himself; and he will do them for the sake of himself, and by doing them he himself will benefit from it 'and he will benefit others; but a
 25 wicked person should not' (1169a13) be self-loving. For the wicked person, supposing that he himself is not the mind within us but rather this body and the irrational life that is destroyed along with it,⁷⁸ and thinking on account of this mistaken supposition that luxury and every bodily pleasure are the most appropriate good for a human being, will pursue and choose these things; thus, he will be, on this
 30 account, unjust and greedy. For how could one flourish by filling a perforated jug,⁷⁹ if not by wronging and robbing? But by wronging [others] he will harm both himself and those who are near to him, for he will do, of necessity, what he thinks are the finest things, even though they are most evil. For everyone strives to do what seems finest, but to him the worst things seem finest; consequently, he will do the worst things. Although one should, then, [Aristotle] says, do
 35 certain things – things that are beneficial, obviously, to the true human being – he does other things because, on account of his wickedness, he is ignorant of the really human being.

506,1 But a decent person, who lives in accord with the mind, does just those things that one should in truth do. For every mind, provided it has not been maimed by pleasure or sickness, by its own nature chooses and pursues what is best and advantageous to itself. This is obvious also from irrational animals, for all these have a certain glimmer of mind – some more, some less, as Aristotle himself says
 5 elsewhere [cf. *History of Animals* 8.1, 558a21-6] – and through this glimmer they seek and find, by their own nature, the things that benefit them. For a snake, when it is sick in its eyes, rubs fennel on [them], and a bear, when it has been feverish, eats ants and cures itself, and a spider weaves its webs for the capture of flies, and a
 10 swallow fixes its nest [in a] semicircular [shape] since such a form is more spacious, and an ant divides the grain that has been stored up in its labyrinths so that it does not sprout. Why need one write much? Aristotle's treatises concerning animals are full of such things, and let him who wishes to, take from them confirmations of the fact that every mind chooses what is best for itself. Thus, a decent person
 15 too, since he obeys his mind, shakes off irrational desires and will choose and do the things that are best both for himself and for his neighbours.

1169a18-19 The [statement] about the worthy person and his doing many things for the sake of his friend is true.

He will not do everything for the sake of his friend, for example those things that produce shame in him or damage of the soul, but rather all those things that tend to the honour and benefit of the true human being. [Aristotle] reasonably, then, did not say that he will do everything but rather that he will do many things. For since he does many things that are noble and advantageous for his own sake, and his friend is another he, he will also do many things for the sake of his friend. And since the whole of him is committed to the virtues, he lives both [in an] ordered [state] and mindfully. But every mind, as was said, chooses the best things (for the being of the mind itself is in this, and this is, so to speak, its nature – to choose the things that are best and advantageous to itself). Since, then, a worthy person is such, he will also do many things for the sake of his country, and if he has to die for it, he will die and he will give away money for the preservation of its citizens and [will give away] all of the goods that are fought over, such as honours and possessions, ‘acquiring for himself what is noble’ (1169a21-2), that is, honour from those who are worthy and recompense from God, our creator.

For the worthy person and everyone who is prudent wishes to enjoy the truest pleasure greatly for a short time rather than much [pleasure] slightly and little by little. For it is obvious and has been said many times that pleasures follow upon actions that are in accord with virtue, if indeed virtue is a habitual condition [consisting] in a mean with regard to us, in accordance with right reason accompanied by pleasure or [at least] not without pleasure. We know too that great pleasures also follow upon great actions. If this is so, it is obvious too that one who does noble things little by little and perchance spends money for a short [time] on these things is pleased for a long time, but little by little and slightly; but one who does them more quickly or who spends all at once for a short time is greatly pleased. For a worthy person resembles one who is very thirsty and drinks cold [water] all at once, but the other resembles one who gulps little by little. The worthy person, then, prefers to be greatly pleased in a short time rather than slightly [pleased] over a long time, and to live one [stretch of] time nobly in dying for his country rather than many [stretches] haphazardly, that is, ignobly and without any honour; and he prefers to do one action that is noble and great, which is to risk danger for his country or friends or to give away all his money and possessions for the sake of some great, noble thing, rather than to accomplish actions that are many and small.

Having said that [the worthy man] chooses one action that is great and noble, [Aristotle] added [by way of] clarifying what a great and

15 noble action is: this happens, doubtless, ‘to those who die for [something]’ (1169a25), meaning [thereby] the same thing as ‘those who do great and noble actions are those who die for their country and friends’. The [word] ‘doubtless’ is added on account of the many and base, for to such people it does not seem a great thing to risk danger for [something], because they do not know what noble things, properly speaking, are.

20 **1169a26** They choose, indeed, a great noble thing for themselves.

Those who die for [something], [Aristotle] says, choose for themselves a great good, and the good which they choose for themselves and prefer to life, and honour more than [life], is this: to be honoured continually by the city with images and statues and memorials and sacrifices and such things. But they also give away money so that
 25 their friends may acquire more of it. For if one’s city is timocratic, he will not spare money but rather may give the defined and instituted price for an office, so that his friend may acquire such an office; if, for example, in his city a prefecture or assistant magistracy is for sale, he may give the price – if he is able, obviously – however much it may be, so that his friend may serve as prefect or as assistant magistrate and receive from this [office] and acquire more than what he [already]
 30 has and abounds in. And his friend gets money or rule or whatever else, but he gets what is noble, for example honour and glory and praise from all; thus he allots the greater good to himself. For honour and good repute are greater than money to those who reason rightly.⁸⁰

35 But also with honours, [Aristotle] says, and with offices ‘it is the same way’ (1169a29-30); for he will give away these things too to his
 508,1 friend and he will prefer his friend to be honoured and rule rather than himself. For it is noble and praiseworthy for one to give away these things to one’s friend. By doing these things he reasonably seems to be worthy. For it is the part of a reasonable person to choose noble things over everything else; this man chooses noble things; consequently this man is worthy. For he does all the noble things, as
 5 was said, and he thinks, furthermore, that it is more noble to concede the office to his friend than to rule himself.

To these [points] [Aristotle] adds: ‘in this way, then, one should be self-loving’ (1169b1), by allotting oneself more of what is noble. For to allot oneself more in the case of money and honours is not self-love, as it seems to the many, but rather greed.

1169b3-4 It is debated too, concerning a flourishing person, 10
whether he will need friends or not.

It used then to be debated whether a flourishing person needs friends or not, and some used to think so and others, not. And the following things were said by those who thought not: anyone who needs a friend in order to provide himself, from him, with the things he lacks, is both in need and is not himself able to provide for himself by himself; a flourishing person is self-sufficient and in need of nothing; for he would not be flourishing if he needed anything; thus there is no need of friends. And the inference of the argument would be in the second [logical] figure as follows: a flourishing person is in need of nothing; one who needs friends is not in need of nothing; consequently, a flourishing person does not need friends. Or again, in the first [logical] figure, [it goes] thus: a flourishing person is in need of nothing; those in need of nothing do not need friends; consequently, a flourishing person does not need friends. 20

Such, then, is the sense of the arguments. The [phrase], ‘when fortune gives amply, what need is there of friends?’ (1169b7-8), is from the *Orestes* of Euripides [verse 667]. Orestes says this to Menelaus when he appeals to him for help. He calls the divine, ‘fortune’. For when the divine helps and provides all fine things, there is no need of friends.

These are the things that those people say who think that a flourishing person does not need friends. But these things seem absurd to those who think that he does need them, and Aristotle above all is one of these. For, Aristotle would say, if a flourishing person is one who has all fine things, and the greatest of fine things is a friend, then if we shall deprive him of any friend, how will he be flourishing? For how could someone who does not have the greatest of fine things be flourishing? For a friend is the greatest good of all external goods, such as wealth, money, and possessions. 25 30

1169b10-12 If it is more the part of a friend to help [another] 509,1
than to be so helped, and to do a service is the part of a good
person and of virtue ...

By these [words] [Aristotle] makes the case that a flourishing person needs friends. What he means is something like this: if it is the part of a good and worthy person to help [another] and do a service (for a worthy person qua worthy has his being [or essence] in acting well and not in being treated so: for even the basest people prefer to be helped, and it is also nobler to help friends than strangers), a flourishing person will need friends so that he may have people whom he may help, since he is a worthy person.⁸¹ [He will need] strangers too, 5

10 then; for it is noble to do a service for such people, too. But he should also do the nobler things; it is nobler to help friends than strangers; consequently, a flourishing person needs friends.⁸²

Since we need friends, both when we are flourishing and when we are unfortunate and ill-starred – when we are flourishing so that we may help [others], and when we are unfortunate so that we may get assistance – it used to be debated, understandably, whether one needs friends more in [times of] good fortune than misfortune. And it is obvious that [one needs them] equally in both, or, if indeed [in one of the two], more in [times of] misfortune.

15 ***1169b16-17** It would doubtless be absurd too to make a flourishing person solitary.

The [word] ‘doubtless’ is added on account of the [kind of] flourishing person about whom he is going to speak in the next book. For in the present book, which is [number] nine in the present treatise, [Aristotle] is discussing a flourishing civic person, but in the next he will produce an account concerning a person who lives in leisure and in the contemplation of the nature of the things that are; whether this man needs friends or not we shall discover, when we get there, from the things that he himself says concerning a flourishing person of this sort. What he says here in the present passages concerning a flourishing civic person as needing friends would be this: it is absurd too, he says, to make a happy person solitary and bereft of friends and of everyone else. For if he will not have friends [who are like him], much less will he have anyone among the other [kinds of people]. For with whom among those who are dissimilar will he pleasurably spend the day and consort together? For agemates delight each other, as do those who are similar. For one who has leisure for the contemplation of the things that are, and treats as of no account the animal [part] of us – let such a person be solitary. But how is it possible for a flourishing civic person, to whom all good things belong, to be solitary? Especially because a human being is a civic animal and is of a such a nature as to live together, a flourishing human being will need friends together with whom he will live. For he has the things that are good by nature, and it is better⁸³ to spend the day together with friends and decent people, that is, those similar to himself, than with strangers and people who are different in their pursuits, for with these he will be together unpleasantly. ‘It is necessary, consequently, for one who is flourishing to have friends’ (1169b22).

1169b22-3 What, then, will the first ones say, and in what way will they say something true? 510,1

The fact that 'love' is used not in one sense but in many senses is the cause of people saying that a flourishing person does not need friends. For of loves, as we learned in the book preceding this one, some are on account of the useful, for example those of commercial people and of those who reciprocally exchange things with one another; some are on account of the pleasing ([loves] for witty people and for boyfriends are of this sort); and some are on account of what is noble and character, as those of worthy people are. Because, then, the many think rather that useful people are friends, but not worthy people, they think that a flourishing person does not need friends. And they have affirmed rightly, for he does not need useful people, since he is in need of nothing; for, since he is flourishing, he has all good things. Nor does he need friends who are [such] on account of what is pleasing; even if at some time, perhaps, on account of sickness or some such thing, he will need them, he will need them only for a little [while]. For since his life is pleasing (for flourishing occurs with pleasure or not without pleasure, as has been said many times and has been shown to be [the case]), he in no way needs the imported and external pleasure of those who are witty. Since he does not need such friends, he seems not to want friends at all. This, [Aristotle] says, is not true. He does not mean that it is not true that a [flourishing] person does not need friends on account of the pleasing and the useful. For it is more true than anything else that he does not need friends who are useful or who provide pleasures. Rather, what he means by 'which is not true' is something like this: to say that, since a flourishing person does not want friends on account of what is pleasing he does not need friends at all, is not <true>, for he does not need those [kinds of] friends, but he does [need] worthy ones, who are indeed truly friends, and he needs them very much.

1169b28-30 It was said in the beginning that flourishing is an activity; and it is obvious that an activity occurs. 25

That a flourishing person needs friends who are worthy and similar to himself [Aristotle] shows also by way of these [following points], but the present matter is reported very unclearly and intricately. The argument by which he makes the case that a [flourishing] person needs worthy friends, since he can spend time and spend the day together with them but with no one else, is like this: he assumes what was said in the first book of the present treatise concerning flourishing, that flourishing is an activity; for there (1.6, 1098a16-18; 1.8, 1099a7) he said that flourishing is an activity of the soul in accord

with virtue in a complete life with pleasure or not without pleasure. Assuming this, he adds: since it is an activity and not some idle habitual condition, like that of doctors who are sleeping or have been locked up in some prison and are accomplishing nothing at all. For⁸⁴ a worthy person and a flourishing person differ in being active and not being active: for a worthy civic person and a flourishing one are the same in their substratum, [but] in their activity [they are not]:⁸⁵ thus, flourishing is an activity; if it is an activity, it is obvious that it is not something whole and subsisting, such as a house or cloak or I or you, but rather it occurs, just as motion too does. For a motion is not simultaneous as a whole, but rather one [part] of it has occurred, another exists [now], and another is about to occur. Flourishing, then, is not something whole, since it is an activity, but it is rather like motion and seeing; since it is such, it is obvious that its being and its essence are a kind of living well and acting well; thus, the being of a flourishing person, not qua human being but rather qua flourishing, is to live flourishingly, that is, to act and effect good and worthy things. For it is the part of a good person to do noble actions and to wish to see people doing them and [see] how they do them.

Since, moreover, to flourish consists in acting and in observing both actions and those who do them, and human beings naturally look rather at their neighbours and their actions than at themselves and their own things – on this account a flourishing man has need of friends, so that by looking at the actions of his friend he may look both at his friend and at himself, and by seeing his own actions he may be pleased. For it is the part of a worthy person to enjoy seeing good things, and, because he is pleased, he performs [them] the more. But how, [simply] by seeing one's friend and one's friend's actions, does one also see oneself and one's own actions? It is because a worthy friend is another selfsame who is loved,⁸⁶ and because worthy friends do the same things. For there is one soul, in a way, in two bodies. If, moreover, a worthy person sees noble actions, he is so much the more eager to do them; we see the [actions] of our neighbours better than our own; [thus,] a flourishing person will need friends, so that by seeing the actions of his friend, which are the same as his own, he will perform [such actions] all the more. For the actions of worthy people, and above all of worthy friends, stir up and arouse those who look at them earnestly⁸⁷ to do the same things as they do. For worthy people are self-moved on their own toward the performance of noble things, but when they see others also doing these things, they aspire even more to them and perform them more eagerly.

The force of the argument, by which [Aristotle] shows that a flourishing person needs friends, is like that. But the [issues] in regard to the text would be as follows. If, [Aristotle] says, to flourish consists in living and being active, that is, if flourishing is life and

activity, he then added, by way of clarifying what such a life is: ‘the 35
 activity of a good person is worthy and pleasing in itself’ (1169b31-2);
 he means, effectively, that ‘when I say that “to flourish is in living
 and being active” (1169b30-1), I am saying⁸⁸ nothing other than that
 to flourish is a life that is active and does noble and worthy things’. 40
 For to flourish is not typified by being able to act but rather by acting
 now. For it was said that flourishing is not a habitual condition 512,1
 separate from activity, but rather a habitual condition that has its
 activity paired with it. For one who has complete virtue but is not
 active, as was said, is called worthy only, but one who, in addition to
 having [virtue], is also active, [is called] flourishing. A worthy person
 is potentially flourishing, but a flourishing person is actually worthy. 5

To flourish is, accordingly, a life that is productive of noble actions,
 which are pleasing in themselves; for all noble things that are in
 accord with virtue are pleasing by nature. Not only things in accord
 with virtue but also one’s own things are pleasing, even if they are
 not worthy: for a bad speech or a bad work, although they are such
 [i.e., bad], are nevertheless pleasing to the bad poet who produced
 and the bad orator who wrote them. Thus, in fact, to a flourishing 10
 person his own deeds are doubly pleasing, both since they are his own
 and since they are worthy. But his activities⁸⁹ are the same as the
 activities of his friend. Thus, to a flourishing person both the activities
 and the deeds of his friend are equally pleasing as his own. ‘For both
 have the things that are pleasing by nature’ (1170a1), [Aristotle] says;
 that is, both things – the deeds of the flourishing person and those of 15
 his friend – are pleasing by nature. Consequently, a flourishing and
 happy person will need such a friend, so that by seeing his actions he
 may see his own.

