noble. Hence when someone else has superior virtue and his power to do the best things is also superior, it is noble to follow and just to obey him. But he should possess not virtue alone, but also the power he needs to do these things.

If these claims are correct, and we should assume that happiness is doing well, then the best life, whether for a whole city-state collectively or for an individual, would be a life of action. Yet it is not necessary, as some suppose, for a life of action to involve relations with other people, nor are those thoughts alone active which we engage in for the sake of action’s consequences; the study and thought that are their own ends and are engaged in for their own sake are much more so. For to do or act well is the end, so that ACTION of a sort is the end too. And even in the case of actions involving external objects, the one who does them most fully is, strictly speaking, the master craftsman who directs them by means of his thought. 16

Moreover, city-states situated by themselves, which have deliberately chosen to live that way, do not necessarily have to be inactive, since activity can take place even among their parts. For the parts of a city-state have many sorts of communal relationships with one another. 17 Similarly, this holds for any human being taken singly. For otherwise GOD and the entire universe could hardly be in a fine condition; for they have no external actions, only the internal ones proper to them.

It is evident, then, that the same life is necessarily best both for each human being and for city-states and human beings collectively.

Chapter 4

Since what has just been said about these matters was by way of a preface, and since we studied the various constitutions earlier, 18 the starting point for the remainder of our investigation is first to discuss the conditions that should be presupposed to exist by the ideal city-state we are about to construct. For the best constitution cannot come into existence without commensurate resources. Hence we should presuppose that many circumstances are as ideal as we could wish, although none should

17. Normally, however, a city-state is politically active when it exercises leadership over other city-states or has other sorts of political relations with them (see 1327b4–6).
18. In Book II.
be impossible. I have in mind, for example, the number of citizens and
the size of the territory.\footnote{See 1265\*17–18.} For other craftsmen—for example, a weaver or
a shipbuilder—should also be supplied with suitable material to work
on, and the better the material that has been prepared, the finer the
product of their craft must necessarily be. So too a statesman or legisla-
tor should be supplied with proper material in a suitable condition.

First among the political resources needed for a city-state is the mul-
titude of people. How many should there be of them, and of what sort?
Similarly for the territory, how large should it be, and of what nature?
Most people suppose that a happy city-state must be a great one, but
even if what they suppose is true, they are ignorant of the quality that
makes a city-state great or small. For they judge a city-state to be great if
the number of its inhabitants is large, whereas they ought to look not to
number but to ability. For a city-state too has a task to perform, so that
the city-state that is best able to complete it is the one that should be
considered greatest.\footnote{See NE 1098\*7–20.} Similarly, one should say that Hippocrates\footnote{A famous fifth-century doctor from the island of Cos.} is a
greater doctor than someone who exceeds him in physical size, not a
greater human being.

Yet even if one had to judge the greatness of a city-state by looking to
the multitude, this should not be any chance multitude (for city-states
inevitably contain a large number of slaves, resident aliens, and foreign-
ers), but rather to those who are part of it, that is to say, those who form
one of the parts from which a city-state is properly constituted.\footnote{See VII.8.} For
possessing a superior number of these is the sign of a great city-state. A
city-state that can send a large number of vulgar craftsmen out to war,
on the other hand, but only a few hoplites, cannot possibly be great. For
a great city-state is not the same as a densely populated one.

Furthermore it is evident from the facts at least that it is difficult,
perhaps impossible, for an overly populated city-state to be well gov-
erned. At any rate, among those that are held to be nobly governed, we
see none that fails to restrict the size of its population. Argument also
convinces us that this is clearly so. For law is a kind of organization,\footnote{Compare 1287\*18.}
and good government must of necessity be good organization. But an
excessively large number of things cannot share in organization. For that
would be a task for a divine power, the sort that holds the entire universe together. For beauty is usually found in number and magnitude. Hence a city-state whose size is fixed by the aforementioned limit must also be the most beautiful. But the size of city-state, like everything else, has a certain scale: animals, plants, and tools. For when each of them is neither too small nor too excessively large, it will have its own proper capacity; otherwise, it will either be wholly deprived of its nature or be in poor condition. For example, a ship that is one span [seven and a half inches] long will not be a ship at all, nor will one of two stades [twelve hundred feet]; and as it approaches a certain size, it will sail badly, because it either is still too small or still too large. Similarly for a city-state: one that consists of too few people is not self-sufficient (whereas a city-state is self-sufficient), but one that consists of too many, while it is self-sufficient in the necessities, the way a nation is, is still no city-state, since it is not easy for it to have a constitution. For who will be the general of its excessively large multitude, and who, unless he has the voice of Stentor, will serve as its herald?²⁴

Hence the first city-state to arise is the one composed of the first multitude large enough to be self-sufficient with regard to living the good life as a political community. It is also possible for a city-state that exceeds this one in number to be a greater city-state, but, as we said, this is not possible indefinitely. The limit to its expansion can easily be seen from the facts. For a city-state's actions are either those of the rulers or those of the ruled. And a ruler's task is to issue orders and decide. But in order to decide lawsuits and distribute offices on the basis of merit, each citizen must know what sorts of people the other citizens are. For where they do not know this, the business of electing officials and deciding lawsuits must go badly, since to act haphazardly is unjust in both these proceedings. But this is plainly what occurs in an overly populated city-state. Besides, it is easy for resident aliens and foreigners to participate in the constitution, since the excessive size of the population makes escaping detection easy. It is clear, then, that the best limit for a city-state is this: it is the greatest size of multitude that promotes life's self-sufficiency and that can be easily surveyed as a whole. The size of the city-state, then, should be determined in this way.

²⁴ Stentor was a Homeric hero gifted with a very powerful voice.
Chapter 5

Similar things hold in the case of territory. For, as far as its quality is concerned, it is clear that everyone would praise the most self-sufficient. And as such it must produce everything, for self-sufficiency is having everything and needing nothing. In size or extent, it should be large enough to enable the inhabitants to live a life of leisure in a way that is generous and at the same time temperate. But whether this defining principle is rightly or wrongly formulated is something that must be investigated with greater precision later on, when we come to discuss the question of possessions generally—what it is to be well off where property is concerned, and how and in what way this is related to its use. For there are many disputes about this question raised by those who urge us to adopt one extreme form of life or the other: penury in the one case, luxury in the other.

The layout of the territory is not difficult to describe (although on some points the advice of military experts should also be taken): it should be difficult for enemies to invade and easy for the citizens to get out to. Moreover, just as the multitude of people should, as we said, be easy to survey as a whole, the same holds of the territory. For a territory easy to survey as a whole is easy to defend.

If the city-state is to be ideally sited, it is appropriate for it to be well situated in relation to the sea and the surrounding territory. One defining principle was mentioned above: defensive troops should have access to all parts of the territory. The remaining defining principle is that the city-state should be accessible to transportation, so that crops, timber, and any other such materials the surrounding territory happens to possess can be easily transported to it.

Chapter 6

There is much dispute about whether access to the sea is beneficial or harmful to well-governed city-states. For it is said that entertaining for-

26. The general investigation advertised in this passage does not appear in the Politics as we have it. The defining principle mentioned is endorsed at 1265*28–38, 1266*24–31. The relationship between ownership of property and its use is discussed in 1262*37–1263*40.
27. euxodon: “get out of.” But see 1327*6–7.
eigners as guests who have been brought up under different laws is detrimental to good government, and that the overpopulation which results from having a multitude of traders who use the sea for importing and exporting is contrary to being well governed. But if these consequences are avoided, it is quite clear that it is better for a city-state and its territory to have access to the sea, both for the purposes of safety and to ensure a ready supply of necessities. For to be able to withstand war more easily and ensure their own safety, the citizens should be capable of defending themselves on both land and sea; and if they are unable to attack their assailants on both land and sea, at least they will be in a better position to do so on one or the other, if they have access to both.

City-states must also import the commodities that are not available at home and export those of which they have a surplus. For a city-state should engage in trade for itself, not others. Those who open their market to everyone do so for the revenue. But a city-state that should not be involved in this sort of acquisitiveness should have no market of this sort.

Even nowadays we see many territories and city-states that have ports or harbors naturally well situated in relation to the city-state, so that they are neither too far away from it nor are yet parts of the same town but are kept under its authority by walls and other similar defenses. So it is evident that if any good comes from this sort of connection with a port or harbor, it will be available to the city-state, whereas if there is anything harmful, it can be prevented by means of laws that specify or define the sorts of people that should or should not have dealings with one another.