1170a4 People think that a flourishing person should live
 pleasurably.

By this [argument] too [Aristotle] infers what is proposed, saying:
 everyone says that the life of a flourishing person is pleasing, and 20
 they believe that someone who is [involved] in sufferings is wretched
 and pitiable; such a person is most ill-starred; thus his life is painful,
 and that of a flourishing person is pleasing. The life of a flourishing
 person, qua flourishing, is activity in accord with virtue; to be active
 in accord with virtue is the same thing as to be active pleasurably;
 thus, the life of a flourishing person, qua flourishing, is to be active
 pleasurably. If he effects this continually, he will also be pleased 25
 [continually]; it is difficult for one who is solitary to be active perpetu-
 ally: this [Aristotle] indicated by [the phrase] ‘life is difficult for one
 who is solitary’ (1170a5), for by ‘life’ he means activities and actions.
 One must understand in addition the [word] ‘continual’, so that the

full [statement] is: ‘a continual life is difficult’. It is difficult, then, for one who is really solitary to be active continually, but together with another it is easy. If, then, it is better to enjoy the finest of the pleasures continually than not continually, and enjoying consists in being active and doing, then enjoying continually also consists in continually doing and being active. For one who is solitary it is difficult to be continually active; consequently, he needs a friend so that he can continually enjoy being continually active.

The inference of the argument would be like this: without that, without which it is impossible to enjoy continually, <it is impossible to be active continually; without a friend it is impossible to enjoy continually;>⁹⁰ therefore it is also impossible to be active continually without a friend. If someone says that ‘impossible’ [here] is false, he would surely agree that ‘difficult’ is at all events true.

Moreover, a flourishing person needs friends for continuous activities, for worthy people stir and rouse one another up to these things and they make each other much more eager.

That, then, is what he wishes to say. In respect to the text that [reads], ‘which must be so concerning a happy person’ (1170a7-8), [the sense] is like this: doing decent things continually and not at intervals must pertain to a happy person, for thus he will be more similar to God. It is better, then, for him to do continually those things which he enjoys. He enjoys noble actions, but is disgusted by their opposites; so too a musical person [enjoys] fine melodies – these are those that are harmonious and tuned – and he is pained by ones that are unharmonious. He needs friends, then, both because of these things and because practice together and exercise together and the whetting of virtue arise, for good people, out of living together. For one cannot exercise and progress in something by oneself as much as one can with others.

1170a13-14 To those who look into it more according to nature, a worthy person seems by nature to be choiceworthy as a friend to a worthy person.

The abovementioned arguments were [derived] from the nature of a flourishing person qua flourishing: a person who is flourishing is not so by nature, for no worthy person is worthy by nature, just as neither a doctor nor a teacher is by nature a doctor or a teacher. Rather, a worthy person becomes such by habit and labour, and a doctor becomes such by learning and experience. The present argument takes its start from the fact that we live and perceive, and living and perceiving, indeed, have not accrued to us by habit and practice together, but are present to us by nature. On this account, [Aristotle] said ‘to those who look into it more according to nature’, as if he was

saying: earlier we were looking at it and arguing not on the basis of things that are present to us by nature; but now, looking into it on the basis of such things, we may discuss it more according to nature. For, when we look at the things that are present to us by nature, we find that a worthy person is choiceworthy by nature as a friend to a worthy person, just as existing and living and seeing and thinking are: for we choose each of these by nature, for by nature we all desire to live and perceive and think. It was said that what is good by nature is, to the worthy person, good and pleasing in itself. It was also said earlier that to exist and live, since it is good, is choiceworthy to a worthy person: for things that are good in themselves, being good by nature, are choiceworthy to a worthy person, and to exist and live is by nature and in itself good. Such a thing, consequently, is choiceworthy to a worthy person.

A friend, too, is very like our existing and being alive, for a good friend is, as it were, the life of his friend; thus, a worthy friend is by nature choiceworthy to a worthy and sensible person. A worthy friend is, in a certain way, not the life and sensation of his friend according to habitual condition, but rather that according to activity, since indeed he is active above all with him.

'Living is defined for animals by the power of sensation' (1170a16). It was said earlier that living, being good, is choiceworthy for a worthy person; here too he says the same thing and makes the same case, so that he may thereby show that a worthy friend is by nature choiceworthy to a flourishing person. But he reports these things very unclearly. What he means is something like this: the essence and existence of the life of animals consists in being able to perceive, for the life of animals is a perceptive power. For the life of plants is a power that nurtures those that have it and makes them engender things similar to themselves, but the power of animals is perceptive, for one animal differs from another, as was said in *On the Soul* (1.2, 413b1), by sensation. For those things that grow of themselves and engender things similar to themselves are said to live, but those things that, in addition to growing and engendering similar things, have sensation of things that are pleasing and are painful are called animals. This does not belong to plants, for none of them is pained when it is struck or pleased when it is taken care of.

[Aristotle] says 'is defined', that is, a definition and an <essential>⁹¹ account of the life of an animal is a power that is cognizant of pleasing and painful things, which is a perceptive and discriminatory power of things that are pleasing and painful. For human beings, living is defined both by being able to perceive and by being able to think, that is, to deliberate: for 'think' has been used instead of 'deliberate'. For only a human being is a deliberative animal. The

[word] <'is defined'>⁹² may have been used instead of 'is typified' and 'is recognized'.

[A human being] is defined, then, by being able to think, but they have this power on account of being active. For the 'supreme thing is in activity' (1170a18): he calls 'supreme' the end and that for the sake of which [i.e., the final cause]. For nature sowed our powers in us for the sake of activity, and for its sake we treat them [i.e., our powers] well and appreciate them; for we like our sight and our auditory power for the sake of seeing and hearing.

If, then, to live consists for us in being able to perceive and think, and we have the ability to perceive and think from the creator on account of being active, living seems properly to be sensation and thought in accord with activity, and to live and conduct oneself and act either in accord with sensation and the irrational desires, as do base people who live in the manner of cattle, or in accord with the mind, as worthy people do. But to live, indeed, and especially as worthy people do, is among the things that are good and pleasing in themselves. To live, consequently, and to be active in accord with virtue is good in itself and pleasing and choiceworthy.

Having said these things, [Aristotle] should have added: when this occurs continually it is better and more pleasing; but it is difficult to do this – I mean, of course, to act continually – when one is solitary. Consequently, a flourishing person needs a friend, so that he may be active continually, that is, so that he may perpetually be actually perceptive and intellective. For this is better than being so potentially, if indeed powers, as was said, are for the sake of activities. If, then, we appreciate sensation according to activity by nature, or because we choose to do so, and that [i.e., sensation] and wishing and acting according to activity are with us especially [when we are] with a friend, a friend is, consequently, by nature choiceworthy for a worthy person. [Aristotle] ought, then, to have added these things, but because he did not add them, although he was looking to this and wished to draw this conclusion, he said what was said [and] created much unclarity.

Further, since it is most pleasing to know oneself, and we are not able to see ourselves by ourselves (this is obvious from what we say every [day]: for we reproach one another, saying 'if you observed yourself, if you knew yourself, you would not wish to accuse this person, you would not say these things against your neighbours') – if, in fact, to know and see ourselves is pleasing, but we cannot do this by ourselves, and a friend is another [selfsame] who is loved,⁹³ [then] a flourishing person needs a friend; so that just as people see themselves when they stare into a mirror, so too a flourishing person, when he looks at his friend, sees himself and recognizes what kind of person

he is – that he is good and lovely – and by seeing and knowing this 15
he will do the things that are noble and best still more.

We are confident that a worthy friend is another [selfsame] who
loves⁹⁴ on the basis of daily things: for if someone loves someone
intensely, he says about him nothing other than that ‘he is another
I, and I am he, and anyone who loves or insults him loves or insults
me’.

Having said that ‘living is among the things that are good and 20
pleasing in themselves’ (1170a19-20), and having shown that he does
not call every life an activity and pleasing and good but rather the
[life] according to virtue, [Aristotle] added ‘for it is definite, and what
is definite is of the nature of the good’ (1170a20-1). We know that the
Pythagoreans used to make two lists, and they ranked all good things
under one, and evil things under the other. And they used to call the 25
one in which they subsumed noble things definite, and that in which
[they subsumed] evil things indefinite; and they used to say that noble
and definite things were convertible. For if something good is definite
and if something definite is good, [then] too evil and indefinite things
are similarly [convertible], for every evil thing is indefinite and every
indefinite thing is evil. There was discussion of these lists in the
Course on Nature (3.4) and in the *Metaphysics* (1.5, 986a15). That to
[live] according to virtue is definite has been shown in many [places]
by Aristotle and Plato. For a base person lives on account of his 30
irrational desires, which he follows, and his boundless appetite for
base pleasures. And he becomes every sort of person, being satisfied
with none of the things he does; and on this account he leaps from
one thing to another, at no time standing still upon anything that is
the same. For base things and the pleasures [that derive] from them
are such things. I call such things either not agreeable or not really 35
pleasing; rather, as soon as they have been done they at once seem
displeasing and painful to those who have done them. Therefore they
proceed to other things, seeking what is really pleasing but unable to
find it on account of the ignorance that afflicts them out of their 516,1
besottedness with base actions. But since a worthy person (for he sees
what is right) pursues and does things that are really good and really
pleasing, he stays with them. For just as what is true is definite, and
what is false is indefinite (for a narrative of the truth is simple, but
one of a falsehood is intricate and highly composite), so too what is 5
really good and really pleasing is simple, but everything false is the
opposite.

Having said that living is among the things that are good and
pleasing in themselves, [Aristotle] added ‘what is by nature good is
also, to a decent person’ (1170a21-2), good and pleasing. Conse-
quently, a good man will choose to live – according to activity,

obviously – and thus also to have a friend with whom he can be active more continually than if he were alone.

- 10 *1170a22-3 One ought not to take a wicked and corrupted life.

By this, [Aristotle] has made obvious <what he meant>⁹⁵ when he said that living is among the things that are good and pleasing in themselves; for he said ‘definite’ not about every life but rather about that of worthy people. One should not suppose, he says, when I say that life is among the things that are good and pleasing in themselves, that I am saying this about every life, but rather about that of worthy
15 people. For those of base people, or of those who are tortured on the wheel and oppressed by misfortunes like Priam’s, are neither pleasing nor fine. [Aristotle] promises to speak about the life of wicked people and that of those who are [involved] in sufferings and miseries, and he will speak about it in the next book, where he speaks about pleasure.

- 20 1170a25-7 If to live itself is good and pleasing – it seems to be so also from the fact that all people desire it and especially those who are decent ...

By this addition [Aristotle] intimated that a life accompanied with virtue is what he calls one that is properly speaking good and pleasing. For in fact base people too by nature desire this [i.e., life] and pursue this, for every mind, as he said in [book] 6 of the present treatise [cf., loosely, 6.2, 1139b4-5], desires the good that is appropriate to its own nature and seeks this; thus base people also do so. But
25 those who have been nurtured evilly fall into wicked and base lives as if they [i.e., the lives] were noble; for they are not able to discriminate what is noble from what is evil, because they are evilly disposed.

- The explanation of the argument is in the [words], ‘as a worthy person is disposed toward himself, he is also toward a friend; for a friend is another selfsame’ (1170b5-7). What he means would be
30 something like this: the friend of a flourishing person is another flourishing selfsame; thus the life, too, of his friend is another selfsame of the life of a flourishing person.⁹⁶ A flourishing person chooses and very much wishes to have his own life, for everyone desires by nature to exist and to live. Thus, he chooses by nature to have a friend. For just as he is disposed toward himself, so too is he toward his
35 friend; for a friend is another selfsame. And the syllogism would be like this: a flourishing person by nature chooses and desires to have his own life; but in fact the life of his friend is the friend himself; a flourishing person, consequently, by nature chooses and desires to have with him a worthy friend.

The sense of what is being said is that. The text would be thus: if living is itself good and pleasing, it is choiceworthy too on this account. For a worthy person chooses to live and to perceive and to think because he perceives both that he lives and that he thinks. For no one wishes to live and to perceive, [on condition of] being insensible of the fact that he lives or that he perceives. For [then] he would be a plant, which indeed lives, but does not know that it lives. If, then, to live and to perceive that one lives and perceives are pleasing and fine, and as one is disposed toward himself, so too is he disposed toward a friend, [then] by nature he chooses that a friend be with him, so that he may perceive both what he is and that he is flourishing. For by perceiving that he [i.e., the friend] both exists and that he is a friend such as this, he understands that he himself both lives and is flourishing. For the friend of a flourishing person, as has been said, is such a one as the flourishing person [himself] is.

1170a29-30 One who sees perceives that he is seeing and one who hears that he is hearing and one who walks that he is walking, and similarly in the case of the other things.

Thinking and judging, when we are seeing and thinking, that we are seeing and that we are thinking – that which is called the attentive part⁹⁷ – is a part of the rational soul and, as it were, the centre of it. For this is what determines that we are seeing when we see, and are reflecting when we are reflecting, and are walking and writing when we are walking and when we are writing. The [phrase] ‘we would perceive that we are perceiving and we would think that we are thinking’ (1170a31-2)^{97a} is the same as ‘for we are not insensible or unconscious when we think and perceive that we are thinking and are perceiving, but rather when we are perceiving and thinking we co-perceive (*sunaiathanomai*) and co-understand that we are perceiving and that we are thinking’, and these things are nothing other than [the fact that] we exist. For one who co-perceives that he perceives, judges and by-perceives [or ‘perceives in addition’: *epaiathanomai*] nothing other than that he is living and exists;⁹⁸ in the same way, too, one who co-thinks that he is thinking, is thinking this: that since he is thinking, he is living and has not died, and is not a non-existing thing but rather something that exists, an animal like this one here.

He indicated these things by saying ‘and that’⁹⁹ we perceive or think, that we exist’ (1170a32-3); one should put a comma at ‘that we think’, and then add ‘that we exist’. [Aristotle] says that the fact that we perceive that we are perceiving and think that we are thinking is [just] to perceive and think that we exist, or that we exist and are among the things that exist. [Aristotle] inferred, then, by [taking] perceiving as a middle [term in a syllogism], that to exist and live is

good. Thus, to perceive and think that we are perceiving and thinking is good. But this is to live and to exist; consequently, to live and exist is good and pleasing and choiceworthy. But to live and exist, properly speaking, is to live according to virtue; to live according to it continually and to be active according to virtue is still more pleasing and better; the worthy person can more easily live continually according to virtue and continually be active with a friend than if he is solitary; consequently, a worthy friend assists in being active continually and doing the noblest things. One who assists in regard to this is choiceworthy; consequently, a worthy friend is choiceworthy for a flourishing person. Hence, a flourishing person needs a friend.

'For to exist was [said to be] to perceive or think' (1170a33-1170b1), since a life in accord with activity is the same as perception in accord with activity, and perception in accord with activity is the same as a life in accord with activity. For [Aristotle] does not take every life or every existing thing, but rather that [i.e., the life] of a worthy person. Since these things are so, he says, taking them as being convertible, that the fact that we exist is nothing other than our perceiving and thinking. If, indeed, our existing is the same as to perceive and think, yet we also say truly, when we convert [the terms], that to perceive and think that we are perceiving and are thinking is the same as [the fact] that we exist and are living, and to perceive that we are living is good and pleasing, then consequently to exist and live is of itself good and pleasing.

Having said that 'life is a good thing by nature' (1170b1-2), and having shown that by a good life he means that in accord with virtue, [Aristotle] added: 'it is pleasing to perceive the good that subsists in oneself' (1170b2-3), that is, it is most pleasing to perceive that the life in oneself is action and contemplation of the things that are; for such are worthy people, productive of noble things and contemplative of the things that are. Since, moreover, what is good and pleasing is choiceworthy, and the life of a worthy person is good and pleasing, the life of a worthy person is, consequently, choiceworthy; hence to live is choiceworthy for a worthy person.

Having said that the existing, or the life, of worthy people is good and pleasing, <by way of clarifying how it is pleasing>,¹⁰⁰ [Aristotle] added: 'for they are pleased when they co-perceive what is noble and good in itself' (1170b4-5).¹⁰¹ He calls 'good in itself' such a life, that is joined with action and contemplation; for worthy people, by perceiving and thinking, co-perceive and co-understand that their own life is the best and noblest, and thinking this, they are pleased.

1170b5-7 As a worthy person is toward himself, so too is he 25
toward his friend, for his friend is another selfsame.

Here is the explanation, as was said, of the present statements. He says – if we may state it by combining these with the former [statements] – that living is, for a worthy person (as has been said), good and pleasing and choiceworthy; for a flourishing person and every worthy person chooses by nature to exist and to live. ‘As he is toward himself, so too is he toward his friend’: for his friend is another selfsame. Consequently, a worthy friend is choiceworthy for a flourishing person. For perceiving and thinking of the life of the worthy person, he co-understands his own [life], and this is pleasing and choiceworthy. Hence, a worthy person too is pleasing and choiceworthy, and when we see or think of him we co-observe and co-think of ourselves. Consequently, a flourishing person will choose and will by nature strive to have a friend. 35

The sequence of all the present statements is like that. The other things were inserted between, and teach that our existing, when we are in the body, is to live and perceive and think that we are living and perceiving and thinking, and that truly to be and live is to conduct oneself in accord with virtue, which indeed is both pleasing and choiceworthy. If to perceive that we exist and are living is pleasing and choiceworthy, then co-perceiving that our friend lives and exists is choiceworthy and pleasing. This is likely to happen when a friend lives together with one and shares in one’s words and actions. It is pleasing and choiceworthy to a flourishing person, consequently, that his friend be together with him and live together with him. 519,1

This is the sense of what is said; the [points] in accord with the text would be such as these: just as to exist is choiceworthy to each person, ‘so too a friend is’ (1170b7-8),¹⁰² [Aristotle] added, ‘or nearly so’; that is, the life of one’s friend is very like and most similar to one’s own life. Everyone by nature likes and wishes to live together with everyone who is similar, and especially a worthy person with a worthy person. By nature, agemate delights agemate and crow sits by crow [cf. 8.14, 1161b34; 8.2, 1155a34-5]. A worthy person, moreover, is pleasing to a worthy person and enjoys living together with him and spending time together with him. 10

Having said that to exist is pleasing and choiceworthy to each worthy person, [Aristotle] says why it is pleasing and choiceworthy. To exist is choiceworthy on account of one’s perceiving oneself as being good; thus, the co-perception of the goodness of one’s friend is also pleasing and choiceworthy to him. He is likely to get such a co-perception from living together ‘and sharing words’ – those that are uttered – ‘and ideas’ (1170b11-12) – the thoughts that are signified by such words. In the case of irrational animals, [Aristotle] says, 15 20

to live together is to graze in the same place, but in the case of human beings it is to share the best and noblest actions and words and ideas.

- 25 **1170b20-2** Should one, then, make as many friends as possible, or just as, in the case of hospitality, it seems to have been felicitously said, ‘may I be called neither many-guested nor guestless’, so too it will be fitting in the case of friendship.

Having shown that a flourishing person wants friends, [Aristotle] raises the question: does he then have need of very many friends? Having raised the question, he at once added the solution, saying: ‘or just as in the case of hospitality, it seems to have been felicitously said’. The [word] ‘felicitously’ is the same as ‘fittingly’. The ancients
 30 used to call ‘guests’ strangers who accommodated them in their trips abroad [and] those who were accommodated by one another. Just as, then, says [Aristotle], there is no need to have many guests, so too neither [is there need to have many] friends; for just as the guestless and many-guested [conditions] are to be avoided, so neither are the friendless and many-friended [conditions] praiseworthy. And he says
 520,1 why having many friends is not a useful thing for any of the species of friendship: having many friends is not something advantageous whether to those who love on account of the useful or to those [who love] on account of the pleasing or to those [who love] on account of character and virtue. [It is not advantageous] to those [who love] on account of the useful, because it is difficult, being one person, to do a service in return and to requite fairly as many things and the kinds of things in which one has been helped by many people. For it is
 5 difficult for one person to do a service in return for many; but it is necessary to requite fairly, for if one will not requite fairly, the friendship may be dissolved; for they love each other on account of requiting fairly and being treated [so] in return.

***1170b23-4** To those who [love] with regard to usefulness, the thing said would seem to be very fitting.

- By ‘the thing said’, [Aristotle] means the [statement] ‘not to have many friends’; for it will be fitting too for those who love on account of what is pleasing and character not to have as many friends as possible, but the thing said is above all fitting for those [who love] on
 10 account of what is useful. For the livelihood of one person and his surplus are not sufficient to do a service for so many people, and above all because in addition to the fact that such people are bothersome, they are also hindrances in regard to living rightly, that is, without much trouble and disturbance: for doing services in return for many people involves much disturbance. And that those who love on ac-

count of what is useful are bothersome is obvious: for they are forever looking round for and inquiring about a fair requital, and whether what is given in return is equal or greater or less. If it is less, they will dissolve the friendship, and if it is equal, they will not dissolve it but recriminate, saying, 'What gratitude is this, that he has given in return the same amount as he received?' As for him who gives more [than he received], his belongings will very quickly fail him. For it is necessary that what he has quickly fail a person who gives in return more than he receives. 15

Similarly, neither is there need of as many [friends] as possible with regard to pleasure, for two or three suffice for that. For just as in food, the salt – for this is what he called 'seasoning' (1170b29) – a little [salt] seasons the food, but a large amount renders it displeasing and inedible, so too those who produce pleasure are productive rather of unpleasantness, not of pleasure. 20

1170b29-30 As regards worthy people, [should one have as friends] the most in number, or is there some measure to the multitude of friends? 25

Here too, the [phrase] 'or is there a measure to the multitude of friends' has been added as a solution. For, having asked concerning worthy people whether there was still need to have the most in number of such people as friends, he replied by saying 'or is there a measure to the multitude of friends' as there is also to a city? For just as it is impossible for there to be a city of ten men (for if it consists of that many, it will be vulnerable and a slave to anyone who wishes), neither [can there be one] of twenty times ten thousand, for the reasons that [Aristotle] mentions in the *Constitutions* (*Politics* 7.4, 1326a6ff.). Having said that a population [of a city] cannot consist either of ten men 'or of ten times ten thousand', that is, a hundred thousand, just as it was seen in the *Constitutions* (*Politics* 7.4, 1326a41) that neither is there a ship of fifty stades [approximately six miles], [Aristotle] added 'the quantity is not, perhaps' (1170b32), definite, but rather it is anything between certain definite [limits]. 30

What [Aristotle] means is that it is hard to say definitively: let a city be of eight thousand or five thousand or some other definite number. One should say: let a city be of some [number] between defined limits. As he said in the *Constitutions*, it is like this: people should, he says there, look at the citizens and the authoritative [element] of the city, at how large and of what kind the city's revenue is, at how many people the land over which the city rules can nurture, and how many and what kinds of soldiers it needs for the protection of the land. And when they have found that so-and-so many are many, whereas so-and-so many are few, and they have defined a large and 5 10

small quantity by [say] ten and two, and have taken ten and two as the limits, [then] from what is between ten and two they should take that quantity which can both protect the land and be nurtured by the land. This should be done both in the case of the farmers and in the
 15 case of the other people, such as the commercial people and those who are like them. As in the case of these, so too in the case of friends there is a certain definite number, and one should seek this: [that is,] the kind of quantity of friends with which it is impossible to live together with ease and without any disturbances. Those with whom it is impossible to live in this way are more than what is due; thus one should avoid that large a number of friends.

20 **1171a2-4** That it is not possible to live together with many people and to distribute oneself among them is not unclear.

What [Aristotle] means is clear to all: for if one of one's friends has the habit of going outside the city each day, another of spending time with those who hold the offices of the city, another of exercising together with those who are exercising, and this one of doing this,
 25 another of doing that, how is it possible for one and the same person at one and the same time or day to be available to and share in doing things with all of them? To be together with none of them is odd and unfriendly; but to be together with this one but not with the others produces a reputation for disdain. But again, that in the case of many people, all should do and practise exactly the same thing, so that all
 30 are one in regard to this same thing, insofar as what they are doing or practising is one; and that it should thereby be possible to say that one can be together with all of them simultaneously – for insofar as they are doing the same thing at this very time, they are together in this respect, even though they are not [physically] together – [nevertheless,] for all of them, since they are many, to do the same thing [at the same time] is unfeasible. For although it is possible for two or three to perform the same thing, when there are, perchance, twenty
 35 it is impossible.

But, further, if friends of the same person are also friends to one another, then it is necessary that the twenty friends of Socrates also be friends of one another;¹⁰³ but this is most difficult. Again, since they are friends of Socrates, and a worthy friend (for the argument is about worthy people) should spend time together and spend the day together with his friend, the twenty should spend the day together
 522,1 with Socrates, and thus also with one another. How, then, will this be possible if they are not friends to one another? But this is one of the most difficult things.

Even more difficult, or rather impossible, is to rejoice together with those who are rejoicing and grieve together with those who are

grieving. For if this one here is crying and this other is laughing simultaneously, how is it possible to laugh and to weep simultaneously [with them]? And if one man is carrying [out] a son who has died, while another is celebrating the wedding of his daughter, both at the same time or even the same day, how is it possible to rejoice and grieve simultaneously? 10

Having said these things, and having shown that it is not possible for a worthy person to have more than one friend, he recognized that this opinion is harsh and, turning to what is heartening, [Aristotle] says that one should avoid having many friends, but should choose as many as one will be able to live together with. This many would be about three, for to have more would doubtless not be easy. For it is impossible to have many friends: for just as rivers that have many splits and divisions flow thin and weak, so too love [or friendship] that is partitioned among many is entirely dulled. For just as, [Aristotle] says, it is impossible to love many people passionately (for passionate love is an excess of friendship [or: of friendly love]), so too it is not possible intensely to love many people [as friends]. 15

Such are the things that have been said. In accord with the fuller text [or: context], however, [Aristotle] said 'in regard to one person' (1171a12) concerning loving passionately [as opposed to the love for friends]; for to love passionately occurs [only] in respect to one person, but to love [friends] intensely occurs in respect to a few. 20

1171a13-14 It seems to be this way also in respect to the facts; for friends are not many in respect to comradely [love].

Having said that [passionate love] occurs in regard to one person (for passionate love is an excess of [friendly] love, and what exceeds cannot possibly occur in regard to many), [Aristotle] confirms this as well from history. For each of the comradely loves that are celebrated in verse are found to have occurred between pairs – that of Achilles and Patroclus, that of Pylades and Orestes, that of Theseus and Pirithous; but no one thinks that those who are friends to many and fall in with all people intimately are friends, on account of the fact that it is impossible for someone to be intensely a friend to many. A person who is a friend to many and approaches all people pleasingly and consorts with them ingratiatingly, even if he should chance to be disposed in a loving [or: friendly] way, is not thought to love them or be a friend to them or be among those who love intensely, on account of the fact that it is not possible, as has been said, for one and the same person to love many people intensely. 25 30

'In a civic way, now' (1071a17-18), [Aristotle] says, it is possible for the same person to love many, but in accord with love [or 'friendship': *philia*] properly so called, which is defined by its being vehement and 35

523,1 intense, it is not possible. The 'civic way' is not to be dissatisfied with the things that those who converse with one say, or to oppose their words or actions, but rather to approve and praise both their words and their actions. People also call these people ingratiating, because they please all people or seem to please all people. But even if one is
 5 not ingratiating, but rather decent ([Aristotle] calls 'decent' here one who is moderate and gracious in character), it is possible for this person too to be a friend to many. This person differs from the ingratiating person, because an ingratiating person is not of necessity also decent, and second because the ingratiating person appears to praise and be amazed at the actions and words of those whom he thinks he pleasing, but a decent person is not like this: for he neither
 10 praises nor blames <but rather is in the mean>.¹⁰⁴ In a civic way, then, it is possible to be a friend toward many. But it is not possible [to be a friend to many] on account of virtue and character, because it is also difficult to encounter many people who are worthy; and in regard to those who are not, there can not be love [or: friendship].

1171a21-2 Is there, then, more need of friends in [times of] good
 15 fortune or in misfortunes?

The question that [Aristotle] is raising is very clear: for those in [tight] straits and those in affluence alike need friends. For those who are in straits [need them] for assistance and help and the averting of misfortune, whereas those who are flourishing need people with whom they will live, for the reasons that we have by now ceased discussing, and whom they will help. For since they are worthy, they
 20 wish to help [others], and it is nobler to help friends than strangers; and the cause of this too has been stated. But a friend is more necessary in misfortunes, for then there is need of money.

A worthy person is a friend on every occasion, but he is useful and pleasing above all in misfortunes. But it is 'nobler' and more pleasing to be a friend 'in [times of] good fortune' (1171a25-6), and the cause
 25 of this too has been stated; but it will be stated yet again, and [this time] on account of the fact that a worthy friend is pleasing. Those who are flourishing and live according to nature (for good fortune precipitates many people into arrogance and boastfulness and insolence toward those who come their way) seek to have decent people as friends, for it is more choiceworthy to do a service for these and to spend time together with such people than to do so for base people
 30 and with base people. 'For the very presence of friends is also pleasing' (1171a27-8) both in [times of] good fortune and in misfortune; for those who are grieving are relieved [by them]. Why the presence of friends in misfortunes is pleasing, [Aristotle] states by these [words], for he already has stated why it is so in [times of] good fortune; in

fact, he stated why it is so in misfortunes too, but [he did so] more elliptically.

One should know that what he says here suits all species of love. There is need of friends, [Aristotle] says, in misfortunes, because when those who are unfortunate see them [i.e., their friends], they are relieved. Just as when two pains, as Hippocrates says (*Aphorisms* 2.46), occur in the same person, the greater pain ousts the lesser and makes it imperceptible; and again when two pleasing things are, say, visible or audible, or one is visible and the other is audible, the more pleasing one pulls us toward itself, compelling us to despise the other; so too when a pleasing and a painful thing exist simultaneously, if they happen to be equal in strength, they set us in the middle, but if one exceeds and the other falls short, they dispose us proportionally to the excess or the shortfall. For the emotion that [comes] from them to us is engendered [in a degree] corresponding to the power of the perceptibles. Since, then, a friend is a most pleasing thing, by ousting what is painful he relieves it and makes it seem more moderate,¹⁰⁵ and by saying and enacting and doing all the things that he knows lead the one who has been pained to a cheerful [state].¹⁰⁶

The presence of the friend relieves the grief and makes it light, not as one who has lifted four bushels [of grain] from someone who is carrying them, but rather, as has been said, since pleasing and painful things are of a nature to act upon us, and the presence of a friend happens to be pleasing, it dulls the pain. For opposite things, when they are mixed, blunt one another, like boiling water when cold [water] has been thrown into it; thus too, what is pleasing, when it has approached what is painful, will make it weaker and less troubling.