As far as naval forces are concerned, it is quite clear that it is best to have a certain amount of them. For a city-state should be formidable on both land and sea, able to defend not just itself but some of its neighbors as well. But when it comes to the number and size of these forces, we have to consider the city-state's way of life. If it is going to have a political life and one of leadership, it must possess naval as well as other forces adequate for its actions. But there is no need for city-states to suffer the overpopulation associated with including a crowd of sailors, since they should not be part of the city-state. For the marines who are part of the infantry are free, and it is they who are in authority and command the crew. And if the city-state contains a multitude of SUBJECT PEOPLES and

28. See VI.4.
29. See 1277a33–b7, 1337b17–21.
farmers, there cannot be any shortage of sailors. We see this happening in certain city-states even now—for example, in the city-state of Heralclea. For it can man many triremes, despite being more modest in size than many other city-states.

Matters regarding territory, harbors, city-states, the sea, and naval force, then, should be determined in this way.

Chapter 7

We spoke earlier about what limit there should be on the number of citizens. Let us now discuss what sort of natural qualities they should have.

One may pretty much grasp what these qualities are by looking at those Greek city-states that have a good reputation, and at the way the entire inhabited world is divided into nations. The nations in cold regions, particularly Europe, are full of spirit but somewhat deficient in intelligence and craft knowledge. That is precisely why they remain comparatively free, but are apolitical and incapable of ruling their neighbors. Those in Asia, on the other hand, have souls endowed with intelligence and craft knowledge, but they lack spirit. That is precisely why they are ruled and enslaved. The Greek race, however, occupies an intermediate position geographically, and so shares in both sets of characteristics. For it is both spirited and intelligent. That is precisely why it remains free, governed in the best way, and capable, if it chances upon a single constitution, of ruling all the others. Greek nations also differ from one another in these ways. For some have a nature that is one-sided, whereas in others both of these capacities are well blended. It is evident, then, that both spirit and intelligence should be present in the natures of people if they are to be easily guided to virtue by the legislator.

Some say that guardians should have precisely this quality: they must be friendly to those they know and fierce to those they do not, and that spirit is what makes them be friendly. For spirit is the capacity of the soul by which we feel friendship. A sign of this is that our spirit is roused

31. Aristotle cannot be supposing that all of Greece might form a single city-state; it was far too large for that. Presumably, then, he is supposing that it might consist of different city-states that are friendly to one another because (unlike Sparta and Athens) they have the same kind of constitution.
32. Plato, Republic 375b–376c.
more against associates and friends who we think have slighted us than against strangers. Hence, when Archilochus was complaining about his friends, it was appropriate for him to say to his spirit: "It is you who are choked with rage against your friends." Ruling and being free invari-
ably derive from this capacity; for spirit is both imperious and in-
domitable. But it is not correct to claim that guardians should be harsh to those they do not know, since one should not treat anyone in this way. Nor are magnanimous people naturally harsh, except to wrongdoers, though they are harsher to companions they think are wronging them, as we said earlier. And it is reasonable that this should be so. For in addition to the wrong they have suffered, they consider themselves to have been deprived of the benefit companions owe to one another. Hence the sayings: "Wars among brothers are harsh" and "Those who have loved excessively will hate excessively, too."

Enough has now been determined about the people who should par-
ticipate in politics, their number and their natural qualities, and about the size and type of the city-state’s territory. We should not expect theo-
retical discussions to provide the same precision as what comes through perception.

Chapter 8

Since, as in the case of every other naturally constituted whole, the things that it cannot exist without are not all parts of it, clearly the things that are necessary for the existence of a city-state should not be assumed to be parts of it either, and likewise for any other community that constitutes a single type of thing. For communities should have one thing that is common and the same for all their members, whether they share in it equally or unequally: for example, food, a piece of territory, or something else of this sort. But whenever one thing is for the sake of an-
other and the other is the end for whose sake it is, they have nothing in common except that one produces and the other gets produced. I mean, for example, the relationship of every tool or craftsman to the work pro-
duced. For the house and the builder have nothing in common. Rather,