Since this is true in the case of opposites, but to Plato what is pleasing does not seem to be opposite to what is painful,¹⁰⁷ [Aristotle] added: let it be dismissed, 'now, whether' (1171a33) what is pleasing and painful are relieved on account of their being opposites to one another or also on account of some other thing, e.g. on account of magnitude and smallness, as Hippocrates too said in the case of two pains; for this is not the present [question], but rather [the fact] that the presence of a friend is necessary in misfortunes because it manifestly relieves the pains of those who are unfortunate.

1171a34-5 Their presence seems to be mixed.

The presence of a friend, [Aristotle] says, seems to be mixed of pleasure and pain, as is grey of white and black: pleasing, because to see a friend is pleasing and above all [when one is] in misfortune, for it gives rise to 'support against grieving' (1171b1-2); for a friend is consoling when he is seen and talks, especially 'if he is astute' – he

calls those people 'astute' who are clever at saying the things that are appropriate to each occasion. Such, above all, are worthy people. 'For he knows', [Aristotle] says, 'about character' (1171b3), that is, the
 30 worthy person knows what things one who is similar to him enjoys and for what things he grieves and with what kinds of things he is satisfied and dissatisfied, and knowing this he says and does the things which he [the friend] enjoys and by which he is put at ease.

On account of these things, then, the presence of a friend is pleasing; but it is painful inasmuch as he [the sufferer] knows that his friend is grieving together with and suffering with him. For no one who is kindly wishes to cause grief to anyone who happens by,
 35 and certainly not to a friend, and to be responsible for some cause [of his grief].¹⁰⁸

But why did [Aristotle] say this, I mean, now, that the presence of a friend is mixed? Since he said that it relieves [pain] but does not completely pry out and utterly eradicate it, he added on this account these [words], as if he were saying by this: 'I did not say that the
 525,1 presence of a friend totally eradicates and completely does away with pain, but rather that it relieves it, and therefore it also causes grief to the [suffering] friend who knows that he [i.e., the consoling friend] is grieving together with and suffering with him'. For the presence of a friend would be completely eliminative and eradivative of the pain of a friend who was unfortunate, if the [consoling] friend, when he
 5 approached, continued to be free of pain. But since it is not so, but rather he grieves and suffers together with him, [the consoler indeed] relieves [the sufferer's pain], since [the consoling friend] is pleasing, but does not do away with it completely, since he engenders pain [in the sufferer] on account of the very fact that he [the consoler] grieves together with him.

Having said that no one wishes to cause grief to his friend, [Aristotle] adds that those who are manly in nature and who bear their fortunes nobly, again because they avoid and do not wish to be
 10 responsible for pain to their friends, are chary of their friends' grieving together with them, and on account of this chariness pretend to rejoice and laugh and pass the time as though they were experiencing nothing painful. And [this is so] in general, [Aristotle] says, unless they exceed in freedom from pain. He means by 'freedom from pain' not to suffer the most vehement and intense pain; that is, that the one who is unfortunate does not suffer or choose or wish to be
 15 responsible for pain to his friends.¹⁰⁹

On account, then, as has been said, both of the fact that the one who is unfortunate does not wish to cause his friend grief and of the fact that he himself is not given to lamentation, he is chary of seeing him grieve together with him.¹¹⁰ For it is the part of base and ignoble people to cry like a woman and wail on account of their misfortunes,

but not the part of worthy people. And on this account they do not welcome co-lamenters. For a co-lamentor is one who laments together with one who is lamenting. How will someone who is unfortunate, but is nobly bearing his fortune through his own virtue and is not lamenting, have someone who laments together with him? Or how will someone who is so disposed welcome one who is lamenting? For it is the part of women and womanish men to seek to have people who groan together and lament together with them, and one ought not to imitate these womanish people. Rather, when we are flourishing, when we are unfortunate, and when we are in an intermediate [state], we ought to look toward those who are better and associate with them.

***1171b12-14** The presence of friends in [times of] good fortune involves a way of life ...¹¹¹

The presence of friends in misfortunes is, as has been said, something mixed of pleasure and pain, but in [times of] good fortune it is unadulterated and pure and unmixed with any pain. For [it involves] a way of life, that is, one's walk, look, standing, sitting, words, and awareness: for since the one who is flourishing is aware that he is engendering pleasure in his friend by the good things that are present to him, he rejoices and glories. 'Therefore, it would seem [right] to summon one's friends in [times of] good fortune ...' (1171b15), both because it is really most fitting for us to be manly and not womanish, and because it is painful for us to be responsible for pain to our friends. It is esteemed and most honoured to summon one's friends to [times of] good fortune and to do them a service (for what is of service is noble), but to be hesitant to summon them to misfortunes, for one ought not voluntarily to give to friends a share of one's own evils. For if a friend is another [who is just] such as the one who loves him is, and if what he wishes to be available to himself he [wishes] also to be available to his friend (he wishes good things to be available to himself), then he should give to his friend a share of good things and not of the evils [that derive] from his misfortune. Thus, it does not seem noble to summon one's friends [when one is] in misfortunes.

1171b18 Whence too the [expression], 'it is enough that I am unfortunate'.

From the fact that one should not fill up one's friends with one's own evils and should in general not ourselves be responsible for pain to them, the proverbial [saying] of the tragedian too has arisen: 'it is enough that I am unfortunate',¹¹² [that is], it suffices that I am unfortunate, and there is no need for my friend too to be unfortunate and grieve together with me. What then, Aristotle? Will we in no way

summon our friends [when we are] in misfortune to console and relieve the heaviness of our pain? Yes, [Aristotle] says, one should summon them, but not on every chance occasion, but rather when they are going to be troubled slightly but will benefit us greatly. But when they are going to be greatly grieved and will not benefit us at all, but rather even cause us more grief (for it has been said that it is distressing to see our friend grieving on account of our misfortune), one should not summon them. In [times of] good fortune, as has been said, one should summon one's friends, but in misfortunes one should be chary of and shrink from doing so, lest we somehow cause them grief unawares.

We ought, then, to act thus; but friends ought, in turn, to go unsummoned [to those] in calamities and misfortunes. For it is noble for a friend who helps [others] <to go on his own initiative to a friend of his who is in misfortune, and to assist him to the extent of his ability (for it is the part of a really true friend to go unsummoned to a friend who is doing miserably)>,¹¹³ and in every way take care of him, above all one who happens to be in need and lacks many or some things. For both things, [Aristotle] says, are 'more noble and more pleasing' (1171b22-3), that is, the two things, i.e., helping him and going unsummoned, are more noble and more pleasing than the single thing, [that is,] helping him at his request.

In regard, then, to their misfortunes, as we are saying, people should go to [their friends] unsummoned; and in their good fortune they should go unsummoned and be at hand quickly to work together and co-operate with them wherever there is need of this (for there are times when, even in good circumstances, there is need of friends). But [they should go] in a more leisurely way to profit and take joy together from the goods of their friend. For it is thought to be neither noble nor loving to be eager to provide for oneself and take profit from one's friends' advantage; for such a thing is the part of flatterers and illiberal people, but not of friends.

We should also drive away and remove from ourselves a reputation for unpleasantness. For even if it is not displeasing to our friend for us to eat more or less continually together with him and profit together with him from his goods, nevertheless we should be chary of and shrink from [doing so], lest we somehow seem to be displeasing. For sometimes satiety and unpleasantness go along with continual presence. [Aristotle] said 'sometimes' (1171b26) on account of worthy people who share reason and contemplation; for among these people satiety never occurs, but rather they forever enjoy being together and continually profiting together from the noble [qualities] that each of them has.

***1171b29-30** It is the case, then, that just as for those who love passionately, to see is the most gratifying thing and they choose this sensation rather ...

With these [words], I think, [Aristotle] teaches the kinds of deeds and the kinds of actions, of people who live together, upon which unpleasantness follows and upon what kinds it does not follow. And he says that no unpleasantness and disagreeableness at all follow upon those [deeds and actions] by which both are pleased and which they wish to effect continually. For example, if both wish to play dice together or drink together and, wishing this, they play dice together and drink together, the one will never be displeasing to the other. But if to the one, playing dice is more pleasing than drinking, but to the other drinking [is more pleasing] than playing dice, continualness of playing dice is displeasing to the drinker and the one who continually plays dice is [displeasing] to the one who continually drinks or continually wishes to drink. If they are displeasing to one another, it is the case that they are not pleased by the same things. 10 15

But worthy friends always enjoy the same things and are pleased by the same things: these people will never be displeasing to one another. This is what [Aristotle] wishes to say; in the words, 'it is the case, then', one should not put a circumflex accent on [the particle] *ara* but rather put an acute accent on it;¹¹⁴ for [Aristotle] says these things not by way of asking [a question] but rather by way of declaring [positively]. It is as if he were saying that it is by now, indeed, clear from what we have been saying that, just as those who love passionately wish to see their boyfriend rather than hear how he is, since passionate love is more in accord with seeing than with hearing, so too it is more choiceworthy for friends to be together and live together with [one another] than to hear and learn, when they are apart from one another, how they are spending their time and how they are. For if love is a commonality, and to share is to live together, then love and living together are the same thing. Consequently, to live together is more choiceworthy than to hear how one's friend is spending his time.¹¹⁵ Further, as was said previously at length, to perceive that we exist and are living is choiceworthy; just as each worthy person is in regard to himself, so too is he in regard to his friend; consequently, to perceive and to see one's friend would be choiceworthy. But it is not possible to see one who is absent; hence, his presence is choiceworthy, as a result of which it is possible in fact to see him. And it is more choiceworthy than his absence, upon which follows not seeing him, but rather hearing at times how he is spending his time. 20 25 30

***1171b35** The activity of it [i.e., sensation] occurs in living together.

35 The activity of sensation, that is, of seeing one's friend, occurs in living together and spending time together doing the same thing – not, of course, in being apart and not living together. Reasonably, then, they aspire to live together, for they think that for them to exist and live is this: living together, obviously. And the syllogism would be something like this: to exist and to live is choiceworthy; they think that to exist and to live subsist in living together; consequently, living together is choiceworthy. Or again, thus: for worthy people, to exist and to live is choiceworthy; they believe that to exist and to live are the same thing as living together; hence, for worthy people living together is choiceworthy.

40

528,1

***1172a1-2** And whatever constitutes existence for each or that for the sake of which they choose to live ...

Those who think that our essence and in general our existence is a life in accord with the mind and with contemplation, and that we have been born for the sake of this, i.e., to persevere in action and contemplation, wish to live by themselves or with their friends actively and contemplatively, and they adhere wholly to such a life. And since they are like this and live like this, unpleasantness never is engendered in them, nor are they unpleasantly disposed toward one another. But one who thinks that our existence is in eating and drinking and playing dice or doing some such thing – again, he too chooses to spend time with such a friend, [that is], one who wishes to eat and drink and play dice. And, simply, whatever each person likes of the things here, he both thinks constitutes his existence and he chooses for the sake of this to spend the day together and live together with his friends. And it is possible every day to hear many people saying: 'my life is to eat such foods or to have this thing here or to practise or to do these things'. And on account of this they choose to live together and be together with those who welcome such lives and think that such a life is their essence, for example the amusing [life] or the money-making or the temperate and worthy one.

5

10

15

For if, as has been said, living together is choiceworthy, and living together is to live with someone who is such as oneself, and such too is a friend; and if [further] both people themselves and their loves [or: friendships] are such as the things on account of which they live together; <then if those things are good, both they themselves and their loves>¹¹⁶ are good, but if those things¹¹⁷ are base, both they themselves and their loves are base and unstable, both because the things on account of which they love each other are base, and because

20

the more they live together and assimilate themselves to one another, the more wicked they become.

But the love [or: friendship] of decent people is decent and firm, 'increasing together with their interactions' (1172a11): for since virtue increases together with the noblest interactions and activities, their love too increases together with them. It increases together with their interactions, because progress in all things naturally occurs by means of activities: on account of this, then, they [i.e., the friends] increase together [in their love], and on account of their correcting one another. 'For they glean from one another' (1172a12-13) and take to themselves one another's deeds and words 'by which they are satisfied' (1172a13) and for the sake of which they are friends. 'For good things', says the poem (Theognis v. 35), '[come] from good things' (1172a13-14). Thus too, from base things we shall reap and store up for ourselves base things.

Thus, then, has been completed [Book] Nine of the *Nicomachean Ethics* and the lectures on it.

This page intentionally left blank

Notes

1. By the phrase ‘from one and to one’, Aristotle identifies items that refer to one and the same notion, without being species of a common genus; the example that Aristotle gives in the *Magna Moralia* is a medical knife, a medical man (i.e., a doctor), and medical knowledge, which all refer to medicine but in categorically different ways. Aristotle uses the same example in *Metaphysics* 7.4, 1030a34-b2 and elsewhere. Scholars today sometimes call this type of common reference ‘focal meaning’; cf. G.E.L. Owen, *Logic, Science and Dialectic*, ed. Martha Nussbaum (London and Ithaca NY, 1986) 217: ‘an expression has *focal meaning*, that is to say that it has a primary sense by reference to which its other senses can be explained’. See also Enrico Berti, ‘Amicizia e “Focal Meaning”’, in Antonina Alberti and Robert W. Sharples (eds), *Aspasius: The Earliest Extant Commentary on Aristotle’s Ethics* (Berlin, 1999) 176-90.

2. Michael’s commentary is addressed to his son.

3. Or emend *ktēsasthai* to *ktēsesthai*, ‘will acquire’.

4. Reading *hêi* for Heylbut’s *ên*, which cannot be right; perhaps *hên*, ‘in respect to which’.

5. Lemmata marked by an asterisk are not distinguished in Heylbut’s text, but appear rather as part of the commentary. For the convenience of the reader I have sometimes marked them as lemmata.

6. For *to de ti* to Heylbut suggests (in app. crit.) *t’auto* or *touto de to*; perhaps *tode de ti*?

7. It is worth noting that Aristotle speaks only of a boyfriend (*erômenos*); it is Michael who introduces the feminine form *erômenê*.

8. The preferred reading in Aristotle’s text is *tauta*, ‘these things’, rather than *ta auta*, ‘the same things’.

9. The words in angled brackets are not in MS B, but appear in the Aldine edition; the words to be supplied do in fact occur at 465,13-14, according to MS B, but were evidently missing in the Aldine editor’s MS of Michael: hence, the comment here, which is evidently misplaced.

10. Reading *eis ho* <ho> *drasas* in place of Heylbut’s *eis ho drasas*.

11. Reading a raised stop rather than a comma (Heylbut) after *pepoiêken*.

12. Reading a full stop rather than a comma (Heylbut) after *diatêrein*.

13. There appears to be a lacuna here, not noted by Heylbut; the sense may have been: ‘<the one who received> should eagerly <confer it>’. The decision of the one who acted [i.e., gave first] <establishes the fair requital>.’

14. The words in angular brackets are missing in B, and are supplied from a.

15. Aristotle’s *proekhô*, which means ‘extend’ or ‘offer’, is analysed by Michael into *pro-*, ‘before’, and *ekhô*, ‘hold’.

16. Heylbut accidentally prints *zêtôi* for *zêtô*.

17. Reading *kurion* with B and a, rather than *kurios* with Heylbut.

18. Correcting the erratum *hupêrêtêton* in Heylbut to *hupêretêton*.

19. The received text of Aristotle has *mallon* before *ê*.

20. Reading full stop in place of Heylbut’s question mark.

21. Reading full stop in place of Heylbut's question mark.
22. cf. Plato *Euthydemus* 281B8-C4.
23. cf. 1.3, 1094b11-27; 1.7, 1098a26-33; 2.2, 1104a1-9.
24. Michael is mistaken; *kêdê* in Aristotle means 'funeral rites'.
25. Sardanapal(l)us was a legendary king of Assyria, renowned for his sybaritic way of life, cf. Diodorus Siculus 2.23.
26. The Paeanians are not a tribe (*phulê*) but a deme, one of the many villages with local institutions which formed part of Athens. There were also ten tribes in Athens at the time of Demosthenes, which again had their rites and cultic institutions; Paeania was part of the tribe Pandion. The Colyttes too were members of a deme, Collytus by name; this deme belonged to the tribe Argeis. A letter, ostensibly by Aeschines (5.6) but almost certainly a later composition passed off as his, reports that he had a house in Colyttus.
27. Reading *philia*, 'friendly', for Heylbut's *philian*, 'love', which does not construe.
28. Eliminating Heylbut's parentheses around *hosôi gar beltîon hê aretê* ['for by as much as virtue is better'] ... *kai analêpsin* ['and recovery'], which leaves the following clause dangling and destroys the parallel between the two reasons offered for correction in regard to virtue rather than money.
29. I have supplied 'not' (*ou*) before *doteon*, as the sense requires.
30. The text of Aristotle reads *tous pelas*, 'near ones', instead of *tous philous*, 'friends'.
31. The text of Aristotle has the singular, 'oneself'.
32. The image is derived from Plato's *Statesman* 273D6-E1, where the phrase, 'having been dissolved, it sinks into the sea of dissimilarity, which is infinite', refers to the possible disintegration of the world into its original state of chaos when it ceases to be guided by its divine pilot or governor.
33. These words are missing in the manuscripts but appear in the Aldine edition.
34. Inserting *hoper esti*, which will have slipped out by haplography.
35. Reading *diamenein* in place of Heylbut's *dianemein*, 'distribute', which seems inappropriate to the context.
36. The expressions 'individually qualified' (*idiôs poion*) and 'commonly qualified' are in fact technical terms of the Stoics, not the Peripatetics; cf. Von Arnim, *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* vol. 2, frs. 374, 395-400, 526, 590, 624; A.A. Long and D.N. Sedley, *The Hellenistic Philosophers* vol. 1 (Cambridge, 1987) 166-72 (translations of Stoic fragments) and 172-6 (discussion). Long and Sedley translate *idiôs poion* as 'peculiarly qualified'. Richard Sorabji writes (personal communication): 'I believe the misconception about Aristotle started because Porphyry put the Stoic view into his introduction to Aristotle, *Isagoge* 7,16-24, although he did not affirm, as his successors do, that it was Aristotle's own view.'
37. Heylbut inserts 'and the wishes', after the Aldine edition, but this is perhaps rather a gloss on 'motions'.
38. The difference between the two readings is the addition of the word 'not'.
39. The straits separating the island of Euboea from Boeotia, notorious for violent and shifting currents; cf. *NE* 9.6, 1167b7.
40. Inasmuch as sickness and blackness are states, rather than processes like healing and whitening, which is how Michael interprets 'affection' or 'a feeling of love' here; the argument has no basis in Aristotle's text.
41. Putting a raised stop after *ouk an eiê*; I suspect that the word *philêsis*, 'affection', has fallen out here.
42. Supplying *gar* after *to*.

43. i.e., one of the teams, identified by their colours, that competed in the Roman circuses.

44. The second figure of inference, in the Stoic classification of propositional inferences, is of the form: if A then B; but not B; therefore not A.

45. The corresponding passage in Aristotle reads 'it [i.e., good will] is a lazy love'; Michael or his source evidently read *arkhên*, 'principle', for *argên*, 'lazy', and then altered *philian*, 'love', to *philiās*, 'of love'.

46. The phrases in brackets are missing in the manuscript, but appear in the Aldine edition.

47. Heylbut notes a lacuna here. What dropped out will have been something like 'requites fairly in return for the things he has been treated to' (*anth' hôn peponthen anteupoiei*), the clause having been omitted by haplography.

48. So Heylbut's text, without comment; Aristotle's text reads *hairetas*, 'elective', rather than *aretas*, 'virtues'.

49. Reading *Lakedaimonious*; Heylbut (following Aristotle) emends to *Lakedaimoniois*, which gives 'to ally oneself with the Lacedaemonians'. This is easier to construe, but may not have been what Michael wrote.

50. I have inserted these words to account for the infinitive *boulesthai* (the Aldine reads *boulontai*, 'they wish'); the syntax of the Greek is loose here.

51. Michael employs the word *theôreomai*, an unusual middle form, in place of Aristotle's *theomai*, 'see'.

52. Inserted, perhaps unnecessarily, by Heylbut from the Aldine edition.

53. There is an anacolouthon or lack of syntactic coherence in the Greek.

54. I suspect that the word *mallon*, 'more', has dropped out before *ê*, and that the sentence should read: 'everyone naturally likes his own product more than one would be liked by one's own product if it became animate.'

55. Literally, one that is [such].

56. There appears to be a lacuna here (not indicated by Heylbut); the sense of the following words may have been: '... when we say that [someone is a human being actually rather than] potentially, because this person lives and is active or able to be active' (sc. ... *anthrôpon energeiâ mallon ê dunamei hotan legômen, hoti* etc.).

57. Michael presumably pointed at an image.

58. Inserting a comma after *telos ousan*.

59. Punctuating with a full stop, rather than Heylbut's raised stop.

60. Removing the full stop in Heylbut's text.

61. The words in brackets (printed without comment by Heylbut) interrupt the syntax, and are probably glosses that have intruded into the text.

62. I have bracketed what seem to me to be redundant phrases, which I presume to have entered the text through dittography.

63. The words in angle brackets are missing in the manuscripts, and supplied from the Aldine edition.

64. I expect that one should read <to> *tou zôgraphou <einai>*.

65. Reading *to tou euergetou einai* instead of *to tou euergetês einai*.

66. The text of Aristotle reads, 'for the sake of a friend'.

67. Understanding *hoti* as equivalent to *ho ti*, the relative pronoun, here used adjectivally with *ergon*.

68. 'Worthy' is the supplement of Heylbut; 'would appear' is my addition, but I suspect that the corruption in this sentence goes deeper.

69. Heylbut inserts *toioutos* from the Aldine edition.

70. The word is inserted by Heylbut.

71. Heylbut deletes this clause as a scribal repetition; within the clause,

'pertains above all' [*huparkhei malista*] occurs twice, and one of these occurrences (most plausibly, the first) must be deleted.

72. 'Dog' can denote the animal, and also a cynic philosopher.

73. Perhaps sc. *autên*, i.e., 'and its [appetite's] lording it', etc.

74. The conjunction should probably be inserted in the Greek text.

75. Heylbut notes a lacuna here, which I have filled in *exempli gratia*.

76. Cf. *De anima* 2, 412a27-8; 413a3-6.

77. Supplied by the Aldine edition.

78. Heylbut inserts (from the Aldine edition) *therapeuei*, 'he ministers to', which will then govern 'the irrational life ...' as object; but a finite verb is not needed here.

79. Plato (*Gorgias* 493A6) compares a person with insatiable desires to a perforated jug which can never be filled.

80. Punctuating with a full stop after *logizomenois*; in Heylbut, the sentence continues until 'it is the same way'.

81. Punctuating with a full stop after *estin*, rather than a comma.

82. Punctuating with a full stop, rather than a comma with Heylbut.

83. Reading *kreitton* with B, rather than *kreittô*, 'better things', with the Aldine and Heylbut.

84. Heylbut encloses this and the next sentence in parentheses.

85. Reading ... *ho eudaimôn, tòi <de> energein <ou> hôste*

86. This cumbersome expression (*ho spoudaios philos allos autos estin ho philomenos*) is apparently Michael's expansion of Aristotle's 'another same' or 'another himself' (*allos autos*); see also 515.12, below, the variation *allos ho philôn* in 515.16, and 516.29-32.

87. Reading *spoudaiôs* with MS B, rather than *spoudaious*, 'worthy people', with the Aldine and Heylbut.

88. Reading *legô*, instead of *legôn* with Heylbut.

89. Reading *energeiai*; Heylbut's text has *energeia* (singular), evidently a misprint.

90. The words in brackets are supplied by Heylbut in his apparatus criticus; Heylbut signals a crux in the text.

91. Inserted by Heylbut from the Aldine edition, perhaps unnecessarily.

92. Inserted by Heylbut from the Aldine edition; the MS B indicates a lacuna.

93. See 511.21-2 with n. 74; Michael here abbreviates the formula to *esti de ho philos allos ho philomenos*.

94. Michael has *philôn* here instead of *philoumenos*, as above.

95. Perhaps some phrase such as *hoper elegen* has fallen out here.

96. For the formula, see n. 86.

97. In Aristotle *prosektikos* occurs only in the Rhetoric (five times). Richard Sorabji informs me in a personal communication that its use in the present context is a Neoplatonist import, ascribed to recent interpreters by pseudo-Philoponus in his commentary on *De anima* 464.20-465.31.

97a. Bywater emends Aristotle's text in the OCT to read: 'if we are perceiving, that we are perceiving, and if we think, that we think.'

98. Punctuating with a raised stop after *estin*, and deleting the comma after *zêi*.

99. Or 'because', the likelier sense in Aristotle's text.

100. Added by Heylbut from the Aldine addition.

101. The words 'noble and' are not in the text of Aristotle.

102. Aristotle's text has *to ton philon*, 'that a friend exist'.

103. Reading *allêlôn* with MS B, instead of *allêlois*, 'to one another', with Heylbut and the Aldine edition.

104. These words are missing in MS B, and are taken from the Aldine edition.

105. There is a deep corruption (not marked by Heylbut) in the text, which is unintelligible. In translating, I have substituted *to lupoun* for *to philoun* and deleted *sunalgein*.

106. Punctuating with a full stop after *lelupêmenon*; the particle *de* following *kouphezai* in the next clause indicates that it is not the apodosis of the conditional introduced by *epei*.

107. cf. *Philebus* 31B; *Phaedo* 60B.

108. I expect that the word *aitias*, 'cause', is an error for *lupês*, 'grief'; in majuscules, lambda is easily confused with alpha, as tau + iota are with pi, but the reason may simply be the accidental influence of *aitios*, 'responsible'.

109. The majority of modern commentators render the term *alupia* in Aristotle's text as 'insensibility to pain'. René Antoine Gauthier and Jean Yves Jolif, *L'Ethique à Nicomaque* vol. 2 (Louvain, 1970) 765-6, note that *alupia* nowhere else in Greek has this sense, and prefer to emend (following Apelt) to *atukhia*, 'misfortune'. They claim further that Heylbut's text of Michael's commentary at this point is 'scarcely intelligible', and propose the emendation, *tên sphodrotatên kai epitetamenên lupên*, *oukh hupomenêi* ..., which yields: 'unless they exceed in *alupia* (he means by *alupia* a most vehement and intense pain), he does not endure it'. This reverses the sense of the term *alupia*, and is a desperate remedy. Michael's text is indeed confused, but should probably stand as it is.

110. Reading *autôi*, as the reading of MS B (*autô*) suggests, rather than *autou* (a misprint?) with Heylbut; the Aldine edition has *auton*.

111. Michael omits the word *hêdeian* in Aristotle's text, which may be rendered: 'involves a pleasing way of life', or 'a pleasing expense of time'.

112. Fragment *76 in Richard Kannicht and Bruno Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1981).

113. These words are missing in MS B, and are supplied from the Aldine edition.

114. The particle *ara* with a circumflex accent on the first *a* is interrogative; with an accute accent it is (among other things) emphatic.

115. Punctuating with a full stop after *diagei*.

116. There is clearly a lacuna in the text, not indicated by Heylbut; the inserted words are my suggestion of how it may be filled.

117. Emending Heylbut's *phaulai* (fem.), sc. 'loves', which is redundant in the context, to *phaula* (neut.).

This page intentionally left blank

English-Greek Glossary

ability: *dunamis*
absence: *apousia*
account for: *hupologizomai*
accuse: *katégoreō*
acquaintance: *sunêtheia*
acting well: *eupraxia*
action, act: *praxis*
active (be): *energeō*
activity: *energeia*
actuality: *entelekheia*
actually: *energeiai*
advantage: *periousia, ôpheleia*
affection: *philêsis*
affection (feel), like: *agapaō*
agreement: *sumphônia*
agreement (in): *sumphônos*
ambiguity: *amphibolia*
analogous (be): *analogeō*
animate: *empsychos*
appearance: *phantasia*
appropriate: *idiopoieomai*
argument: *logos*
aristocracy (live in an):
 aristokrateomai
art: *tekhnê*
assimilate oneself: *exomoioomai*
association: *koinônia*
attentive: *prosektikos*
authoritative: *kurios*
aware (be): *ennoeō*
awareness: *ennoia*

base, bad: *phaulos*
baseness: *phaulotês*
beautiful: *kalos*
beauty: *eidōs, kallos*
believe: *pisteuō*
benefaction: *euergesia*
benefactor: *euergetês*
beneficial: *ôphelimos*
benefit (v.): *ôpheleō*
benefit (n.): *ôpheleia*
bodily: *sômatikos*

body: *sôma*
boyfriend: *erômenos*
by one's very nature: *autophuôs*
by-perceive: *epaisthanomai*

causative: *aitios*
cause (reason): *aition*
change (v.): *metaballō*
change (n.): *metabolê*
character: *êthê, êthos*
character (like in): *sunêthês*
cherish: *stergō*
choiceworthy: *hairetos*
choose: *haireomai, proaireomai*
citizen: *politês*
civic: *politikos*
co-perception: *sunaisthêsis*
co-think: *sunnoeō*
co-understand: *sunepinoeō*
cognizant: *gnôstikos*
coin: *nomisma*
comfort: *eupatheia*
commercial: *agoraios*
common: *koinos*
commonality: *koinônia*
company: *homilia*
compensation: *kharis*
complete: *teleios*
composition: *sustasis*
comrade: *hetairos*
conception: *sullêpsis*
concord: *homonoia*
confirmation: *pistis*
consensus: *homodoxia*
consist: *sunistamai*
contemplation: *theôria*
contemplative: *theôrêtikos*
contestant: *agônistês*
conversion: *antistrophê*
convert, be convertible: *antistrephô*
correct (v.): *epanorthōō*
correction: *epanorthôsis*
corrupting: *kakôtikos*

courage: *andreia*
 courtesan: *hetaira*
 crave: *epithumeô*
 creator: *demiourgos*
 custom: *ethos*

dear: *philos*
 debate: *zêteô*
 debt: *ophlêma*
 decent: *epieikês*
 decision: *proairesis*
 deed: *ergon*
 define: *horizô*
 definite: *hôrizmenos*
 definition: *horismos*
 deliberate: *bouleuomai*
 deliberation: *boulê*
 deliberative: *bouleutikos*
 democracy (live in a): *dêmokrateomai*
 deserving: *axios*
 desire: *epithumia*
 desire (v.): *oregomai*
 desire (n.): *orexis*
 determination: *diakrisis*
 diction: *lexis*
 disadvantageous: *asumpheron*
 discriminate: *diakrinô*
 dissimilar: *anomoios*
 dissimilar in kind: *anomoeidês*
 dissimilarity: *anomoiotês*
 distributive: *dianemêtikos*
 divide: *diaireô*
 division: *diairesis*

education: *paideia*
 effect: *energeô*
 effectively: *dunamei*
 eliminative: *anairesetikos*
 emotion: *pathos*
 emotional way (in an): *empathôs*
 end: *telos*
 enjoy: *hêdomai, khairô*
 equal: *isos*
 equal (be), equalize: *isazô*
 equal in strength: *isosthenês*
 equality: *isotês*
 equitable: *axios*
 equivocal: *homônumos*
 erotic: *erôtikos*
 err: *hamartanô*
 error: *hamartia*
 essence: *ousia*

essential: *ousiôdês, sunektikos*
 ethics: *êthika*
 evidence: *tekmêrion*
 evil (adj.): *kakos, ponêros*
 evil-loving: *philoponêros*
 example: *paradeigma*
 excess: *hyperbolê, hyperokhê*
 exchange (n.): *antallagê, enallagê*
 exchange (v.): *antallattomai*
 experience (n.): *empeiria, pathos*
 explain: *apodidômi*
 extension: *ektasis*