33. Diehl I.230, fr. 67b. Archilochus was a seventh-century poet from Paros.
34. The first quotation is from Euripides (Nauck 672, fr. 975); the second (Nauck 854, fr. 78) is from an unknown author.
35. Presumably, because no theoretical discussion can take account of all the empirical details (observation or perception must provide these).
the builder's craft is for the sake of the house. That is why, though city-
states need property, property is not a part of a city-state. Among the
parts of property are many living things, but a city-state is a community
of similar people aiming at the best possible life.
Since happiness is the best thing, however, and it is some sort of acti-
vation or complete exercise of virtue,36 and since, as it happens, some
people are able to share in happiness, whereas others are able to do so
only to a small degree or not at all, it is clear that this is why there are
several kinds and varieties of city-state and a plurality of constitutions.
For it is by seeking happiness in different ways and by different means
that individual groups of people create different ways of life and differ-
ent constitutions.37
But we must also investigate the question of how many of these things
there are that a city-state cannot exist without. For what we are calling
the parts of a city-state would of necessity be included among them. So
we must determine the number of tasks there are, since this will make
the answer clear. First, there should be a food supply. Second, crafts (for
life needs many tools). Third, weapons; for the members of the com-

unity must also have weapons of their own, both in order to rule (since
there are people who disobey) and in order to deal with outsiders who
attempt to wrong them. Fourth, a ready supply of wealth, both for inter-
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nal needs and for wars. Fifth, but of primary importance, the supervi-
sion of religious matters, which is called a priesthood. Sixth, and most
necessary of all, judgment about what is beneficial and what is just in
their relations with one another.38 These, then, are the tasks that need to
be done in practically speaking every city-state. For a city-state is not
just any chance multitude, but one that is self-sufficient with regard to
life, as we say; and if any of these tasks is lacking, a community cannot be
unqualifiedly self-sufficient. Hence a city-state must be organized
around these tasks. So there should be a multitude of farmers to provide
the food, craftsmen, soldiers, rich people, priests, and people to decide
matters of necessity and benefit.39

38. Deliberative judgment concerns what is beneficial, judicial judgment what
is just or unjust (see 1328b6–7).
39. What is necessary is what justice requires (see 1328b14).
Chapter 9

Having determined these matters, it remains to investigate whether everyone should share in all the tasks we mentioned (for it is possible for all the same people to be farmers, craftsmen, deliberators and judges), or whether different people should be assigned to each of them, or whether some tasks are necessarily specialized, whereas others can be shared by everyone. But it is not the same in every constitution. For it is possible, as we said, for everyone to share every task, or for not everyone to share in every task, but certain people in certain ones. For these differences too make constitutions differ. In democracies everyone shares in everything, whereas in oligarchies it is the opposite.

Since we are investigating the best constitution, however, the one that would make a city-state most happy—and happiness cannot exist apart from virtue, as was said earlier—it evidently follows that in a city-state governed in the finest manner, possessing men who are unqualifiedly just (and not given certain assumptions), the citizens should not live the life of a vulgar craftsman or tradesman. For lives of these sorts are ignoble and inimical to virtue. Nor should those who are going to be citizens engage in farming, since leisure is needed both to develop virtue and to engage in political actions.

But since the best city-state contains both a military part and one that deliberates about what is beneficial and makes judgments about what is just, and since it is evident that these, more than anything else, are parts of the city-state, should these tasks also be assigned to different people, or are both to be assigned to the same people? This is also evident, because in one way the tasks should be assigned to the same people, and in another they should be assigned to different ones. For since the best time for each of the two tasks is different, in that one requires practical wisdom and the other physical strength, they should be assigned to different people. On the other hand, since those capable of using and resisting force cannot possibly tolerate being ruled continuously, for this reason the two tasks should be assigned to the same people. For those who control the weapons also control whether a constitution will survive or not. The only course remaining, then, is for the constitution to assign both tasks to the same people, but not at the same time. Instead, since it

40. For example, II.1–5.
41. For example, those that a deviant constitution makes about the nature of justice. See Introduction, lxvi–lxvii.
is natural for physical strength to be found among younger men and
practical wisdom among older ones, it is beneficial and just to assign the
tasks to each group on the basis of age, since this division is based on
merit.

Moreover, the property should belong to them. For the citizens must
be well supplied with resources, and these people are the citizens. For
the class of vulgar craftsmen does not participate in the city-state, nor
does any other class whose members are not "craftsmen of virtue." This is clear from our basic assumption. For happiness necessarily ac-
companies virtue, and a city-state must not be called happy by looking at
just a part, but by looking at all the citizens. It is also evident that the
property should be theirs, since the farmers must be either slaves or
non-Greek subject peoples.