fair requital: *anteupoiia*
 fairness: *epieikeia*
 faring well: *eupragia*
 favour (do a): *kharizomai*
 final: *telikos*
 fine (adj.): *kalos, khrestos*
 flourish: *eudaimoneô*
 flourishing: *eudaimôn, makarios*
 force: *dunamis*
 form: *eidos, idea*
 formal: *eidikos*
 fortune: *daimôn, tukhê*
 frankness: *parrhêsia*
 free of pain: *alupos*
 freedom from pain: *alupia*
 friend: *philos*
 friendship: *philia*

genus: *genos*
 girlfriend: *erômenê*
 glimmer: *ellampsis*
 good: *agathos*
 good (do): *agathoergeô*
 good fortune: *eutukhia*
 good treatment: *eupoiia*
 good will (having): *eunous*
 good will: *eunoia*
 goodness: *agathotês*
 gratitude: *kharis*
 grief (cause): *lupeô*
 grieve: *lupeomai*
 grieve together with: *sullupeomai*
 guest: *xenos*

habit: *ethos*
 habitual condition: *hexis*
 happy: *eudaimôn*
 harmonious: *enarmonios*
 having many friends: *poluphilia*

homonymy: *homônumia*
 honour (v.): *timaô*
 honour (n.): *timê*
 honourable: *kosmios*
 hospitality: *xenia*
 human: *anthrôpeios, anthrôpikos*
 human being: *anthrôpos*
 hypothesis: *hupothesis*

idea: *dianoêma, dianoia*
 idle: *argos*
 ignorance: *agnoia*
 ill-starred: *kakodaimonês*
 ill-starred (be): *kakodaimoneô*
 illiberal: *aneleutheros*
 immoderate: *ametros*
 impulse: *hormê*
 incorrigible: *aniatos*
 indicate: *sêmainô*
 individual: *atomos, idios*
 inference: *sunagôgê*
 ingratiating: *areskos*
 inquiry: *zêtêma*
 insensible: *anaisthêtos*
 inseparable: *akhôristos*
 intellect: *dianoia*
 intellective: *dianoêtikos*
 intellectual: *noeros*
 intend: *ennoeô*
 investigation: *zêtêsis*
 involuntary: *akousios*
 irrational: *alogos*
 irrationality: *alogia*

joy: *khara*
 just: *dikaïos*
 justness: *dikaïosunê*

kindred: *homogenês*
 kingdom (live in a): *basileuomai*
 knowledge: *epistêmê, gnôsis*

lack: *endeia*
 law: *nomos*
 lawfulness: *nomimotês*
 lecture: *skholê*
 leisure: *skholê*
 licentious: *akolastos*
 life (way of), livelihood: *bios*
 light: *phôs*
 like (adj.): *homoios*
 like opinion (be of): *homodoxeô*

likeminded (to be): *homognômoneô*
 live: *bioô, zô*
 live together: *suzô*
 living well: *euzôia*
 look to, observe: *theôreô*
 lovable: *philêtos*
 love (v.): *phileô*
 love (n.): *philia, philotês*
 love in return: *antiphileô*
 love passionately: *eraô*
 lover: *erastês*
 loving: *philikos*

mad for fame: *doxomanês*
 many-friended: *poluphilos*
 many-guested: *poluxeinos*
 material (adj.): *hulikos*
 mean (n.): *mesotês*
 measure (v.): *metreô*
 measure (n.): *metron*
 middle: *mesos*
 mind: *nous*
 misery: *kakôsis*
 misfortune: *atukhia*
 money: *argurion, khrêmata*
 money-loving: *philokhrêmatos*
 motion: *kinêma, kinêsis*
 move (v.): *kineô*

natural: *phusikos*
 naturally: *pephuka*
 nature: *physis*
 nature (be of a): *pephuka*
 nature (by one's very): *autophuôs*
 necessary: *anankaïos*
 necessity: *anankê*
 need: *khreia*
 negation: *antithesis*
 number: *arithmos*

oblivion: *lêthê*
 observe: *theôreô*
 occasion: *kairos*
 office: *arkhê*
 oligarchy (live in an): *oligarkheomai*
 opinion: *dogma, doxa*
 opinion (hold an): *doxazô*
 oppose: *enantioomai*
 opposite: *enantios*
 order (v.): *kosmeô*
 order (n.): *taxis*
 own: *oikeios*

pained (be): *lupeomai*
 painful (be): *lupeô*
 paradoxical: *paradoxos*
 part: *meros*
 particular: *merikos*
 particular property: *idiotês*
 partition: *merizô*
 partner: *koinônos*
 passionate (be), love passionately: *eraô*
 passionate love: *erôs*
 pay back: *apodidômi*
 perceive: *aisthanomai*
 perceptible: *aisthêtos*
 place: *topos*
 plausible: *pistos*
 please: *hêdô*
 pleasing: *hêdus*
 pleasure: *hêdonê*
 plot: *hupothesis*
 potentially: *dunamei*
 power: *dunamis*
 predicate: *katêgoreô*
 presence: *parousia*
 preservation: *sôtêria*
 preserve: *sôzô*
 prime of life: *akmê*
 principle: *arkhê*
 product: *ergon*
 productive: *energos*
 profit (v.): *kerdainô*
 profit (n.): *kerdos*
 property: *ousia*
 proportion: *analogia*
 proportional: *analogos*
 proportionality: *to analogon*
 proposition: *logos*
 prosper: *eutukheô*
 prospering: *eudaimonia*
 prosperous: *eudaimôn, eutukhês*
 prudence: *phronêsis*
 purging: *katharsis*
 puzzle: *aporia*

quantity: *poson*
 question (raise a): *aporeô*

rational: *logikos*
 reason (v.): *logizomai*
 reason (cause) (n.): *aitia*
 reasonable: *logistikos*
 recognize: *gnôrizô*
 recollection: *mnêmê*

relative (n.): *sungenês*
 relevant: *oikeios*
 repayment: *antidosis*
 reputation: *doxa*
 reverence: *aidôs*
 right: *themis*

salvation: *sôtêria*
 science: *epistêmê*
 seek, investigate: *zêteô*
 self-control (without): *akratês*
 self-controlled: *enkratês*
 self-hate: *misautia*
 self-love: *philautia*
 self-loving: *philautos*
 self-moved: *autokinêtos*
 self-sameness: *to ti ên einai*
 self-sufficient: *autarkês*
 sensation: *aisthêsis*
 sense (n.): *dianoia*
 sex: *ta aphrodisia*
 shame: *aiskhunê*
 shameful: *aiskhros*
 share: *koinônêô*
 sign: *sêmeion*
 signify: *sêmaino*
 similar: *homoios*
 similar in kind: *homoeidês*
 sophistical: *sophistikos*
 soul: *psukhê*
 species: *eidos*
 speech: *logos*
 spending time together: *sundiagôgê*
 standard: *kanôn*
 substratum: *hupokeimenon*
 suffer together: *sunkakopatheô*
 suffer together with: *sumpentheô, sunalgeô*
 supposition: *hupolêpsis*
 surplus: *periousia*
 syllogism: *sullogismos*
 sympathy: *sumpatheia*

temper: *thumos*
 temperate: *sôphrôn*
 tension: *diatasis*
 text: *lexis*
 think: *noeô*
 think right, worth while: *axioô*
 thought: *noêma, noêsis*
 timocratic (be): *timokrateomai*
 true: *alêthês*

trust, believe: *pisteuô*
 truth: *alêtheia*
 tyranny (live in a): *turanneomai*

unawares (do something): *lanthanô*
 unconcern: *ameleia*
 unconscious(ly): *anennoêtos*
 undergoing: *pathêsis*
 understand: *epinoeô, phroneô*
 understanding, contemplation: *theôria*
 unfortunate (be): *atukheô*
 unfriendly, friendless: *aphilos*
 ungrateful: *akharistos*
 unharmonious: *anarmostos*
 unit: *monas*
 unjust: *adikos*
 unknown: *agnôs*
 unlawful: *athesmos*
 unlovable: *aphilêtos*
 unpleasantness: *aêdia*
 unreasonable: *paralogos*
 unsuitable: *aprepês*
 use, usefulness: *khêsis*

value: *timê*
 vice: *kakia*
 viciousness: *kakourgia*
 virtue: *aretê*
 voluntary: *hekousios*

wicked: *mokhthêros*

wickedness: *mokhthêria, ponêria*
 wisdom: *sophia*
 wise: *sophos*
 wish (v.): *boulomai*
 wish (n.): *boulêma, boulêsis, thelêma*
 without a notion: *anennoêtos*
 word: *logos, lexis*
 work: *ergon*
 world: *kosmos*
 worth (n.): *axiôma*
 worth (adj.): *axios*
 worthy: *spoudaios*
 wrong (v.): *adikeô*

Greek-English Index

- adikeô*, wrong, 471,12
adikos, unjust, 491,14
aêdia, unpleasantness, 484,21
agapaô, feel affection, like, 475,6
agathoergeô, do good, 480,19
agathos, good, 461,18
agathotês, goodness, 519,18
agnoia, ignorance, 484,3
agnôs, unknown, 486,12
agônistês, contestant, 487,25
agoraios, commercial, 461,22
aidôs, reverence, 474,13
aiskhros, shameful, 484,19
aiskhunê, shame, 472,37
aisthanomai, perceive, 486,26
aisthêsis, sensation, sense, 483,2;
 483,5
aisthêtos, perceptible, 524,6
aitia, reason, cause, 483,21
aition, cause, 492,35
aitios, causative, responsible, 471,28;
 472,28
akharistos, ungrateful, 492,15
akhôristos, inseparable, 503,24
akmê, prime of life, 464,18
akolastos, licentious, 503,28
akousios, involuntary, 469,5
akratês, without self-control, 479,21
alêtheia, truth, 472,16
alêthês, true, 474,6
alogia, irrationality, 503,13
alogos, irrational, 470,27
alupia, freedom from pain, 525,13
alupos, free of pain, 525,5
ameleia, unconcern, 492,24
ametros, immoderate, 480,16
amphibolia, ambiguity, 467,3
anairetikos, eliminative, 525,4
anaisthêtos, insensible, 517,4
analogeô, be analogous, 495,22
analogia, proportion, 462,27
analogon (to), proportionality, 462,12
analogos, proportional, analogous,
 463,2
anankaios, necessary, 468,10
anankê, necessity, 461,7
anarmostos, unharmonious, 513,12
andreia, courage, 479,33
aneleutheros, illiberal, 465,19
anendeês, in need of nothing, 508,15
anennoêtos, unconscious(ly), without
 a notion, 468,8; 517,20
aniatos, incorrigible, 476,27
anomoeidês, dissimilar in kind,
 462,12
anomoios, dissimilar, 462,5
anomoiotês, dissimilarity, 480,17
antallagê, exchange, 463,28
antallattomai, exchange, 463,29
anteupoia, fair requital, 465,27
anthrôpeios, human, 481,12
anthrôpikos, human, 492,19
anthrôpos, human being, 461,18
antidosis, repayment, 467,31
antiphileô, love in return, 463,33
antistrophô, be convertible, convert,
 483,35; 518,8-9
antistrophê, conversion, 502,8
antithesis, negation, 502,8
aphilêtos, unlovable, 497,29
aphilos, unfriendly, friendless, 474,29
aphrodisia (ta), sex, 484,36
apodidômi, pay back, explain, 471,26
aporeô, raise a question, 474,33
aporia, puzzle, 469,34
apousia, absence, 499,4
aprepês, unsuitable, 473,32
areskos, ingratiating, 523,3
aretê, virtue, 462,2
argos, idle, 511,1
argurion, money, 466,27
aristokrateomai, live in an
 aristocracy, 504,13
arithmos, number, 462,17

arkhê, principle (source), 486,7;
office, 490,14
asumpheron, disadvantageous, 471,2
athesmos, unlawful, 475,18
atomos, individual, 481,29
atukheô, be unfortunate, 509,11
atukhia, misfortune, 509,14
autarkês, self-sufficient, 508,15
autokinêtos, self-moved, 511,29
autophuôs, by one's very nature,
493,18
axia, worth, value, 465,13; 467,34
axiôma, worth, 472,17
axioô, think right, worth while,
462,20; 485,12
axios, worth, equitable, 463,9; 468,29;
deserving, 491,18

basileuomai, live in a kingdom,
504,11
bioô, live, 491,4
bios, way of life, life, 474,14; 480,28;
livelihood, 520,10
boulê, deliberation, 486,28
boulêma, wish, 491,10
boulêsis, willing, wish, 486,22; 502,13
bouleuomai, deliberate, 514,20
bouleutikos, deliberative, 514,21
boulomai, wish, want, 465,30; 479,7

daimôn, fortune, 508,21
dêmiourgos, creator, 506,32
dêmostrateomai, live in a democracy,
504,12
diairesis, division, 467,3
diaireô, divide, 482,24
diakrinô, discriminate, 516,27
diakrisis, determination, 496,22
dianemêtikos, distributive, 461,4
dianoêma, idea, 519,23
dianoêtikos, intellective, 514,38
dianoia, sense, intellect, 468,27;
477,8-9; idea, 519,20
diatasis, tension, 486,22
dikaïos, just, 461,20
dikaïosunê, justness, 461,3
dogma, opinion, 522,12
doxa, opinion, reputation, 492,22;
521,28
doxazô, hold an opinion, 490,6
doxomanês, mad for fame, 466,36-7

dunamei, potentially, effectively,
482,24; 497,7
dunamis, power, force, ability,
462,17; 511,32; 514,9

eidikos, formal, 488,5
eidos, species, beauty, 461,15; 464,5;
form, 488,9
ektasis, extension, 487,4
ellampsis, glimmer, 506,4
empathôs, in an emotional way,
481,4-5
empeiria, technique, experience,
467,2; 468,3
empasukhos, animate, 493,28
enallagê, exchange, 463,2
enantioomai, oppose, 479,24
enantios, opposite, 475,161-7
enarmonios, harmonious, 513,11
endeia, lack, 462,31
energeia, activity, 474,15
energeiai, actually, 493,35
energeô, be active, effect, 480,8;
480,20
energus, productive, 512,6
enkratês, self-controlled, 504,17
ennoeô, intend, be aware, 490,25;
525,31
ennoia, awareness, 525,31
entelekheia, actuality, 503,24
epaisthanomai, by-perceive, 517,24
epanorthoô, correct, 476,21
epanorthôsis, correction, 476,22
epieikeia, fairness, 472,13
epieikês, decent, 469,21
epinoeô, understand, 496,23
epistêmê, knowledge, science, 481,34;
491,2-3
epithumeô, crave, 476,11
epithumia, desire, appetite, 472,21-2;
482,26
eraô, be passionate for, 464,24; love
passionately, 488,1
erastês, lover, 463,5
ergon, product, work, deed, fact,
463,8; 466,21; 475,21; 501,4
erômenê, girlfriend, 461,21
erômenos, boyfriend, 461,21
erôs, passionate love, 488,6
erôtikos, erotic, 463,30
êthê, character, 464,29
êthika, ethics, 528,31

ethos, custom, habit, 490,10; 513,21

êthos, character, 474,14

eudaimôn, prosperous, flourishing,
happy, 508,10

eudaimoneô, flourish, 509,11

eudaimonia, prospering, 510,13

euergesia, benefaction, 464,36

euergetês, benefactor, 470,27

eunoia, good will, 486,4

eunous, having good will, 486,14

eupatheia, comfort, 478,4

euphuês, naturally fine, clever, 475,9;
524,28

eupoia, good treatment, 466,24

eupragia, faring well, 489,17

eupraxia, acting well, 511,10

eutukheô, prosper, 478,6

eutuchês, prosperous, 496,10

eutukhia, good fortune, 509,14

euzôia, living well, 511,10

exomoioomai, assimilate oneself,
476,14

genos, genus, 461,12

gnôrizô, recognize, be acquainted
with, 463,11; 486,18-19; make
known, discover, 474,1; 509,21

gnôsis, knowledge, 487,14

gnôstikos, cognizant, 514,17

haireomai, choose, get, prefer,
468,14; 468,35; 507,7

hairetos, choiceworthy, 483,11;
elective, [490,14]

hamartanô, err, mistake, 483,33;
505,28

hamartia, error, 470,8

hêdô, please, 474,36

hêdomai, be pleased, enjoy, 463,4;
506,33

hêdonê, pleasure, 465,5

hêdus, pleasing, 461,18

hekousios, voluntary, 469,3

hetaira, courtesan, 468,17

hetairos, comrade, 470,28

hexis, habitual condition, 506,35

homilia, company, intercourse,
interaction, 468,18; 499,7; 528,23

homodoxeô, be of like opinion, 490,4

homodoxia, consensus, 489,29

homogenês, of like kind, kindred,
462,29; 474,15

homognômoneô, to be likeminded,
concur, 485,16; 502,28

homoeidês, similar in kind, 462,15

homoios, similar, like, 462,4; 476,16

homonoia, concord, 489,29

homônumia, homonymy, 467,3

homônunos, equivocal, 503,9

horismos, definition, 514,16

hôrizmenos, definite, 473,3

horizô, define, 465,18

hormê, impulse, 486,23

hulikos, material (adj.), 488,5

hyperbolê, excess, 466,32

hyperokhê, excess, 497,30

hupokeimenon, substratum, 498,9

hupolêpsis, supposition, 505,28

hupologizomai, account for, 496,34

hupothesis, plot, hypothesis, 490,23;
502,7

idea, form, 488,8

idiopoieomai, appropriate, 491,21

idios, individual, 493,22

idiotês, particular property, 481,28

isazô, equalize, be equal, 462,13;
463,24

isos, equal, 461,4

isosthenês, equal in strength, 524,4

isotês, equality, 461,6

kairos, time, occasion, 471,7; 523,23

kakia, vice, 472,8

kakodaimoneô, be ill-starred, 509,12

kakodaimonês, ill-starred, 512,21

kakos, evil, 474,24

kakôsis, misery, 516,18

kakôtikos, corrupting, 505,19

kakourgia, viciousness, 472,19-20

kallos, beauty, 464,18

kalos, beautiful, noble, fine, 464,26;
467,13; 473,24

kanôn, standard, 479,28

katêgoreô, predicate 461,12; accuse,
515,10

katharsis, purging, 494,38

kerdainô, profit, 468,23

kerdos, profit, 465,6

khairô, enjoy, rejoice, 477,10; 478,6

khara, joy, 468,18

kharis, compensation, gratitude,
470,29; 492,8

kharizomai, (do a) favour, 471,17

khreia, need, 471,8
khremata, money, 464,5
khresis, use, usefulness, 489,20; 520,7
khrestos, fine, 472,9
kinema, motion, 482,21
kineô, move, 492,27
kinêsis, motion, 487,7
koinônêô, share, 467,22
koinônia, association, commonality, 463,2; 527,25
koinônos, partner, 474,9
koinos, common, 463,6
kosmeô, comport, put in order, 474,1-2; 492,26; order, 506,24
kosmios, honourable, 473,33
kosmos, world, 473,36-474,1
kurios, empowered, authoritative, 469,14; 503,35; supreme, 514,23
lanthanô, do something unawares, 526,18
lêthê, oblivion, 485,6
lexis, text, diction, 461,11; 467,4; wording, word, 488,15; 480,27
logikos, rational, 482,18
logistikos, reasonable, 480,10
logizomai, reason, 474,10-11
logos, argument, ratio, 462,10; 462,28; word, reason, 465,1; 479,11; speech, proposition, 493,21; 500,18; account, 509,28
lupeô, cause grief, be painful, 472,29; 514,14
lupeomai, grieve, be pained, 472,23; 513,12
makarios, flourishing, 508,16
merikos, particular, 461,12-13
merizô, partition, 522,17
meros, part, 461,16
mesos, middle, 463,20
mesotês, mean, 506,36
metaballô, change, 479,35
metabolê, change, 481,11
metreô, measure, moderate, 466,30-1; 492,26
metron, measure, 463,6
misautia, self-hate, 502,11
mnêmê, recollection, memorial, 481,35; 507,23
mokhthêria, wickedness, 476,27
mokhthêros, wicked, 472,6

monas, unit, 463,27
noêma, thought, 519,20
noeros, intellectual, 480,25
noeô, think, understand, 481,25; 496,21
noêsis, thought, 514,30
nomimotês, lawfulness, 461,4
nomisma, coin, money, 463,6; 496,9
nomos, law, 469,3
nous, mind, 480,31
oikeios, relevant, own, 462,10; 463,28; appropriate, related, 474,10; 476,26; characteristic, 492,23
oligarkheomai, live in an oligarchy, 504,12
ôpheleia, dividend, benefit, 465,22; 466,15; advantage, 526,32
ôpheleô, benefit, 463,33
ôphelimos, beneficial, 491,13
ophlêma, debt, 465,29
oregomai, desire, 464,33
orexis, desire, 485,33
ousia, property, essence, 476,25; 480,10
ousiôdês, essential, 514,16
paideia, education, 474,4
paradeigma, example, 473,17
paradoxos, paradoxical, 491,33
paralogos, unreasonable, 500,5
parousia, presence, 488,11
parrhêsia, frankness, 474,5
pathêsis, undergoing, 498,5
pathos, emotion, experience, 462,3; 496,1
pephuka, be of a nature, naturally, 478,36; 511,15
periousia, advantage, surplus, 500,27; 520,11
phantasia, appearance, 483,9
phaulos, base, bad, 462,30; 512,8
phaulotês, baseness, 476,18
philautia, self-love, 500,8
philautos, self-loving, 500,4
phileô, love, 461,8
philêsis, affection, 486,21
philêtos, lovable, 461,17
philia, love, friendship, 461,3; 519,26

philikos, loving, of friends, 477,30;
520,26
philokhrêmatos, money-loving,
466,37
philoponêros, evil-loving, 476,14
philos, friend, 461,7
philos, dear, 478,34-5
philotês, love, 462,21
phôs, light, 481,33
phroneô, understand, think, 480,12;
513,29
phronêsis, prudence, 483,11
phusikos, natural, 491,3
phusis, nature, 480,11
pisteuô, trust, be confident, 469,14;
477,36; believe, 512,20
pistis, confirmation, 506,13
pistos, plausible, 503,2
politês, citizen, 506,29
politikos, civic, citizen, 463,1; 521,7
poluphilia, having many friends,
519,34
poluphilos, many-friended, 519,33;
friends to many, 522,29
poluxeinos, many-guested, 519,25
ponêria, wickedness, 477,27
ponêros, evil, 472,15
poson, quantity, 462,27
praxis, action, act, 462,3; 475,18
proaireomai, choose, 490,10
proairesis, decision, 467,21
prosektikos, attentive, 517,15
psukhê, soul, 479,4

sêmainô, indicate, signify, 484,6;
503,8
sêmeion, sign, 475,25
skholê, lecture, leisure, 467,6; 509,19
sôma, body, 473,13
sômatikos, bodily, 503,15
sophia, wisdom, 483,11
sophistikos, sophistical, 467,4
sophos, wise, 461,19
sôphrôn, temperate, 461,19
sôtêria, preservation, salvation,
478,4; 500,33
sôzô, preserve, 461,8
spoudaios, worthy, 462,6
stergô, like, cherish, 469,13; 474,30
sullêpsis, conception, 499,8
sullogismos, syllogism, 487,34

sullupeomai, grieve together with,
482,11
sumpatheia, sympathy, 481,36
sumpentheô, suffer together with,
525,6
sumpherô, be advantageous, 471,1
sumpheron, to, advantage, 501,3
sumphilosophêô, philosophize
together, 474,4-5
sumphônia, agreement, 482,22
sumphônos, in agreement, 470,32
sunagôgê, inference, 500,21-2
sunaisthêsis, co-perception, 519,17
sunalgeô, suffer with, 478,28

sundiagôgê, spending time together,
489,2
sunektikos, essential, 495,25
sunepinoeô, co-understand, 517,21
sunêtheia, acquaintance, 477,21
sunêthês, like in character, 489,1
sungenês, relative, 473,18
sunistamai, consist, 481,28-9
sunkakopatheô, suffer together,
488,26
sunnoeô, co-think, 517,24
sustasis, composition, 481,27
suzô, live together, live with, 476,15;
509,20

taxis, order, position, 474,1; 480,12
tekhnhê, art, 493,36
tekmêrion, evidence, 502,4
teleios, complete, 486,31
telikos, final, 488,5
telos, end, 461,23
thelêma, wish, 482,21
themis, right, 472,8
theôreô, look to, observe, 462,23;
491,5
theôrêtikos, contemplative, 518,16
theôria, understanding, 481,2;
contemplation, 481,37
thumos, temper, 482,26
timaô, honour, assess, 461,8
timê, honour, value, 467,24; 468,39
timokrateomai, be timocratic, 507,25
topos, place, 519,22
to ti ên einai, self-sameness, 481,11
tukhê, fortune, 470,7
turanneomai, live in a tyranny,
504,14

xenia, hospitality, 519,25

xenos, guest, 519,30

zêtêma, inquiry, 466,1-2

zêteô, seek, investigate, 464,39;
465,27; inquire, debate, 470,29;
508,12

zêtêsis, investigation, 492,24-5

zô, live, 470,19

Index of Names

- Achilles, 478,1. 2.17.19bis; 522,28
Aeschines, 474,17-18
Alexander [the Great], 464,33.35;
498,17
Antisthenes,
471,20.21-2.22.24.26.27.31
Ares, 488,28
Aristotle, 461,14; 465,3; 467,5; 470,8;
483,6; 486,15; 487,39; 489,10;
490,24; 493,8; 496,36; 498,18-19;
506,5.12-13; 508,27-8; 515,30;
526,10
Basil the Great, 462,19.20; 479,6
Darius, 486,16.17bis.18
Demosthenes, 474,17
Dionysus, 488,29
Epicharmus, 492,13.15
Eteocles, 490,30.31
Euripides, 490,22; 508.22
Euripus, 484,22-3
Gregory [of Nazianzus], [462,19]; 479,5
Hesiod, 466,19
Hippocrates, 523,37; 524,20
Lysias, 475,8.9
Menelaus, 508,23
Orestes, 508,22bis; 522,29
Patroclus, 478,1.2-3.18bis.19; 522,28
Phaedrus, 475,8.10bis.11
Pirithous, 522,29
Pittacus, 490,17bis.18.19.20
Plato, 483,3; 504,21bis; 515,30; 524,17
Polemarchus, 471,20.21.23bis.32
Polyneices, 490,30.31
Protagoras, 466,7.8,12.13
Pylades, 522,28
Sardanapalus, 474,3; 480,33; 481,9
Socrates, 493,13bis.14.15;
494,8bis.9.10; 504,20bis; 522,1.2.4
Theseus, 522,29
Xerxes, 490,1
Zeus, 473,6.9

Subject Index

This index refers to the whole volume and references are to the pages of this book. It lists passages where a point is discussed rather than passing references; where a topic is identified in only one of the commentators on Book 8 or Book 9, the reader may wish to consult the parallel discussion in the other commentator. It is advisable to follow up cross-references in the index, since they may contain references to additional passages and provide additional sub-headings.

- absence, effect of on love, 26-7, 69
- acquaintance, and the feeling of love, 98-9, 165; needed for love or friendship, 23-4, 66, 83
- action and emotion, 147-7
- activity, and love, 26, 28, 69, 175; best when continuous, 193-4; comparison with crafts, 102, 173; and happiness or flourishing, 108-9, 191-3; and living, 109, 173, 196
- advantage, and civic association, 77-8; less pleasing than the good, 174; each species chooses its own, 186
- affection, as process, 164-5; *see also* feeling of love
- age-mates, love between, 38, 82-3
- agreement, love by, 39
- altruism or love for another's sake, 30, 35-6, 63-4, 66, 70-1, 96, 154, 182; vs. noble actions performed in one's own behalf, 106, 187-8
- animals, love among, 14, 61, 83; and sensation, 195
- appetite, 164
- aristocracy, analogous to a husband's love for a wife, 38, 80
- association, purpose of, 77; three kinds, 78
- awareness, of a friend's thinking, 109-10; of self, 109-10; *see also* self-awareness
- base people as friends, 24-5, 67-8; as benefactors, 92, 147; not capable of concord, 100-1, 169-70; in disaccord with themselves, 96-8, 155, 162-3; do not wish the best for themselves, 97; as ignorant, 161; their lives indefinite, 197-8; their love unstable, 76; and self-love, 105, 155, 180, 186; share and desire base things, 114, 160; not truly pleasing to themselves, 160-3; do not even seem pleasing to themselves (of the altogether base), 161; why they spend time with others, 162-3
- being loved vs. loving, 35-6, 75
- benefactions, *see* services
- benefactors, become better through helping, 103; their love of beneficiary, 101-3, 170-3; love being superior, 177; their love analogous to mother's love of children, 179
- beneficiary as product, 172-3; as the being of the producer, 177-8; *see also* product
- blood relationship as basis of love, 40, 82
- brothers, love among, *see* fraternal love
- character-based friendship, *see* good people, virtue
- children as bond between parents, 83-4
- childhood friends, loyalty to, 95, 153
- citizens, concord among, 100-1; love among, 62
- city, ideal size of, 110, 203-4

- civic love, 39; and civic association, 77;
as concord, 169; and many friends,
111, 205-6
- commercial relations involving
affection, 41-2, 85-6, 139
- commonalities and love, 77, 81
- commonly qualified (e.g., a human
being), 158
- community, love in, 39-40
- complaints, between friends based on
utility, 84-5, 90-1, 151; in erotic
love, 150; absent among the
virtuous, 87
- complete love, 22-4, 66, 71-3
- comradely love, 38, 40, 70, 81-2, 149;
and timocracy, 81
- concord, 14-15, 62, 168-9; in cities,
100, 169; different from consensus,
168; among good people, 100-1; as
likemindedness, 100-1, 168; not
possible among base people, 100-1,
169-70; for the sake of advantage,
168
- consensus, different from concord, 168
- consolation, and friendship, 112-13,
207-10; mixes grief with pleasure,
207-8
- contracts, and love, 41-2, 81-2, 85,
90-1, 142-3; voluntary, 143-4
- co-perception, 199-200; *see also*
self-awareness
- correction of friend who has become
base, 94-5, 152
- craftsman's love of product, 102, 172-3
- cross-division of genus by species, 16
- currency, *see* money
- debts, *see* loans
- decision (*proairesis*) and love, 28, 70
- definite, the good as, 197-8
- democracy, 37, 79
- desire, for similar things among the
many, 160; three kinds of, 164
- difficulty, *see* effort
- discord in the self, 96-8
- dissimilarity, *see* oppositeness
- dissolution of love or friendship, 89,
94-5; conditions for, 150-3; in case
of erotic love, 150; of friendships
based on character, 94-5, 151-2
- doing and undergoing as one in
substratum, 178
- effort as contributing to lovability of
product, 178-9
- elderly, friendship among, 21, 27, 65,
69, 71; honour due to, 149
- emotion, love as, 28-9, 70-1; in
relation to action, 147-8; when
appropriate, 148
- emotional disposition, 28
- equality, and love, 24, 32, 40-1, 135;
and proportion, 88; of quantity vs.
quality, 34-5, 73-4, 136
- erotic love, 22, 24, 65, 67; dissolution
of, 150; gives rise to complaints,
138; as an intense form of love,
111; and love between opposites,
76; and proportionality, 88; and the
sight of beloved, 99, 113, 166
- essence of a human being as the
rational part of the soul, 97, 105-6,
156, 181, 185; *see also* mind
- exchange, of commodities, 137; of
dissimilar things between friends
or lovers, 139, 143; *see also* loans
- existence, *see* living
- experience of another, and love, 23;
see also acquaintance
- fair requital, different from good will,
167
- familiarity, *see* acquaintance
- favours for friends or loved ones, 92-3;
see also services
- feeling of love, 18, 28, 70-1; as an
activity, 103; as aspiring to love,
164-5; different from good will,
98-9; arises with familiarity, 98-9,
165; as process, 164; proportional
in unequal loves, 34, 73; and
tension, 164; *see also* affection
- flourishing, as an activity, 108-9; *see
also* happiness, prosperity
- focal meaning, 16, 19, 23, 45n10; *see
also* homonymy
- fortunate and unfortunate people
need friends, 111-12, 206-7
- fraternal love, 80, 83, 149; analogous
to timocracy, 38, 40
- friends, as another self, 109, 113, 187,
192, 197-8, 201; offering
consolation, 112, 207-10; correction
of, 95, 152; in good fortune, 107-9,
112, 206-7, 209; limit on number of,