Of the things we listed earlier, then, only the class of priests remains. Its organization is also evident. No farmer or vulgar craftsman should be
appointed a priest, since it is appropriate for the gods to be honored by
citizens. But because the political or citizen class is divided into two
parts, the military and the deliberative, and because it is appropriate for
those who have retired because of age to render service to the gods and
find rest, the priesthoods should be assigned to them.

We have now discussed the things without which a city-state cannot
be constituted, and how many parts of a city-state there are. Farmers,
craftsmen, and the laboring class generally are necessary for the exis-
tence of city-states, but the military and deliberative classes are a city-
state's parts. Each of these classes is separate from the others, some per-
manently, others by turns.

Chapter 10

Those who philosophize about constitutions, whether nowadays or in
recent times, seem not to be the only ones to recognize that a city-state
should be divided into separate classes, and that the military class
should be different from the class of farmers. For it is still this way even

42. Plato, Republic 500d.
43. The best constitution must be happy; a constitution is happy if all its parts
are; happiness goes along with virtue; so all the parts must have virtue; vul-
gar craftsmen cannot have virtue; hence they cannot be happy; hence they
cannot be parts of the best constitution.
today in Egypt and Crete, Sesostris having made such a law for Egypt, so it is said, and Minos for Crete.\footnote{See Herodotus II.164–67; Plato, \textit{Timaeus} 24b. Sesostris or Senusret III was king of Egypt c. 2099–2061.}

Messes also seem to be an ancient organization; they arose in Crete during the reign of Minos, but those in Italy are much older. Local historians say that the Oenotrians changed their name to Italians when a certain Italus who settled there became their king. It was because of him that the promontory of Europe that lies between the Gulfs of Scylletium and Lametius (which are a half-day’s journey apart) was given the name Italy.\footnote{The area referred to is the “toe” of modern Italy between the Gulfs of Squillace and Eufemia.} It was Italus, they say, who made the nomadic Oenotrians into farmers, enacted laws for them, and first introduced messes. That is why some of his descendants still use messes even today, as well as some of his other laws. Those living near Tyrrenia were the Opicians, who were then (as now) called Ausonians; those living near Iapygia and the Ionian Gulf, in a region called Siritis, were the Chonians, who were related to the Oenotrians by race. So it was in this region that messes were first organized. The separation of the political multitude into classes, on the other hand, originated in Egypt, for the kingship of Sesostris is much earlier than that of Minos. We should take it, indeed, that pretty well everything else too has been discovered many times, or rather an infinite number of times, in the long course of history. For our needs are likely to teach the necessities, and once they are present, the things that add refinement and luxury to life quite naturally develop.\footnote{See 1264\textsuperscript{5} and note.} Hence we should suppose that the same is true of matters pertaining to constitutions. That all such matters are ancient is indicated by the facts about Egypt. For the Egyptians are held to be the most ancient people, and they have always had laws and a political organization. Therefore, one should make adequate use of what has been discovered, but also try to investigate whatever has been overlooked.

We said earlier that the territory should belong to those who possess weapons and participate in the constitution; we explained why the class of farmers should be different from them; and we discussed how much territory there should be and of what sort. Our first task now is to discuss the distribution of land, who the farmers should be, and what sort of people they should be. We do not agree with those who claim that...
property should be communally owned, but it should be commonly used, as it is among friends, and no citizen should be in need of sustenance.\footnote{See 1263a21–41, Introduction lxxvi–lxxviii.} As for messes, everyone agrees that it is useful for well-organized city-states to have them. (Our own reasons for agreeing with this will be stated later.)\footnote{A promise unfulfilled in the \textit{Politics} as we have it.} All the citizens should participate in these meals, even though it is not easy for the poor to contribute the required amount from their private resources and maintain the rest of their household as well. Furthermore, expenses relating to the gods should be shared in common by the entire city-state.

So the territory must be divided into two parts, one of which is communal and another that belongs to private individuals. And each of these must again be divided in two: one part of the communal land should be used to support public services to the gods, the other to defray the cost of messes; one part of the private land should be located near the frontiers, the other near the city-state, so that, with two allotments assigned to each citizen, all of them may share in both locations. This not only accords with justice and equality, but ensures greater unanimity in the face of wars with neighbors. For wherever things are not this way, some citizens make light of feuds with bordering city-states, while others are overly and ignobly concerned about them. That is why some city-states have a law that prohibits those who dwell close to the border from participating in deliberations about whether to go to war with neighboring peoples, because their private interests are thought to prevent them from deliberating well. For these reasons, then, the land must be divided in the way we described.

As for the farmers, ideally speaking, they should be racially heterogeneous and spiritless slaves, since they would then be useful workers, unlikely to stir up change. As a second best, they should be non-Greek subject peoples, similar in nature to the slaves just mentioned. Those who work on private land should be the private possessions of the owners; those who work on the communal land should be communal property. Later we shall discuss how slaves should be treated and why it is better to hold out freedom as a reward to all slaves.\footnote{The promised further discussion is missing from the \textit{Politics} as we have it. See \textit{Oec.} 1344b11–21.}
Chapter 11

We said earlier that a city-state should have as much access to land and sea, and indeed to its entire territory, as circumstances allow. As regards its own situation, one should ideally determine its site by looking to four factors. The first is health, since it is a necessity. City-states that slope toward the east, that is, toward the winds that blow from the direction of the rising sun, are healthier. Those that slope away from the north wind are second healthiest, since they have milder winters. A further factor is that the city-state should be well sited for political and military activities. As regards military activities, the city-state should be easy for the citizens themselves to march out from but difficult for their enemies to approach and blockade. It should also possess a plentiful water supply of its own, especially springs. But if it does not, the construction of many large reservoirs for rain water has been found as a way to prevent the supply from running short when the citizens are kept away from their territory by war. Since we must of necessity consider the health of the inhabitants, and it depends on the city-state being well situated on healthy ground and facing in a healthy direction, and second, on using healthy water supplies, this too should be matter of more than incidental concern. For the things our bodies use most frequently and in the greatest quantity contribute most to health, and water and air are by nature of this sort. Hence if it happens that all the springs are not equally healthy or if the healthy ones are not abundant, well-planned city-states should keep apart those suitable for drinking from those used for other purposes.

The same type of fortification is not beneficial for all constitutions. For example, an acropolis [hill fort] is suitable for an oligarchy or a monarchy; one on level ground for a democracy. An aristocracy, on the other hand, should have neither of these, but rather a number of strongholds.

Where private dwellings are concerned, the modern Hippodamean scheme of laying them out in straight rows is considered pleasanter and

50. Reading pros hautēn at 436 with Dreizehnert and the mss. The four factors could be either fresh air, clean water, political requirements, and military requirements, or health (which is largely a matter of fresh air and clean water), political requirements, military requirements, and order or beauty (see 1330b51, 1331b12).

51. Hippodamus of Miletus: see II.8.
more useful for general purposes. But, when it comes to security in wartime, the opposite plan, which prevailed in ancient times, is thought to be better. For it makes it difficult for foreign troops to enter and for attackers to find their way around. Hence the best city-state should share in the features of both plans. This is possible if the houses are laid out like vine “clumps” (as some farmers call them), that is, if certain parts and areas are laid out in straight rows, but not the city-state as a whole. In this way, both safety and beauty will be well served.

Some people say that city-states that lay claim to virtue should not have walls. But this is a very old-fashioned notion. Especially when it is plain to see that city-states that pride themselves on not having walls are refuted by the facts. It may not be noble to seek safety behind fortified walls against an evenly matched or only slightly more numerous foe, but it can and does happen that the superior numbers of the attackers are too much for human virtue or the virtue of a small number of people. Hence if the city-state is to survive without suffering harm or arrogant treatment, it should be left to military expertise to determine what the most secure form of fortified walls are for it to have, particularly now that the invention of projectiles and siege engines has reached such a high degree of precision. To claim that city-states should not have surrounding walls is like flattening the mountains and trying to make the territory easy to invade, or like not having walls for private houses, on the grounds that they make the inhabitants cowardly. Furthermore, we should not forget that the inhabitants of a city-state with surrounding walls can treat it either as having walls or as not having them, whereas the inhabitants of a city-state without walls lack this option. Given that this is how things stand, a city-state not only should have surrounding walls, it should take care to ensure that they both enhance the beauty of the city-state and satisfy military requirements, especially those brought