- 110, 203-4; loyalty to after a falling-out, 154; in misfortune, 111-13, 207-10; as necessary, 107-8; pairs of friends, 205; rejoicing with, 96; services to, 107; and sharing, 77, 113-14; similarity between, 25-6, 136; 76; as one soul in two bodies, 155, 183; suffering together with, 96, 111-12; trust among, 24-5, 68; wives as, 33-4; *see also* friendship, love
- friendship, definition of, 18; alternative definition as suffering and rejoicing with, 96, 154; and acquaintance, 23-4, 66, 83; between age-mates, 38, 82-3; among base people, 24-5, 67-8; and change of character, 94-5, 151-2; civic, 111, 205-6; dissolution of, 89, 94-5, 150-3; and exchange, 139, 143; among good people, 22-4, 191-2; among happy people, 107-9, 189-90; and inequality, 35, 74, 95, 153; and justice, 13, 15, 32, 34-7, 77, 84; and living together, 27-8, 113-14, 210-12; with many, 29, 71, 110-11, 202-6; between masters and slaves, 32, 39, 81; in misfortune, 111-13; as mutual love, 18-19, 29, 63-4, 67, 71; necessary, 13-14, 61, 107-10, 189-90; and pleasure, 21-2, 29-30, 64-5, 67-8, 72, 93-4; and power, 31, 72; and prosperity, 107-9, 112, 209; and self-knowledge, 196; and self-sufficiency, 107, 189-90; as one soul in two bodies, 155; and slander, 24-5, 68; and spending time together, 69, 113-14, 154, 210-12; between superior and inferior, 32-5, 40-1, 73, 84, 95; and utility, 20-1, 29-30, 63-4, 67-8, 84, 93-4, 108; and virtue, 13, 61, 94-5; among young people, 21-2, 65; *see also* love
- genus of love, 15-16, 20, 25
- gods (or God), friendship with, 35, 74; wishing one's friend to be a god, 35, 74
- good, as definite, 197-8; as lovable, 17-18, 62, 152; love on account of, 66; more pleasing than advantage, 174; recollection of, 102-3, 176-7; simply vs. good for someone, 17, 22; specific to species, 157-8
- good fortune, need of friends in, 107-9, 111-12, 206-7, 209; shared with friends, 113; *see also* happiness, prosperity
- goodness not given by nature, 193
- good people, as choosing noble actions, 105-6; and fair requital, 141-2; as friends, 22-4; as friends of happy people, 191-2; as friends of those in power, 31, 72; in harmony with themselves, 96, 162-3; life of as pleasing, 193-4; their lives are definite, 197; their love is stable, 75, 86, 138; naturally choiceworthy as friends, 195; pleasing to themselves, 97, 158, 161-2; and self-love, 104-6; as the standard of love, 156; unregretful, 158; when one party to a friendship changes character, 93-5, 151-2; wish the best for themselves, 96-7
- good will, as the beginning or source of love, 99-100, 165-7; as efficient principle of love, 166; different from fair requital, 167; vs. love, 18-19, 64, 98-9, 163-7; arises spontaneously, 98-9, 165; different from love on account of the useful, 167-8
- government, change of, 79; kinds of, 37-8, 78; as name for timocracy, 78
- grandparents' love, 38
- grief, *see* consolation
- habitual condition (*hexis*) and love, 28-9, 69-71
- happiness, 30; as an activity, 108-9, 191-3; includes love, 61
- happy people, need friends, 107-8, 189-90; not solitary, 107-8, 190
- harmony, with oneself (of good people), 96-7, 162-3; not possible for base people, 96-8, 155, 162-3
- hierarchical love, 80-1
- homonymy and the several kinds of love, 15-16, 19-20, 23, 25, 32, 36, 135, 191; cf. 46n22; *see also* similarity

- honour, love of, 35, 74-5; in return for a benefit, 42, 87-8; toward parents, elders, etc., 93, 149
- hospitality, 202
- humaneness (*philanthrôpia*) and love, 61
- husband's love for wife analogous to aristocracy, 38, 40, 80; *see also* marriage
- inanimate things, love of, 18, 63-4, 81; as product, 102, 172-3
- incomplete love, 22, 24, 67
- incidental, in relation to love, 20, 22, 26, 65, 68-9; meaning of, 25
- individually qualified (i.e., a particular person), 158
- inequality, and love, 30-1, 40-1, 73, 80-1, 84; incompatible with friendship when extreme, 35, 74, 95, 153
- intellectual soul, 157; *see also* mind
- justice, distributive, 135; and equality, 34-5, 73-4; among friends, 36-7, 77; and friendship, 13, 15, 32, 34, 84; vs. love as bond, 62; in governments and in love, 81
- kinds of love, 15, 18-19, 25, 63-4, 135, 191; between unequals, 34
- kingship, 78-9; analogous to paternal love, 37-8, 79-80
- kinsmen, love among, 39-40, 82; meaning of, 149
- lamentation as womanish, 209
- law-based love, 41, 85
- law-suits and voluntary exchange, 91, 144
- lenders' love of debtors, 41-2, 84-6, 101-2, 170-2, 176-7; *see also* loans
- living, as an activity, 109, 173; as naturally choiceworthy, 195-7, 199-200; as pleasing, 109; as perceiving and thinking, 200-1; sensing that one is living, 109, 199-200
- living together, and friendship, 27-8, 113-14, 210-12; *see also* spending time together
- loans, and love of lender and debtor, 41-2, 84-6, 101-2, 170-2, 176-7; not basis of love, 102; measurement of, 86, 144-5; recompense of base people not required, 92, 147; who establishes the amount, 90, 139-43; whom one should pay back, 91-3, 148-9
- longing and love, 166
- lovable, as the good, 17-18, 62, 152; and the investment of effort, 178-9; kinds of (three), 19, 25, 63, 135; on account of pleasure, 20, 63; as relative, 21; on account of the useful, 20
- love, and acquaintance, 23-4, 66, 83; as an activity, 26, 28; between age-mates, 38, 82-3; among animals, 14, 61, 83; for another's sake, 30, 35, 36, 63-4, 66, 70-1, 95-6, 154, 182; of benefactors for beneficiaries, 101-3, 170-3; among citizens, 39, 62, 111, 205-6; complete, 22-4, 66, 71-3; comradely, 38, 40, 70, 81-2, 149; in contracts, 41-2, 81-2, 85, 90-1, 142-3; and decision, 28, 70; dissolution of, 89, 93-5, 150-3; as an emotion, 28, 70-1; as an emotional disposition, 28; and equality, 24, 32, 40-1, 135; erotic, 22, 24, 65, 67; and exchange, 139, 143; feeling of, 18, 28, 70-1; for a father, 148-9; fraternal love, 80, 83, 149; and effort, 103, 178; and good will, 18-19, 64, 98-9, 163-7; of grandparents, 38; as a habitual condition, 28, 69-71; and happiness, 61; hierarchical, 80-1; homonymous kinds, 15-16, 19-20, 23, 25, 32, 36, 135, 191; of honour, 35, 74-5; and humaneness, 61; between husband and wife, 32-4, 38, 40, 73, 80; of inanimate things, 18, 63-4, 81; incomplete, 22, 24, 67; and justice, 37, 77; incidental, 20, 22, 26, 65, 68-9; among kin, 39-40, 82, 149; kinds of, 15, 18-19, 25, 63-4, 135, 191; and the law, 41, 85; between lenders and debtors, 41-2, 84-6, 101-2, 170-2, 176-7; and longing, 166; among the many (or multitude), 159-60; for many, 29, 71, 110-11; among members of the

- same trade, 37, 77; of the mind or rational part of the soul, 32, 39, 81; mothers' for children, 18, 36, 75, 95-6, 154, 179; as natural, 61; of oneself, 96-8, 183; between opposites, 15, 62, 36, 76, 136; between parents and children, 32-4, 73, 82-3; paternal, 37-8, 42-3, 79-80, 88, 136; and power, 30-1; 33-4, 72; primary sense of, 19-20; principle of, 167; of product, 102, 172-3; and proportionality, 33-4, 88, 136; of the same thing as basis of friendship, 68; of self, 96-8, 102, 104-6, 155, 159, 180-3, 186; among similars, 15, 62, 82, 201; standard of (good people's love), 156; and superiority or inequality, 32-5; between teacher and pupil, 142; trace of, 36; and tyranny, 38-9, 78-9, 81; between unequals, 30-1, 40-1, 73, 80-1, 84; *see also under separate subheadings*
- loving vs. being loved, 35-6, 75
- loving, characteristics of, 95-6; intensity of, 111
- loving acts, 153-4
- loyalty to friends after a falling-out, 154
- many friends, 29, 71, 110-11, 202-6; and civic love or friendship, 110-11, 205-6; not an advantage, 202; and friendships of utility, 202-3
- marriage, love in, 32-4, 73; according to nature, 83
- masters and slaves as friends, 32, 39, 81
- metaphor, 166-7
- middle (or mean) as object of attraction, 36
- mind, as essence of self, 97, 105-6, 181, 156, 159, 183-5; as object of love, 105, 181; as the divine part of the self, 157; analogous to ruling caste in a city, 184; as characteristically human, 196
- money, 89; as common denominator of exchange, 137
- mothers' love for children, 18, 36, 75, 95-6, 154; increased by the effort of childbirth, 103, 179; by the certainty of parenthood, 179; analogy with benefactor's love, 179
- multiple senses of a term, 15-16, 19
- many, the (the multitude), and love, 159-60; identified with their irrational part, 160
- misfortune, role of friends in, 111-13, 207-10
- mutuality of love between friends, 18-19, 29, 63-4, 67, 71
- natural, love as, 61
- necessary, friendship as, 13-14, 61
- need of friends vs. self-sufficiency, 107-10, 189-90; among fortunate and unfortunate people, 111-13, 206-7; the happy man needs good men as friends, 191
- noble actions performed by good people, 106, 185; for one's own sake, 187; produce brief but intense pleasure, 187; nature of, 187-8
- number of friends, 110-11; *see also* many friends
- obedience to fathers and other authorities, 145, 148-9
- oligarchy, 37; analogous to undue domination of husband over wife, 80
- oppositeness, as a cause of love in nature, 15, 62; in love based on utility, 36, 76, 136
- opposites, cancelling each other, 207; pleasure and pain as, 207
- pain, opposite of pleasure, 207; greater cancelling lesser, 207
- pairs of friends, 205
- parents and children, love between, 32-4, 73, 82-3; love due to father, 148-9
- paternal love, analogous to kingship, 37-8, 79-80; renunciation of a son, 42-3, 88; proportional to son's, 136
- perception, *see* sensation, self-awareness
- philanthrôpia* (humaneness) and love, 61
- plants, nature of, 195
- pleasure and friendship, 21-2, 29-30, 64-5, 67-8, 72; dissolution of

- friendships based on, 93-4;
- incompatible with grief in the same moment, 163; in what is present, 174-5; balancing pain, 207
- power, those in positions of, and love, 30-1, 33-4, 72
- principle of love (metaphorically = good will), 167
- product, love for, 102, 172-3; remains when contributory causes have vanished, 175; as the being of the producer, 177-8
- proportionality and love, 33-4, 88-9, 136
- prosperity and need of friends, 107-8, 111-12, 209; sharing prosperity with friends, 113
- rational part of soul, 159; in conflict with irrational, 162-3; *see also* mind
- reciprocity and love, *see* loans
- recollection of the good more pleasing than of the useful, 103, 176-7
- rejoicing, with friends, 96; impossible with many friends, 204-5
- relativity of the lovable, 21
- seeing the actions of friends, 192
- self, friend as another, 109, 113, 187, 192, 197-8, 201; *see also* mind, essence
- self-awareness, awareness that one is living, perceiving, or thinking, 109, 199-200
- self-control, 184; lack of, 162
- self-knowledge and friendship, 196
- self-love, characteristic of good person, 96-8, 104-6, 155, 159; as greatest love, 102; stigmatized, 104, 180; analogous to love of friend, 104, 182; in base people, 105, 180, 186; equivocal, 183
- self-sufficiency of fortunate person, vs. need of friends, 107, 189-90
- sensation that one is living, 109, 195; sensation as naturally choiceworthy, 195, 199; as property of animals, 195
- services, to whom they are due, 91-2, 145-6; to friends, 107; similar to a product, 172; doing of as a sign of superiority, 177; *see also* product
- sharing among friends, 77; sharing pursuits, 114, 165, 211
- similarity as a cause of love, 15, 62, 82, 201; between friends, 25-6, 76, 136; of pleasure and utility love to real love, 32, 66-8, 71-3; *see also* homonymy, sharing
- simply good or pleasing (vs. for someone), 17, 22-3, 63
- slander and friendship, 24-5, 68
- slaves and masters as friends, 32, 39, 81
- solitary life not that of happy person, 107-8, 190, 193-4, 196
- sophists who charge for teaching, 140-1
- soul, one in two bodies (of friends), 155, 183; two or three parts of, 159; *see also* mind
- species, change from one to another, 157-8; the good for each, 158
- species of love, 135; *see also* kinds of love
- spending time together, of friends, 69, 113-14, 154, 210-12; as limit to the number of friends, 111, 204-5; and pleasure, 70; pleasure vs. satiety of, 210-11; improves character among good people, 213
- standard of love as that of good people, 156
- suffering with friends, 96, 111; in misfortune, 111-13
- superiority of one friend to another, 32-5, 40-1, 73, 84; when one friend becomes superior, 95; love of, 177
- temper, 164
- tension as element in a feeling of love, 164
- thinking, as characteristically human, 196; that one is thinking, 109, 199-200; *see also* mind, self-awareness
- timocracy, 37, 78-9; analogous to fraternal love, 38, 80; to comradely love, 81
- trace of love, 36
- trust among friends, 24-5, 68
- tyranny, worst form of government, 37; least love in, 38-9, 78-9, 81

- unfortunate people need friends,
111-13
- utility and friendship, 20-1, 29-30,
63-4, 67-8; unstable basis of, 84;
dissolution of friendships based on,
93-4; not basis of friendship for
prosperous people, 107-8; different
from good will, 167-8; and concord,
168; not in need of many friends,
202-3
- virtue, dissolution of friendships
based on, 94; and friendship, 13,
61; not given by nature, 194; of
ruler and ruled or husband and
wife, 33; secure against complaints,
85; *see also* good people
- wicked people as friends, *see* base
people
- willing, 164
- wives as friends, 33-4; *see also*
husband's love, marriage
- worthy people, *see* good people
- young people, friendship among, 21-2,
65