52. Reading duseidos with Richards, Ross, and others. Alternatively (mss.): “difficult to get out of” (duseidos). See 1330b2–3.
53. A vine clump was laid out like the five spots on a die.
54. See Plato, Laws 778d–779b. The virtue in question is primarily courage (see 1331a6).
55. Probably an allusion to Sparta, which prided itself on having no walls, and suffered humiliating defeat in 369, when it was invaded by the Theban Epaminondas (1269b37).
56. The level of nonheroic virtue achievable by most humans (1295b25–31).
57. Catapults, siege towers, and battering rams had all been fairly recently introduced.
to light by recent discoveries. For just as attackers are always busily concerned with new ways to get the better of city-states, so too, though some defensive devices have already been discovered, defenders should keep searching for and thinking out new ones. For when people are well prepared in the first place, no one even thinks of attacking them.

**Chapter 12**

Since the multitude of citizens should be assigned to messes, and the walls should have guard houses and towers in suitable places, clearly some messes should be provided in these guard houses. That, then, is how one might arrange these matters. But as for the buildings assigned to the gods, and the principal messes for officials, it is fitting for them to be located together on a suitable site (except in the case of temples assigned a separate location by the law or the Delphic Oracle). This site should be adequate for the display of virtue and also better fortified than the neighboring parts of the city-state.

Below this site, it is fitting to establish the kind of marketplace called “free,” and named as such in Thessaly. This is one that should be kept clear of all merchandise, and that no vulgar craftsmen, farmers, or the like may enter unless summoned by officials. The place would have added appeal if the gymnasium for adults were situated there. It is also fitting that these be organized by division into age groups. Some of the officials should spend their time with the younger men, while the older men should spend time with the other officials. For being under the eyes of the officials is what most engenders true shame, and the kind of fear appropriate to free people. The marketplace for merchandise, on the other hand, should be different from the free one. It should have a separate site, conveniently located for collecting together goods sent in from both land and sea.

Since the city-state’s governing class is divided into priests and officials, it is fitting too for the messes of the priests to be located in the vicinity of the temples. As for the boards of officials that supervise con-

---

58. Reading *thesin...epiphaneian* with Thomas and Lord. Alternatively (mss.): “This site should be adequately conspicuous as a place of virtue (*epiphaneian...thesin)*.”

59. Reading *onomazousin* at *32* with Dreizehnter and the mss.

60. The mss. have *pléthos* (“multitude”); Newman’s *proestos* (“the governing class”), accepted by Ross and Pellegrin, gives a better sense.
tracts, legal indictments, summonses, and other administrative matters of that sort, as well as those that deal with marketplace management and so-called town management, they should have buildings near the marketplace or in some public meeting place in the vicinity of the "necessary" marketplace. For the upper marketplace is intended for leisurely activities, the lower, for necessary ones.

The organization of the country areas should mimic the one just described. For the officials that some call foresters and others country managers must have messes and guard houses in order to promote security. Moreover, some temples dedicated to gods and others to heroes have to be distributed throughout the countryside.

It would be a waste of time, however, to speak about such things in detail here. For they are not hard to think out, just hard to do. Speaking about them is a task for ideal theory; the task of good luck is to bring them about. Hence any further discussion of them may be set aside for the present.

Chapter 13

But we must now discuss the constitution itself, and from which and what sorts of people a city-state should be constituted if it is to be a blessedly happy and well governed. In all cases, well-being consists in two things: setting up the aim and end of action correctly and discovering the actions that bear on it. These factors can be in harmony with one another or in disharmony. For people sometimes set up the end well but fail to achieve it in action; and sometimes they achieve everything that promotes the end, but the end they set up is a bad one. Sometimes they make both mistakes. For example, in medicine it sometimes happens that doctors are neither correct in their judgment about what condition a healthy body should be in, nor successful in producing the condition they have set up as their end. In the crafts and sciences both of these have to be under control, the end and the actions directed toward it. It is evident that everyone aims at living well and at happiness. But while some can achieve these ends, others, whether because of luck or because of something in their nature, cannot. For we also need resources in order to live a good life, although we need fewer of them if we are in a better condition, more if we are in a worse one. Others, though they could

61. See 1332v28–32 for a more careful statement.